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Voice

Speak freely, girl.
Don't let those things that rage -
the elements,
the minds,
the childhood secrets,
direct your spirit.
Let it flow
from the blood of your pen
to the tip of their iceberg hearts.
You know the way you see the world.
They say they do,
but they're not behind your eyes.

Speak freely, girl.
Let your voice
trumpet the coming of a new age,
a new person,
a new world.
Trust your own ways,
your own knowing.
They haven't lived for you,
even though they think they have.
They haven't felt the terror,
or known the beauty of an evening song.

Speak freely, girl.
It is your life,
claim it.

by Logan Fenserson,
from Tainted Nights (1989).
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ABSTRACT

This qualitative study investigates the interaction among teachers' beliefs, their practices, and the practical argument staff development process in two schools and suggests how school culture may affect that interaction. The subjects for this study were the intermediate teachers from two of the schools participating in the OERI Study, A Study Teachers' Research-Based Instruction of Reading Comprehension (RIS).

This study was designed to investigate the proposal in staff development/teacher change literature that conscious examination of beliefs facilitates teacher change. Furthermore, this study explores the importance of school culture to the success of a staff development program. Social interactivity may affect the change process.

Data was gathered in a participant-observation process extending over an eight-month period. During that time, there were classroom and staff development process observations, formal and informal interviews with teachers and administrators, examination of audio/videotapes of events, dialogues with the research team, and documentation of each event with field notes.

The findings are introduced through a description and interpretation of events in each of the two schools. They
are established upon an understanding of how the participating teachers responded to change and to the staff development process, and how school culture affected those teachers and the process. The findings also incorporate the most recent research on teachers' beliefs, staff development, and school culture. They address the theory/practice dichotomy and its relation to change; teachers' beliefs about reading and teaching and their relationship to the teachers' involvement in the staff development program; the culture of each school; the practical argument staff development program, its organization, and presentation; and the relationship between the teachers' willingness to change and the school culture, teachers' beliefs, and the staff development process.

This is a set of case studies about teachers in two schools with varied beliefs and backgrounds. Generalizations from this study, applied to other schools and/or staff development programs, may focus on an understanding of the influence of teachers' beliefs and school culture on a staff development program and the process of teacher change.
This qualitative study examines the practical argument staff development process as a catalyst for change. Teachers' beliefs were observed throughout the staff development as the intermediate teachers of two schools participated in a part of the OERI Study, *A Study of Teachers' Research-based Instruction of Reading Comprehension (RIS)* (1986-1990). This study concentrates on the change process which underlies their involvement in the practical argument staff development process and the influences of school culture on the beliefs and practices of the participating teachers.

I began this study by observing the practical argument staff development process and the culture of the schools involved in the study. During my observations, it became apparent that each school had a culture and each faculty was looking for something quite different from their participation in the program. As a result, I realized that simply observing the staff development process was misdirecting the question. In fact, I should not focus on the staff development itself but the underlying process--
the process of change in which the teachers were engaged. The resistance to and/or the engagement in the staff development, which specifically focuses on altering practices, became the more intriguing consideration.

Change is a process in which teachers are always engaged. They vary their practices, adjust their views of certain students, use one story or chapter instead of another. They construct and reconstruct their classrooms each day within the context of their pre-existing beliefs and theories about education and teaching. These individual changes may not, however, affect the system of education. As Sarason (1982) and Cuban (1988) suggest, the more things change, the more things remain the same.

Before considering teacher change, however, the context out of which the ideas, thoughts, and beliefs were derived must be considered. Teachers come to teaching with a certain teacher education preparation as well as years of classroom observations as a student. Over their years of experience they have developed theories and beliefs generated from both research and their participation in practice. [They can recall their powerless experiences as a student.] Many times teachers have been trained as students in public school and then as students in colleges of education to be passive participants in the educational system. In both sets of
experiences they have participated in the banking model of education (Friere, 1970), where information is transferred from the instructor to the instructee rather than experiencing an environment where inquiry can occur. It is no wonder then that major changes rarely occur in education. It is no wonder that the system is rarely challenged. Teachers' training has not prepared them to critically examine and take control of the system.

Issues to Consider

Theory and Practice

One crucial issue generated from teachers' training is the distinction between theory and practice. In a preservice program students are acquainted with theoretical orientations, given readings by the dozen, and lectures by their professors, while their practical experience is often lacking. Information is simply transferred from paper to brain, from instructor to instructee. They do not see theory put into practice, often not even in their college classrooms. Thus begins the dichotomy between theory and practice. The theoretical perspective is kept separate from the practical perspective as if they can not/should not be joined. Connections between the two are not linked or clarified. Furthermore,
there is no examination of how and where their own theories might fit.

At the same time, the future teachers are generating their own theories, drawn from their experiences as a student and their research readings. They begin a meshing process among their experiences in their K-12 classrooms, their theoretical readings, preservice classrooms, and their field experiences to create their own theories. These experiences, along with their own beliefs about life and teaching, which may or may not be conscious, form a teacher's personal theoretical structure. Unfortunately, these theories are often not considered in their classrooms, or are labelled invalid by the instructor. This leads to a student entering the teaching profession with somewhat entrenched personal theories, a reification of scientific theory, and a small repertoire of practices all based on their beliefs. These beliefs about the classroom, learning, teaching and specific context are, in actuality, the foundation of what occurs in the classroom.

The relationship of theory to practice has often been invisible. The "knowing how" and "knowing that" distinction that Fenstermacher (1986), Richardson-Koehler (1987), Schon (1983), and others have discussed addresses a seemingly large gap between researchers and practitioners. Schon (1983) claims they are two very
different epistemologies while Fenstermacher (1986) suggests a possible communion if the relationship is approached very differently than it has been in the past.

**Beliefs**

At the heart of the "knowing how/knowing that" distinction are the beliefs of teachers--about teaching, learning, and subject matter. Some assert that these beliefs drive action. Addressing this issue, Fenstermacher (1986) claims that practical argument, a series of premises that end in an action or an intention to act, reveals the construction of a belief, making it conscious, and serves as a tool by which beliefs can be examined.

In recent research it has become apparent that teachers' beliefs are important if we are to uncover the relationship between scientific theory, personal theory, and practice. Some, like Fenstermacher (1979), Richardson-Koehler (1987), and Green (1971), assert that teachers' beliefs drive teachers' actions. Others, for example, Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel (1976), described the wide variations in teaching orientation, and Oberg (1987) suggested that "reasons for actions stem from the actor's intentions and beliefs" (p. 2). Elbaz (1983) suggests that teachers' practical knowledge is distinct from theoretical knowledge while Russell (1987) finds teachers
resistant to formal theory. Often teachers do not include formal theory in their curricular discussions (Hargreaves, 1984).

The shift in research on teaching from a focus on behaviors to beliefs may be important in understanding the change process and promoting a closer relationship between theory and practice. During the past ten years research on teachers' thinking (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Hollan and Anderson, 1987; Shavelson and Stern, 1981) has been extensive. Although many aspects of teachers' thinking, such as teachers' cognitions, decision-making, perspectives, judgments, and planning, are important for examining what occurs in classrooms, perhaps the most important and potentially most influential to the uniting of theory and practice is an examination of teachers' beliefs.

**Staff Development**

The reform movement, technological advances, and public demands almost guarantee that a teacher's training becomes obsolete soon after graduation. To compensate for this obsolescence, staff development programs are designed to provide the necessary training and generate the appropriate change. **Staff development programs are**
intended to reach teachers and have an impact on their practice.

Considerable research on teaching and learning—for example, time on task (Berliner, 1979), wait time (Rowe, 1974), planning (Yinger, 1979), and decision making (Shavelson, 1983)—that should be useful for teachers has been available in journals, teacher publications, and through staff development programs. Yet, there is evidence that teachers neither know it nor use it. Even though there are many research-based staff development programs, they appear to be less than successful, or succeed only in making minor changes.

That lack of success has been examined by researchers. Richardson-Koehler (1987) has suggested that there is an "often troubled relationship between producers and users of research" (p. x); Schon (1983) has advised that professionals recognize a distinction between knowledge and practice and suggests a potential incompatibility between them because of the changing nature of practice. Fenstermacher (1986), on the other hand, has proposed that researchers, as knowledge producers, can inform teachers, as knowledge users, and the relationship between them needs further investigation. Waxman et al. (1986) claim that the teachers resist research and its potential usefulness in their practices. In fact, Hargreaves (1984) suggests that
research data are rarely appraised when teachers discuss their practices together. What will help mend the "troubled relationship" that Richardson-Koehler (1987) addresses? And what staff development design might be successful in changing teachers' practices?

Historically, staff development has not had great success. In fact, most research on staff development emphasizes its failures (Guskey, 1986). Corey (1957) and Davies (1967) discuss incompetent design. Bird (1984) calls for mutual adaptation between staff development sponsors and the local organization. Bird and Little (1986) discuss the importance of collegiality. Hall and Loucks (1976) recommend attending to teacher concerns, while Courtner and Ward (1983) claim the importance of the "work together" attitude. Goodlad (1983) stresses the importance of focusing improvement on the individual school, whereas Lieberman and Miller (1984a) accent the isolation of the individual teacher. Howey and Vaughan (1983), discussing current trends in staff development, criticize the lack of appropriate materials and strategies in staff development programs, the ineffective ways they address student outcomes, and the ignorance of social context.

Yet, teachers want to be the best teachers they can possibly be. They want to serve their students well and
please their students' parents. How they can be helped to do so becomes a significant question. How will the entrenched personal theories and beliefs be examined? To become the best possible teacher, a person certainly must be willing to undergo change. How can teachers be supported in that endeavor? And to what degree does school culture affect that endeavor?

Fenstermacher (1979; 1986) suggests that to appraise change teachers need to examine their beliefs, reflect upon them, and evaluate them. Richardson-Koehler (1987) concurs, recommending that for teachers to respond honestly to proposed change "they must assess their belief systems and possibly change their assumptions concerning the way certain aspects of their professional lives work" (p. 42). To that purpose Fenstermacher (1986) proposes that an examination of the practical arguments of teachers, which is the conscious examination of beliefs in relation to empirical research, will facilitate change. Although staff development may be a promising way to foster teacher success and teacher change, teachers are reluctant to participate because of the unsuccessful history.

Few staff development/educational change programs have considered teachers' beliefs. Rather, their purposes have been to present data and generate its adoption into the curricula. Many recent studies suggest, however, that this
is unsuccessful for promoting change. In fact, it may undermine it. According to Fenstermacher (1979), Hollingsworth (1987), and Russell (1987), teachers do not adopt ideas if they are not closely related to their own beliefs. Further, McCloskey (1983) suggests that teachers' beliefs, the foundations of personal theories, endure in the face of formal training. They simply reinterpret research-based material to fit their preexisting beliefs. If this is true, then staff development that attends to beliefs is crucial for teacher change to occur.

Another reason for unsuccessful staff development programs may be the failure to account for school culture. How the principal participates, the relationship of the teachers, and the norms of collegiality may all affect participation. The shared meanings, the sometimes tacit assumptions, the beliefs of teachers about school operations and the students within it can powerfully affect its programs (Page, 1988). School factors play an important role in the beliefs of the teachers and influence the possibilities of change.

Questions

This study is an exploration of one solution to the "how" question of supporting teachers through a change
process which entails an examination of beliefs, personal theories, staff development, and school culture.

This study investigates the interaction between teachers' beliefs and the practical argument staff development process in two schools, a major element in a Study of Teachers' Research-Based Instruction of Reading Comprehension (RIS) (See Anders and Richardson-Koehler, 1988), and suggests how school factors affect that interaction. It was approached with the intent to explore a particular, untried until now, staff development process and determine whether, and if so why it was successful. What role did the culture of the school have on that success? How was the staff development organized to provide a successful experience for the participating teachers? These questions are answered through a description of two schools' participation in the RIS Project and an in-depth examination of four teachers' (two from each school) participation in the staff development process. To accomplish this purpose, these questions were investigated:

1. What are individual teachers' beliefs about reading and teaching?

2. What is the school culture? What role does it play in the formulation of teachers' beliefs?
3. How does the practical argument staff development process affect teachers' beliefs? Do teachers elaborate more on their initial theories? Do they change the premises of their practical arguments?

Predictions and Limitations

As this study was undertaken, I predicted that

1. School culture is important to the success of the staff development;

2. Attending to beliefs is important to the success of the staff development;

3. The practical argument staff development model would provoke a thoughtful, changeful reflection; and

4. Beliefs would have to change before behavior.

I also identified limitations to this study:

1. The small number of subjects was necessary to study teachers' beliefs/personal theories in depth, therefore, the results are not statistically generalizable to the general population.

2. The study in its brevity could not measure change in classroom behavior, therefore the focus was on degrees of change in awareness of concepts and issues presented in the staff development process as evidenced in the teachers' language.
Focus of Study

One purpose of the RIS Project was to establish whether teachers use research-based practices and if they do, how they use them. The Project fulfilled that purpose and went beyond it, exploring change within the schools. The focus of my study was initially to explore whether teachers' beliefs changed as they participated in the Practical Arguments Staff Development. As time progressed, however, the focus became less on an individual's change as measured at two points in time, and more on the process of change. The magic feather principle, addressed in the tale of Dumbo and explored by Bentzen (1974), suggests that teachers need to have confidence in themselves and their new program before they undertake change. I suggest that there may be a need to go further. They may need to know their beliefs, have confidence in them and, finally, have confidence in how they [the teachers] fit within their school before significant change can take place.

This study suggests that to generate change of great magnitude, change that affects not only practice but the teacher's philosophical/theoretical roots, a teacher's reflective abilities, the kind developed in a practical argument staff development process, must be honed. This reflective expertise involves an intensive examination of one's beliefs and personal theories using both an
introduction to the most recent research findings in their area(s) of interest followed by an interactive conversation between staff developers and teachers at both the individual and group levels.

My Place in the Study

During this nine-month study I was a participant-observer in each staff development that occurred in two schools; used formal and informal interviews with the participating teachers and administrators; examined the results of a project-collected questionnaire; observed in the classrooms of selected teachers; and analyzed project-collected belief interviews. I also brought my experience as a teacher, a staff developer, a student of educational research, and my training as an anthropology student to the data analyses.

Analyses of the Findings

The findings of the study are based upon the analysis of data gathered in affiliation with the OERI-funded RIS Project. These findings:

1. Document a way of bringing together research and practice which could improve the structure of staff development programs;
2. Add to the growing base of literature about teachers' beliefs and teacher change and clarify the relationship between teachers' beliefs and teacher change; and

3. Improve upon teacher change models which, in turn, can lead to better staff development programs.

The findings are presented through a description and interpretation of what occurred in the two staff development programs and are based upon an understanding of how the participating teachers responded to change, to the staff development process and how school culture affected those teachers and the process. The findings also incorporate the most recent research on teachers' beliefs, staff development, and school culture. They address:

1. The theory/practice dichotomy and its relation to change including:
   - a consideration of several views of the dichotomy,
   - a look at a way to bring them together, and
   - an examination of how the dichotomy affects change.

2. The teachers' beliefs about reading and teaching and their relationship to the teachers' involvement in the staff development program, entailing:
   - teachers' personal theories,
   - relationships to research/practice, and
   - the relationship to change.
3. The culture of each school and its relationship to its teachers, specifically examining:
   - issues of collegiality,
   - codes of individualism, and
   - social organization of each school.
4. The staff development program, its organization and presentation, using the practical argument process addressing:
   - its effectiveness in each school, and
   - teachers' participation in change.
5. Teachers' willingness to change and its relationship to school culture, teachers' beliefs and the practical argument staff development process developing:
   - suggestions for the change process.

Organization of Chapters

I organized this study according to the flow of events my own reflection that took place over the nine-month period. Chapter II discusses the various literatures considered for this study. The literatures include teacher change, beliefs, staff development, and school culture. Although not every contributor to each literature is discussed, I did examine the findings I thought were most relevant to the study. Chapter III presents the
organization and the methodology of the study. It justifies each step taken along the way.

Chapter IV introduces the two schools, including the teachers, their beliefs about reading and teaching in general, and a description of each school culture. The individual teachers are described through their own language with attention on two teachers from each school, who are described in greater detail.

Chapter V describes the staff development process. A general description of the practical argument staff development process illustrates why it was chosen as a potentially successful staff development program. Next the staff developers and their beliefs are described. This is followed by a thorough descriptive analysis of each staff development process.

Chapter VI focuses on change. It elaborates on the changes noticed in the teachers, their classrooms, their talk, and attempts to fit these ideas about change into a particular model. This chapter and Chapter VII contain interpretations of how the practical argument staff development process and school culture influenced the teachers' change process. Finally, Chapter VIII discusses implications of this study on future research.
A Note on Style

This study was a part of an ongoing Project currently entering its third year. Although I stopped observing the staff development in School A and School F by May, some aspects of the staff development programs continued until the end of their school year and may continue into the Fall, 1989. I have, however, chosen to use the past tense because for this study, the action has been completed. It is important to note that these teachers have not necessarily concluded their involvement with the Project and/or commitment in their own change process.
CHAPTER II
THE IMPORTANT ISSUES

This chapter explores educational change. Because it has often been discussed, one would assume there is a general understanding of the process, but that does not appear to be the case. Rather, there are various articles written about educational change and programs that have been attempted with minimal success. This chapter jumps into that fray with a difference. The attention given here to teachers' beliefs and school culture breaks from the traditional notions of change and offers an alternative that accounts for the social aspects of experience.

To do this, Chapter II covers a wide range of literatures. Accepting, as described in Chapter I, the importance of examining the relationship, or lack thereof, of scientific theory, personal theory, and practice, this chapter offers ideas that should be appraised for drawing them together. This chapter explores the literature on teachers' beliefs and their effects on the scientific theory/practice dichotomy and teachers' personal theories; staff development, addressing why it can be a vehicle for change; and school culture, suggesting the relevance of context to change. Moreover, confronting these issues may help draw
these notions together and bring clarity to the theory/practice dichotomy.

Change Literature

In education, change is viewed as positive. In fact, there are often varied reactions. Cuban (1988), for example, cites the arrival of tax-supported common schools to illustrate the sides of the change coin. At the time, common school advocates believed that this was a progressive move to better educate students living in a democracy, while the opponents saw it as a move by the elite to indoctrinate the masses. Each side had a different perspective and each side was willing to fight for their perspective. The concept of change and its value are socially constructed from a person's life experiences and his/her background.

In education, there have been many waves of reform attempting to affect and/or change the system. They have not always met with great success. In the 1970s the Rand Corporation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975, 1978) studied a variety of federally-funded projects that promoted educational change. They concluded that, although numerous innovations were initially adopted, the long run effects were very small. In addition, they suggested that staff training, regular meetings, local material
development, strong principal support, and establishment of a critical mass of project participants were conditions necessary for change to occur.

Another group of studies found that it takes several years to implement change (Hall and Loucks, 1976; Hall and Rutherford, 1975). While the innovation may be appealing, feelings of insecurity tend to increase before there is a routinized use of the innovation. Evidently, after the first year of implementation there appears to be little impact from an innovation. Instead, teachers are primarily engaged in understanding the innovation and how to adapt into their own practices. Additionally, the studies suggest that collegiality, principal support, accessibility of materials, and collaboration are keys to teacher change, if it is going to occur.

In other studies on change, researchers (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975) suggest that teachers are intuitive and less rational than researchers, resulting in their resistance to change. Teachers are simply less likely to accept suggestions from research. These notions perpetuate that research/practice dichotomy drawing distinct lines between a teacher's practice and a researcher's observations. The researcher is given more credibility.
While these studies indicate that the failure of immediate implementation relates to resistance to change, researchers accept resistance as a factor without a further examination of causes. The most recent change literature (Deal, 1985; Hollingsworth, 1987; Munby, 1983; Richardson, 1989) suggests that beliefs and personal theory may play a large role in that resistance. Given an opportunity to reflect upon research findings, their own theory, and their own practice, teachers may change. Weinshank, Turnbull and Daly (1983) claim that teachers "are acknowledged to play a central role in successfully managing school change" (p. 311), but their role in that change is unclear. Summarily, this research proposes that collegiality, extended time, collaboration, and attention to teachers' position are necessary concerns for and may expedite that change.

School culture is another necessary consideration when examining change. Courter and Ward (1983) indicate that "... to bring about school improvement frequently requires changes in the ways in which people function, interact, and think" (p. 189), and to underscore this point, Deal (1984) confirms it, suggesting that to

. . . make schools different we need to focus on the attitudes and beliefs of people and the norms that develop in small social collectives. Attitudes, beliefs, skills, and norms are the catalysts for new directions. The concepts also form powerful barriers or offer resistance in support of the status quo. (p. 125)
Goodlad and Klein (1970); Griffin (1983a), Sarason (1982), and Schiffer (1980) concur that school culture and failure to understand it has impeded educational innovations.

Watzlawick, Weakland and Fisch (1974), in an examination of change in the mental health field, presented the notion of first and second order change. First order change is a change from one behavior to another within a given way of behaving which itself remains unchanged. Second order change is a change from one way of behaving to another. These changes occur within the system itself and appear unpredictable, abrupt, and illogical, only in terms of first order change.

First order change is the affirmation of the "more things change, the more they remain the same." An example would be a teacher in a basal reading program, who changes the story schedule, putting one story ahead of another. On the other hand, a second order change would be a teacher putting aside the basal reading program for a whole language program, a move from one system to another.

Watzlawick et al. (1974) suggest reframing as a key to second order change. They define it as changing . . . the conceptual and/or emotional setting or viewpoint in relation to which a situation is experienced and to place it in another frame which fits the "facts" of the same concrete situation equally well or even better and thereby changes its entire meaning. The mechanism involved here is not immediately obvious, especially if we bear in mind that there is change while the situation itself may
remain quite unchanged and, indeed, even unchangeable. What turns out to be changed as a result of reframing is the meaning attributed to the situation, and therefore its consequences, but not its concrete facts — or, as the philosopher Epictetus expressed it as early as the first century A.D., "It is not the things themselves which trouble us, but the opinions that we have about these things." (p. 95)

Cuban (1988) has built upon these ideas and applied them to education. He defines first order change as "reforms that assume that the existing organizational goals and structures are basically adequate and what needs to be done is to correct deficiencies in policies and practices. Engineers would label such changes as solutions to quality control problems" (p. 228). Romberg and Price (1983) confirm this notion of first-order change suggesting that innovations

. . . are introduced into social situations in which people have beliefs, hopes, desires and interests, and into institutional contexts that structure actions. The net effect of an innovation can easily be a surface change congenial to existing values and assumptions. Innovations tend to be assimilated into existing patterns of behavior and belief, frequently coming to function as little more than slogan systems that legitimize the values and assumptions underlying the status quo. (p. 163)

Cuban (1988) defines second order change as

. . . altering the fundamental ways of achieving organizational goals because of major dissatisfaction with current arrangements. Second-order changes introduce new goals and interventions that transform the familiar ways of doing things into novel solutions to persistent problems. The point is to reframe the original problems and restructure organizational conditions to conform with the redefined problems. Engineers would call this their solutions to design problems. (p. 229)
He also suggests that second order change cannot occur in a sweeping fashion without external—social and political—changes outside the schools. In other words, for a large scale group to adopt whole language and put aside the basal, outside support would be necessary.

Where does this second order change begin? Is it externally imposed upon the teachers? Or is it internally imposed as a function of the dynamics between individuals and their school culture? There are many first order changes occurring every day in every school, but if teachers want to break away from the disempowering authoritarianism of the system, second order change must be promoted. And it would appear, therefore, that with teacher change as the hoped-for goal, teachers’ beliefs and social context must be accounted for.

Rather than loading teachers with externally-generated ideas, the important components to the change process are teacher beliefs, social context (March and Simon, 1958), and teachers’ participation in the planning process. And the question becomes how can teacher change occur? This study examines that question exploring a newly designed staff development process that accounts for both teachers’ beliefs and social context. However, before we discuss the specific staff development in Chapter IV, this chapter
explores the relevance of teachers' beliefs, staff development, and school culture to teacher change.

**Teachers' Beliefs Literature**

Should we change teachers' behavior before we change their beliefs or should we attend to teachers' beliefs before we attend to their behaviors? This is a question asked in staff development meetings, in the staff development literature and, I think, a question that must be addressed as teacher change is considered. Actually, before addressing this question, which is addressed in the staff development section, I explore beliefs and how they have been defined. Further, I discuss their relationship to the theory/practice dichotomy and the pertinent findings to underscore the significance of an examination of that dichotomy for the consideration of teacher change. I also look at personal theory and where beliefs fit in their development. Finally, I emphasize the significance of beliefs and their study when examining change.

Among the social sciences there are varied definitions of beliefs. In psychology, Stich (1983) dismisses beliefs as non-existent and Kelly (1955) considers beliefs as personal constructs, with features ascribed to the components of a person's world. Philosophers suggest that beliefs are ambiguous, with Quine (1978), for example,
suggesting that beliefs are not constant and maintain little evidence that they exist.

Sociologists and anthropologists, on the other hand, suggest that beliefs are a social construction (Berger and Luckman, 1966). That is, beliefs are generated through an interaction with other people as well as with socially created notions about the way the world works. Words, concepts, and institutions are influenced by those interactions. In fact, social construction suggests that individual members of society formulates their beliefs in a process of filtering their own ideas through their interactions with others (Berger and Luckman, 1966).

Many anthropological studies have addressed beliefs (Needham, 1972). Wallace (1970), for example, referred to beliefs as a division of things—self/non-self. Goodenough (1971) stated that beliefs were propositions that were accepted as true indicating that they were valued in some way. He suggested that there were: private beliefs, that were accepted as true irrespective of the beliefs of others; declared beliefs, that appeared to be accepted in public behavior and were cited in argument to justify action; and public beliefs that group members accept as their common declared beliefs. Further, Jahoda (1970) indicated that an individual's beliefs tend to reflect things prevalent in her/his social environment. In
contrast, Stromberg (1986) suggested the use of the term commitment instead of belief, referring to belief as simply an assent to something. He claimed a person was committed when the emotional investment included greater certainties that reflect a world view.

Most recently, cognitive anthropologists have discussed a view of culture that includes socially constituted understandings of the world (Quinn and Holland, 1987). This view suggests what people must know in order to act as they do, and how they interpret their experience encompasses both personal beliefs and those beliefs about customs, oral traditions, and artifacts held by other members of the culture (Quinn and Holland, 1987).

Many sociologists also define reality as a social construction (Garfinkel, 1955). Their interests are rooted in political examination of society, looking for the social structure of the society and the social function of ideas (Whiteside, 1978). In fact, sociologists are more likely to discuss ideology, than belief. According to Berger (1963), ideology represents certain ideas that have an established interest in society. An ideology appears to be a system of beliefs that is shared within a society.

There are, of course, some sociologists who investigate beliefs. Rokeach (1968) looked at beliefs from an individual standpoint, defining a belief as any
simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase "I believe that." The content may be true or false. On the other hand, Borhek and Curtis (1975) view a belief as a general social process. Moreover, they define belief systems as sets of related ideas that are learned, shared and are usually permanent.

Educational research has borrowed definitions of beliefs from philosophy and the social sciences. For example, Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1987) borrowed their definition of beliefs from Goodenough (1971) and others stating that a belief is a shared statement of relationship among things accepted as true. Klein and Smith (1987) borrowing from Rokeach (1968), defined a belief as a simple proposition, either conscious or unconscious, that can be inferred from what a person says or does. Green (1971) taking a philosophical perspective, defined beliefs as statements that are clustered in groups with other beliefs and accepted as true.

For purposes of this study, using a definition from educational philosophy, I define belief as a proposition or statement of relationship among things accepted as true (Fenstermacher, 1979, 1986; Green, 1971). Cognitive anthropologists have extended this definition to state that a value is placed on the proposition. For example, in
Goodenough's (1971) analysis, to accept a definition as true is to value it in some way for "logical and empirical grounds or ... social and emotional reasons" (p. 25). As Eisenhart et al. (1986) pointed out, this definition has been used by cognitive anthropologists who have developed methodologies to investigate beliefs.

Relatively few studies represent the teacher from his/her perspective (Lortie, 1975, p. 490). Many studies identify teachers' problems or list their errors, but few recognize their points of view. Recently, however, there has been a shift in that direction, attempting to have teachers define their own work situation (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). There is also recognition of the contributions teachers can make on and the insights they can have about the improvement of teaching. Characteristically teachers work in isolation and are not acknowledged for holding a unique body of professional knowledge and expertise. In fact, a commonplace view among researchers is that teachers experience while researchers know. Furthermore, the term practical knowledge, which includes the beliefs, insights, and routines that enable teachers to do their work, reinforces the dichotomy between theory/practice, because practical implies a lack of a scientific base. Practical knowledge is time and
situation-bound, and action-based (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986).

Schon's (1983) work on reflective practice, for example, suggests that practitioners' knowledge-in-action is intuitive, tacit, and based on trial and error. Reflection-in-action, the ability to reflect on what you know while it happens, helps practitioners handle situations of "uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict" (p. 50) as well as day-to-day occurrences. Elbaz (1981, 1983) identifies three forms of practical knowledge: rules of practice, practical principles, and images, and suggests that teachers use them differently in practice. She also distinguishes five orientations of practical knowledge (situational, social, personal, experiential and theoretical) which when taken together, suggests that a teacher's practical knowledge is not acquired vicariously and abstractly (as in a teacher preparation course) but is learned, tested, and developed through field experience. The rules of practice are brief, clearly formulated statements prescribing how to behave in frequently encountered teaching situations. Principles of practice are more general constructs than the rules of practice, derived from personal experience, and embodying purpose in a deliberate and reflective way, which
can be drawn upon to guide a teacher's action and explain the reasons for those actions.

Teachers, Lortie (1975) argues, are satisfied with simple explanations justifying their teaching on the basis of feelings rather than deliberation, and they oppose practices different from their own and rely on private experience to justify their actions. Moreover, teachers do not have a shared vocabulary for characterizing their mostly tacit practical knowledge (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1982) or a shared body of practical knowledge (Sarason, 1982).

Nisbett and Ross (1980) suggest that "rich store of general knowledge of objects, people, events and their characteristic relationships" affects "people's understanding of the rapid flow of continuing social events" (p. 28). Further they suggest that one aspect of this knowledge is its schematic, cognitive structure and another aspect is represented by beliefs or theories which are "reasonably explicit 'propositions' about the characteristics of objects or object classes" (p. 28).

Personal theories, in this case for teaching, are mostly unconscious (Kay, 1987), taken-for-granted theories about teaching that are routinely used and that play an immense role in their understanding of their teaching and their behavior in it. These theories are comprised of
beliefs and other data gathered from life experiences. Often, when researchers compare a teacher's personal theory with a traditional research theory, the personal theory is considered incorrect, although many aspects of the theories may be similar. Scrutinizing personal theory as modification of the research theory may offer clues about the congruity between theory and the practices derived from it. Furthermore, Wiser and Carey (1983) suggest that rather than condemn the personal theory because of its failure to solve problems in the researcher's domain, problems should be found that the personal theory can elucidate, and thus, its explanation process could be probed.

Distinctions between scientific theory and personal theory have been of interest in the social sciences for some time. Scientific theory offers an explicit, objective, and credible view of a problem or situation because it transcends specific details of a subject, the researchers' biases, and the limits of their experience. This includes "beliefs and relations among beliefs held, understood, and used by experts in a particular domain" (Linde, 1987, p. 341) that have been formalized into the classical theories of categorization (Lakoff, 1987).

In contrast to scientific theories, personal theory is "a statement of common sense understandings that people use
in ordinary life" (D'Andrade, 1987, p. 113) that simply describes what is there (Kay, 1987). It is experiential, embodied and reconstructed, based on their experiences while growing up and being socialized, (Connelly and Clandinin, 1986; Lakoff, 1987) and are used by individuals, implicitly or explicitly, to explain how people/things function in their everyday activities (D'Andrade, 1987; Kempton, 1987), including the classroom.

Although Esland (1971) distinguishes "everyday knowledge" from "theoretical knowledge" (p. 92), suggesting everyday knowledge is nontheoretical, Berlak and Berlak (1983) view personal knowledge as "theoretical" or concrete, defining personal knowledge as knowledge that is "validated through its relationship to the knower" (p. 276) and recognize that knowledge by exploring its "contribution to person's subjective understanding of their experience" (p. 276).

Further, Lakoff (1987) asserts that it is easier to demonstrate what is wrong with scientific theory than with a personal theory. It is also true that personal theories are often resistant to change (McCloskey, 1983). When change, in the form of a good idea and/or research theory, is presented, the listeners simply reinterpret what they have heard into their own preexisting theory. For example, in a study of college physics students McCloskey (1983)
found that although students recognized scientific definitions of momentum, they also added their own interpretations which in turn tended to contradict the scientific theory. Similarly, researchers, when they compare a practitioner's theory with a traditional research theory, consider that theory incorrect, without considering where the theory came from or its valid points. The similarities are often overlooked, and some have suggested (Wiser and Carey, 1983) an examination of the personal theory and its driving beliefs as possible enhancements for the research domain.

Linde (1987) distinguishes between personal theory and scientific theory and suggests that an explanatory system is a system of beliefs derived historically from some scientific system but used by someone with no real license or credentials to do so. For example, Freud's explanation of the Oedipus complex was, at one time, a scientific theory with the person discussing it being an authority of some degree. It was not common place for discussion among friends. That, however, is no longer the case. It has been incorporated into our language and our culture in a way that anyone can discuss as if he/she were the expert (Linde, 1987). The explanatory system provides a means for understanding and interpreting experience as a guide for future behavior (Linde, 1987).
Although Lortie (1975), Jackson, (1968) and Waller (1932) assert that teachers use little scientific theory, it may not be true. In fact, teachers may incorporate considerable scientific theory into their own theory. Studies have attempted to explore the teachers' world and their understandings of what is salient (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975). It is difficult to capture teachers' thinking about their knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986), hindered by a limited shared vocabulary for describing this often tacit knowledge. Additionally, teachers often work in isolation, which may explain their lack of a shared vocabulary (Sarason, 1982). Furthermore, Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) suggest that "teachers have not been seen as possessing a unique body of professional knowledge and expertise. The prevailing view among most researchers is that teachers have experience while academics have knowledge" (p. 512).

Teachers, as members of a profession with similar preservice preparation, have specific knowledge. Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) suggest that teachers acquire fundamental perspectives and understandings in their preservice programs and hold onto them during their years of teaching. It is in their university training where they are introduced to scientific theory about
teaching, and it is there where they begin to mingle their own theories with the scientific theory.

The studies discussed in a review of the teacher thinking literature by Clark and Peterson (1986) "hold in common the idea that a teacher's cognitive and other behaviors are guided by and make sense in relation to a personally held system of beliefs, values and principles" (p. 287). Typically these theories are tacit prior to the researcher's intervention, and the task of the researcher is to facilitate the teacher in moving from an implicit to explicit recognition of his or her theory. This can be complicated with the fact that changing teachers' personal theories is difficult because they are so entrenched, implicit and often hard to uncover.

It appears that teachers' theories are related to scientific theory (Hamilton, 1989) and that teachers have found ways to teach that comfortably mesh their own beliefs, routines, values, and everyday experiences with information they have accumulated in their teacher training. The teachers' theories are more robust, situation-oriented, and complex than the researchers', reflecting more the reality of classroom and school.

Teachers' absorption of new information occurs when the new information matches or closely resembles the beliefs/theories of teachers. Although time constraints
inhibit further exploration, it appears that teachers may actually mask their own theories and strategies to appear more like the school/district guidelines rather than relinquish their theories. Nevertheless, knowledge of teachers' theories greatly enhances the effectiveness of efforts to change teachers' approaches to classroom instruction.

Staff Development Literature

Teachers cannot learn everything about teaching in their preservice training. Nor can they be expected during their free time, after a busy day, to remain up-to-date on all the latest theories, strategies, and/or practices being promoted. Yet teachers want to be better teachers and staff development appears to be the most promising way to achieve that. They hope to gain specific, concrete, and practical ideas that will help the daily operation of the classrooms (Guskey, 1986). To this end staff development, a buzzword for the 80's (Fenstermacher and Berliner, 1985), has been recognized as "one of the important and powerful ways" of apprising teachers of the rapid changes in schooling" (p. 282), and it is also seen as "the more promising and most readily available routes to growth on the job" (Fullan, 1982, p. 6). These programs can be considered potentially effective means to promote growth,
understanding and change (Griffin, 1983a). Moreover, staff development is more than just inservice education or retraining (Clark and Clark, 1983; Dale, 1982; Fenstermacher and Berliner, 1985). It is a major activity which "attempts to alter the professional practices, beliefs and understanding of school persons toward an articulated end" (Griffin, 1983b, p. 2) and which will "advance the knowledge, skills and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior" (Fenstermacher and Berliner, 1985, p. 283), claiming it "also involves determining the organizational dynamics that permit the fullest realization of staff skill and talent, in pursuit of the larger goals of education" (p. 283). Often staff development has been situation-specific, planned and implemented as a result of a perceived need in a particular setting at a particular time.

Traditionally staff development, focused predominantly on improving individual skills away from the context of school and classroom (Goodlad, 1983), has not been overwhelmingly successful. While looked upon as a panacea by educators, the research has underscored its lack of success (Guskey, 1986). For example, Corey (1957) emphasizes that although the need for staff development continues to increase, the design and the content are
ineffective; and Davies (1967) suggests that staff development was the most impoverished aspect of the American educational system. Guskey (1986) suggests that "the majority of programs fail because they do not take into account two critical factors: what motivates teachers to engage in staff development and the process by which change in teachers typically takes place" (p. 6).

Howey and Vaughan (1983, p. 98) offer criticisms of staff development:

1. The materials, practices, and content of the staff development do not often consider the social context of the participants.

2. Staff developments often do not relate in any concrete way to each other, leaving the participants wondering about its relevance.

3. Staff development rarely provide measurement of change in either teacher behaviors or student learning outcomes, a gain leaving the participants wondering about the program's impact.

4. Staff development often becomes a deficit training rather than as a normal growth experience.

5. Staff developments often present the teacher as the responsible party for improving instruction without concern for the other important aspects that affect the school and school community.
Further, Howey and Vaughan (1983) state that

... the most serious criticism that could be levelled at staff development today is that it generally fails to consider most of what we have learned about effective teaching and to a lesser extent, what we have learned about the content and processes of effective staff development. (p. 100)

Judith Warren Little has conducted numerous studies on what contributes to successful staff developments. She (1982) discovered that success most often occurs when teachers engage in frequent and concrete talk about practice.

By such talk, teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtues from another and capable of integrating large bodies of practice into distinct and sensible perspectives on the business of teaching. Other things being equal, the utility of collegial work and the rigor of experimentation with teaching is a direct function of the concreteness, precision and coherence of the shared language. (p. 331)

According to Little (1982) "... one of the features found to distinguish relatively more successful from relatively less successful schools has been the frequency, precision and depth of the talk among teachers about curriculum and instruction" (p. 80).

Little also suggests that professional development makes a difference where there is a predominant norm of collegiality. Further, she says to

... the extent that teachers view improvements in knowledge and practice as never ending, they do value staff development but place increasingly stringent and sophisticated demands on the nature and quality of
assistance. Where analysis, evaluation and experimentation are treated as tools of the profession, designed to make work better and easier and where such work is properly the work of the teacher, teachers can be expected to look to staff development to help provoke questions, organize analysis, generate evidence of progress and design differences in approach. . . . Staff development appears to have greater prospects for influence where there is prevailing a norm of analysis, evaluation and experimentation- a norm that may be unsupported by persons' actual experiences in learning to manage new and unfamiliar circumstances and that calls for a stability and a security that may be in short supply, especially in urban districts. (p. 339)

Little (1984a) states that the "prospects for establishing and maintaining a high standard of teaching quality can be argued to rest upon strong lateral relations among teachers as colleagues, backed by a common technical language" (p. 81). She concluded that staff development was most influential when it . . . 1) ensures collaboration adequate to produce shared understanding, shared investment, thoughtful development and the fair, rigorous test of selected idea; 2) requires collective participation in training and implementation; 3) is focused on crucial problems of curriculum and instruction; 4) is conducted often enough and long enough to ensure progressive gains in knowledge, skill and confidence, and 5) is congruent with and contributes to professional habits and norms described elsewhere as norms of collegiality and experimentation. (p. 93)

Bird and Little (1986) found that the . . . norms of collegiality and experimentation are promoted when teachers and principals join in training or other focused interaction designed (a) to forge common goals for improving practice, (b) to promote agreements about desired practice, (c) to develop language with which to describe and analyze practice, and (d) to help the participants achieve, in each others' eyes, the virtues they need to observe each
other, teach each other and work closely together in other ways. (p. 498)

Furthermore, Little (1987) suggests that the "advantages of collegial work, as experienced teachers describe them, center around one theme: breaking the isolation of the classroom. Over time, teachers who work closely together on matters of curriculum and instruction find themselves better equipped for classroom work" (p. 8). She also found that teachers' willingness to work together is based upon:

1. **Shared language** for describing and analyzing the problems of curriculum and instruction;

2. **Predictability** in group dealings, including rules for group process and especially for airing and resolving disagreements;

3. Talk that concentrates on **practices and their consequences** rather than people and their competence; and

4. **Sharing equally in the obligations** to work hard, to credit one another's contributions and to risk looking ignorant, clumsy or foolish. (p. 52)

Finally, Little (1987) states that teaching "has often been described as a private activity, both in planning and instruction" (p. 11). However, the research demonstrates that the more successful schools support active professional exchanges among teachers. These teachers discuss in detail their teaching and students' progress, rather than "oversimplified war stories that defy analysis, concentrating instead on straightforward assessments that
reveal the true complexities of a situation and yield new options" (p. 11).

**Two Views**

There are, in fact, two theories of effective staff development. The first, derived from the literature on the implementation of new programs, suggests that often what teachers hope to gain through staff development programs are specific, concrete and practical ideas that specifically relate to daily classroom activities (Bolster, 1983). For Fullan (1985) "change in attitudes, beliefs and understanding tend to follow rather than precede changes in behavior" (p. 393). In agreement, Guskey (1986) claims that staff development programs frequently strive to change teachers' beliefs "about certain aspects of teaching or the desirability of a particular curriculum or instructional innovation" (p. 6) with the hope that this change will generate specific changes in classroom behaviors and/or practices, and consequently, improve student learning. While this theory of staff development claims that teachers' behaviors must change before beliefs, it also emphasizes the importance of student outcomes on long-term change.

Bolster (1983) indicates that research and strategies about teaching are accepted as true by teachers only if
they work in their classrooms with their students. He further asserts that "efforts to improve education must begin by recognizing that teachers' knowledge of teaching is validated very pragmatically, and that without verification from the classroom, attitude change among teachers with regard to any new program or innovation is very unlikely" (p. 298). Moreover, Guskey (1986) recommends that "efforts to facilitate change must consider the order of outcomes most likely to result in desired change and the endurance of that change" (p. 8). It would seem then that teacher commitment develops primarily after new practices are successful in their classrooms (Crandall, 1983). Guskey (1986) asserts that, in fact, change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes is primarily a result, rather than a cause, of change in the learning outcomes of students. In the absence of evidence of positive change in students' learning, [he] suggests that significant change in the beliefs and attitudes of teachers is very unlikely. (p. 9)

Teachers do not readily change their teaching practices, refined for their classroom (Bolster, 1983). The probability of the implementation of practices or programs different from teachers' current practices or that require major modifications in present approaches to teaching is relatively small (Doyle and Ponder, 1977). Guskey (1986) suggests that "some time and experimentation are necessary for teachers to fit a new practice to their unique classroom conditions" (p. 10), because there are
rarely smooth transitions between the introduction of the new program and its adaptation to the classroom.

One problem with this approach to staff development is that it takes the top-down approach and does not consider the teacher's perspective about the proposed change. Often a "false clarity" is created (Fullan, 1981). Teachers may say they are implementing a particular change, when they are only utilizing the materials without altering their teaching practices and behavior (Bussis et al., 1976; Fullan, 1981). Further, one-time activities are not effective in changing teacher behaviors. When change is imposed upon teachers with little attention to their viewpoint, implementation may be difficult.

An alternative view of staff development suggests that teachers' beliefs may affect teachers' implementation of change. Munby (1983) proposes that a teacher's beliefs "constitute a significant part of his or her context for making choices about adopting research findings, implementing novel curricula or in other ways altering professional practice" (p. 27). Beliefs appear important to classroom occurrences as well as possible desired changes. Hollingsworth (1987) found that change occurs in the classroom when a teacher's existing beliefs are congruous with the new information. She (1988) also recognizes the significance of understanding teachers'
prior beliefs to inform teachers' education. This supports Zeichner's (1986) findings that innovations do not succeed unless beliefs and values are addressed. Furthermore, Richardson-Koehler (1987) suggests that "in order for individuals to respond in a professional and authentic manner to proposed change, they must assess their belief systems and possibly change their assumptions concerning the way certain aspects of their professional lives work" (p. 42).

Olson (1981) and Munby (1983) suggest a sense of both the variability and consequentiality of teachers' implicit theories about teaching. Both researchers make a persuasive case for staying close to the language of practice in eliciting and describing teachers' belief systems. Oberg and Field (1986) concur suggesting that a purpose of teacher development "is to help the teacher give voice to her intentions and beliefs through reflecting on her practice" (p. 2). They infer that "good professional practice" is a function of teachers' beliefs and understanding of the situation at hand. Furthermore, Oberg and Field (1986) claim that teachers' beliefs are at least as important as the study of teachers' behaviors, if not more. In fact, teachers must be able to justify their beliefs, suggesting that "delving beneath surface appearances brings the teachers close to [their] underlying
beliefs and values and commitments" (p. 13) is important to the perpetuation of good professional practice. It is in the revelation of self that the individual can discover their own theories and their links with scientific theory. Oberg (1987) described the "ground" or foundation of teachers' practice as the intentions and beliefs that one brings to that practice. She further asserts that the recognition of that ground was essential to understanding practice. It becomes clear that in order to address one's beliefs, they must be engaged in that process. Without consideration for teachers' beliefs formal training has little impact (McCloskey, 1983).

Few teachers can move from a staff development directly into the classroom and begin implementing a new program or innovation with success. In most cases, some time and experimentation are necessary for teachers to fit the new practices to their unique classroom conditions (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Joyce and Showers, 1980; 1982; Smith and Keith, 1971). "Change is a process rather than an event" (Guskey, 1986, p. 10).

The question becomes whether beliefs are guided by behaviors or behaviors are guided by beliefs. This process described in this study suggests that behaviors are guided by beliefs. This process employs the use of practical argument into a staff development which brings teachers'
beliefs into contact with research findings
(Fenstermacher, 1986).

Practical Argument Literature

Aristotle, elaborating on the link between thought and action, contrasted theoretical and practical arguments. While each provides a way of knowing the world (Morine-Dershimer, 1987c, p. 2), a theoretical argument culminates in a truth claim whereas a practical argument concludes in an action. Green (1976) applied these Aristotelian notions to education stating that the competencies that a teacher needs "are simply those that, within moral restrictions, are required for a teacher to change the truth value of the premises of the practical argument in the mind of the child" (p. 249). The change in truth value addresses a shift from subjectively reasonable to objectively reasonable. He claims that the

... competencies needed by a successful teacher in instruction are those needed to do whatever is required within moral limits to

1. Change the truth value of the premises in the practical argument in the mind of the child, or to

2. Complete those premises, or to

3. Add to the range of premises accessible to the child in the formation of practical arguments. (p. 250)

With additional information, in this case provided by the teacher, a student will supposedly reconsider their
beliefs. It is the teacher's job to enlighten the students.

Extending Green's work, Fenstermacher (1986; 1987a) has proposed examining the practical arguments of teachers. Focusing on educational change and the tenuous relationship between research and practice, Fenstermacher (1986) proposed that this relationship can best be promoted through teachers' practical arguments. In this process research findings could be considered "as evidence, as information, as sources of insight for teachers to consider along with their own experience" (Fenstermacher, 1979), with teachers' beliefs potentially shifting from subjectively to objectively reasonable. That is, the teachers' beliefs upon consideration of the evidence may align with the research findings. Fenstermacher (1986) asserts that "when it is argued that research has benefit for practice, the criterion of benefit should be the improvement of practical arguments in the minds of teachers and other practitioners" (p. 44). Of most use to us in this proposal is Fenstermacher's (1979, 1986) conception of teachers' practical arguments. Fenstermacher's intent in developing the concept was to indicate the ways in which teachers can use research results: "as evidence, as information, as sources of insight for teachers to consider along with their own experiences" (1979, p. 175). The
concept, then, of the practical argument is not meant to describe the ways in which teachers make decisions, but provide a means of transforming teachers' beliefs from being subjectively to objectively reasonable. For Fenstermacher (1986) "the relevance of research for teaching practice can be understood as a matter of how directly the research relates to the practical arguments in the minds of teachers" (p. 44).

The practical arguments in the minds of teachers can account for their actions in the classroom and if accumulated over time, a full description of teachers' actions and their reasons for doing them can be gathered (Fenstermacher, 1987a). It is important to note, however, that a practical argument elicitation is not a way of outlining teachers' decision making (Richardson-Koehler and Fenstermacher, 1988). In fact, it is a heuristic device used to assist teachers in examining their beliefs (Fenstermacher, 1986). What occurs is the integration of research into the teachers' personal experiences (Richardson-Koehler, 1987, p. 14).

The practical argument consists of a series of three types of premises, value, empirical and situational, that represent an action taken or an intention to act (Fenstermacher, 1987a, p. 6). There can be numerous premises with at least two empirical premises, and they can
be sequenced in a variety of ways (Morine-Dershimer, 1987c) with all empirical premises potentially testable (Morine-Dershimer, 1987b). They explicitly/implicitly set an if-then relationship applicable to the situational premise which describes the circumstances and sets the context (Fenstermacher, 1986). The value premise states a desired condition associated with that situation (Morine-Dershimer, 1987c, p. 5). But research that is presented in rhetorical statements, that do not account for teachers' practical arguments, will probably be ignored or discounted. Further, mandated practices based on the research will be performed in a perfunctory manner, if at all (Richardson-Koehler, 1987).

Teachers do not consciously think in practical arguments. An interviewer is required, who listens to the teacher talk about teaching and lays out their arguments. A dialogue then begins to clarify the premises and discuss possible discrepancies between the teachers' beliefs and various research findings. Fenstermacher (1986) suggests that the value premise is pivotal when exploring possible differences because of the teacher's commitment to the students. In fact it is the "teachers themselves [that] determine whatever new practices follow from modifications they make to their practical arguments" (p. 44). The purpose of the practical argument is to allow the teacher
to "take possession of the new knowledge and understanding to work it into [her/his] overarching conception of what [he/she] is doing and why, and to consider revising [her/his] practices in light of the new knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1987a, p. 7).

School Culture Literature

The social context of the schools has been explored as having great influence on teachers' beliefs, actions and participation in any school program. The importance of social context (Dewey, 1904), cultural setting (Philips, 1983), and social construction (Berger and Luckman, 1966) has been recognized from some time, and much research since that time (Bossert, 1979; Guilfoyle, 1988; Page, 1988) has supported it. Educational anthropologists have emphasized its importance by elaborating on the various aspects of school culture. For example, Wolcott (1973) described the intricacies of school through the eyes of a school principal; Erickson and Shultz (1982) discussed the role of a counselor within a school culture; Erickson and Mohatt (1984) addressed the cultural organization of Indian students' classroom and participation; McDermott (1976) investigated the social relations between teachers and students in the development of learning environments in the
classroom; and Heath (1983) observed the distinctions between home and school.

The classroom and its activities within it do not occur in a vacuum, rather they occur within a school culture. Schwille and Melnick (1987) suggest that a positive climate is necessary for encouraging change, experimentation and teachers' willingness to be flexible, while Lortie (1975) has noted that the "work relationships of teachers have been marked more by separation than by interdependence" (p. 23). The culture of a school both shapes teachers' understanding of their actions and their students' and is grounded in faculty members' shared definitions. It is linked to the larger social order by staff members' shared perceptions of the social class of the school's typical student and to the educational demands of the community. A strong culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time; it enables people to feel better about what they do, so they are more likely to work harder (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). A teaching culture is embodied in the work-related beliefs and knowledge teachers have including beliefs about appropriate ways of acting on the job, the rewards of teaching, and the knowledge that enables teachers to do their work. Moreover, teachers' beliefs, an essential element in the promotion of teacher change, are
affected by that culture. Therefore, for a change/staff development process it seems important for the school culture to be taken into account. This section covers three areas: (a) definitions of school culture; (b) effects of school culture; and (c) shared values.

**Definitions of School Culture**

Schools have their own culture (Feiman-Nemser and Floden 1986; Sarason, 1982) and the teachers within the schools have their own ways of thinking (Tyler, 1987). There are also shared ways of thinking within the school (Page, 1988). It would, however, be erroneous to assume that there is a shared teaching culture among schools (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Each school has its own culture with students, community, environment and faculty contributing to that culture. How a person participates in their classroom, views their role in the classroom, and, in turn, how they and their classroom are viewed by the school affects everything that occurs in that classroom and that school. Teachers are interested in change, but school is considered a structure of isolation and individual choice. There is a "built-in resistance to change" (Lortie, 1975) because teachers believe that "their work environment has never permitted them to show what they really can do" (p. 235). This culture has strong impact on what goes on in
the school and within the individual classrooms. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) contend that "teaching cultures are embodied in the work-related beliefs and knowledge teachers share--beliefs about appropriate ways of acting on the job, . . . knowledge that enables teachers to do their work" (p. 508). Although typically teachers work in isolation (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Sarason, 1982), the school culture cuts through that isolation in ways not completely understood. A school like other complex organizations (Jelinek, Smircich, and Hirsch, 1983) has an ethos or culture, a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions that participants share (Metz, 1983; 1986; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore and Oston, 1979). While the beliefs are often tacit and regarded as self-evident by members of the culture, they, nevertheless, provide a powerful foundation for members' understanding of the way they and the organization operate. Morgan (1986) contends and others agree (Louis, 1985; Papalewis, 1988; Siehl, 1985; Tichy, 1983) that organizations as socially constructed realities are cultures composed of ideas, norms, rituals and beliefs. Recent research (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Papalewis, 1988; Peters and Waterman, 1982) suggests that organizations with "strong cultures" are indeed apt to be more successful.

In educational settings, Sergiovanni (1984) defines culture as the organization's climate and relationships
that are combined tightly into structure values loosely structured in the system. It has been further defined as the normative glue which holds the organization together (Siehl, 1985; Tichy, 1983). It expresses values or social ideals and the beliefs that organization members come to share (Louis, 1985). Sergiovanni (1984) and Morgan (1986) emphasize that organizations that are "successful" and link themselves to excellence, display evidence in its members who believe in themselves as an ideological system, a culture composed by ideas, values and beliefs that sustain themselves as socially constructed realities.

Effects of School Culture

Many small occurrences combine to define the schools' culture (Bird and Little, 1986). The organization of the school from time considerations to daily patterns reflects a set of values, orientations and beliefs about teachers and teaching (Little, 1984a). Romberg and Price (1983) argue that schools have a culture of their own that affects and is affected by efforts at curriculum development. Young (1971) argues that the relationship between teachers and students is essentially a reality-sharing, world-view building enterprise. Culture, refers to the patterns of behavior, artifacts and knowledge that people have learned or created. It is an organization of things with meaning
given by people to objects, places and activities. Within a school, it is the patterns of behavior, artifacts and knowledge that socially construct the operations of the school.

Lortie (1975) described school culture as consisting of certain norms that suggest that teachers rely on their own beliefs and past experience and resist externally imposed change; work in the present rather than plan to the future; and work in isolation except perhaps during the first two years (Fuchs, 1969). Often teachers depend upon trial and error to develop bases for practice. Within a school, variation among teachers is expected because of the variation among students and circumstances. In fact, differences in practice are viewed as matters of philosophy (Metz, 1978).

Waller (1932) described schools as theaters of social drama. Building upon that description, numerous researchers (Deal, 1984; Goodlad and Klein, 1970; Griffin, 1983a; Sarason, 1982; Schiffer, 1980) attest that failure to understand school culture has inhibited educational innovations and promoted stasis. Often staff development activities focus only on the teacher as responsible for improving instruction without sufficient attention to the cultural context in the school and school community (Howey and Vaughn, 1983). Within the school as a culture stands
the teacher as an individual in a place of work (Bird and Little, 1986). A central problem in research on the culture of teaching is how to get "inside teachers' heads" to describe their knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986).

**Shared Values**

Those interested in enriching the schools must attend to the culture of this school (Sarason, 1982), the dilemmas involved in modifying that culture (Heckman, 1987) and begin to understand each school's unique personality (Tye, 1987). According to Sarason (1982) schools have distinct cultures that must be understood if changes are to be more than just cosmetic. Because schools vary, they seldom have shared problems (Tyler, 1987). Furthermore, the entire school setting must be considered if the process of renewal is to be successful (Heckman, 1987). When change is introduced from the outside there is little indication that teachers executed it (Cuban, 1988; Heckman, 1987; Tyler, 1987). Furthermore, teachers teach what they know, believe to be important, and what they can use successfully (Tyler, 1987). Teaching is an isolated, individualistic enterprise (Goodlad, 1983). Yet, it would be an error to accept that the focus of change should be the individual teacher working by him/herself.
Research on effective schools provides information on the characteristics of schools that are particularly effective in increasing student learning (Bossert, 1985; Corcoran, 1985; Purkey and Smith, 1983) which indicates that it is the teacher who is affected by and mediates between many of these school level characteristics and student learning. According to Goodlad (1983), failure of a staff development to address unquestioned expectations of teachers embedded in the school culture can effectively constrain a teacher's use of information acquired in a staff development. School culture can reinforce old practices and discourage the new ones (Goodlad, 1983).

It is this shared underlying culture that impacts upon the classroom. In a study of teachers' perceptions of students in two schools, Page (1988) found that the school culture affected how teachers' viewed and behaved with students. She states that "teachers' definitions of students are not simply a matter of personality, style or expectations of individuals but are social constructions. Teachers' definitions of students reflect the culture of the educational organization and are, simultaneously, one of its defining elements" (p. 89). Further, she claims that the "culture of the school both shapes teachers' understanding of their mode of operation and/or students and is grounded in faculty members' shared definitions"
It is linked to the larger social order by staff members' shared perceptions of the social class of the school's typical students and of the educational demands of the community. Because of this extensive impact, it is crucial to consider school culture when investigating teachers' beliefs and their relationship potential to teacher change.

Rosenholtz (1986) has analyzed how school factors affect teachers' commitment. She determined that teachers' perceptions of their work are definitely influenced by the context in which they find themselves. For example, teachers identified as leaders in successful schools were those who "moved others toward fulfilling their instructional purposes" (Rosenholtz, 1986, p. 23). In less successful schools, teacher leaders were recognized as "engaging in non-instructional activities, either by union-related leadership, or by their empathic responses to colleagues' classroom or personal problems" (Rosenholtz, 1986, p. 23). The degree of collaboration in a school was also found to be important in whether schools adopted innovations. Huberman and Miles (1984) found that change occurred in schools with norms that supported collaboration, cohesive relationships and reasonable tolerance for diversity. Together, these studies signify that school factors strongly affect teachers' sense of
efficacy and commitment, and hence, the degree of participation and the manner in which they participate in changing their practices.

Teachers in successful schools where school improvement occurs appear to have a "shared technical culture" (Lortie, 1975) and a shared language for describing, analyzing, debating and improving the practice of teaching (Little, 1981; 1984a). One can speculate that teacher's faith in their profession and in their colleagues might be strengthened by a shared sense that the practice is both artful and well-founded (Little, 1984b).

Staff development has overlooked cultural occurrences and "especially the actual functioning of the school as a social system within a larger cultural context" (Goodlad, 1983, p. 44). In the past staff development programs have centered primarily on improving individual skills, usually away from the context of the school and the classroom.

Lieberman and Miller (1984a) contend that

... little will happen unless attention is paid to the necessity for building an ethos, a climate for collective effort on the part of teachers and principals. ... Discussion of new instructional strategies or new texts or new curricular efforts must be mated with discussions of how best to engage teachers in dialogue about their own teaching, how to find ways for teachers to have a greater sense of their own professionalism, their own sense of excitement as teachers. This can come about only through strategies that involve teachers in experiences where they can work together as colleagues, where they can be involved in the plans,
and where their concerns can be made primary. . . . There is no one strategy. (p. 9)

Suggesting that attention to teachers and their culture is important, Little (1982) concludes that

... continuous professional development appears to be most surely and thoroughly achieved when: teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practices . . . teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful (if potentially frightening) critiques of their teaching . . . teachers plan, design, research, evaluate and prepare teaching materials together . . . and teachers teach each other the practice of teaching. (p. 331)

Furthermore, Little (1982) found that where there was a prevailing norm of collegiality, there were greater prospects for teacher growth with a responsive culture, and Heckman (1982) that schools continually change in response to the problems inside and outside of the school and to new knowledge.

In this Chapter I have attempted to weave together the literatures referred to during this study. Initially notions of educational change were discussed. I presented ideas that concur with Fullan's assertion that

Studies that trace change over a period of time (even short periods) are essential to inferring how people change. Research needs to go beyond theories of change (what factors explain change) to theories of changing (how change occurs, and how to use this new knowledge). (p. 392)

To that end I offer Watzlawick et al.'s (1974) theory of first/second order changes and Cuban's (1988) later interpretation of that theory as a way to view the
changing process. These theorists suggest reframing as the key to significant change. To reframe according to Watzlawick et al.'s (1974) definition, one must change viewpoint. Accepting that, the issue of teachers' beliefs becomes the core of the study because teachers' theories and practices are based on beliefs. Only when new material can be converged and meshed with beliefs does change occur.

Helping people become conscious of their beliefs may facilitate the change process. Reflection is one way to develop that consciousness. Although most staff development has ignored these important points about change, the notion of practical argument and the practical argument staff development process is designed to incorporate both a reflective process and a reframing process. As the teachers reflect upon their theories and practices, it is hypothesized that examination of the practical argument causes them to reframe their questions. Teachers become conscious of their thinking; they become conscious of their beliefs; they can consider change.

A final element to this study of change/changing is cultural context. Neither teachers' beliefs, nor staff development, occurs in a vacuum. One way of understanding schools is to look at them as cultures. This culture affects what goes on in classrooms and how change is
undertaken. However, teachers do not always have shared values. Therefore, to study change external to the individual, cultural context/school culture must be examined and understood.

With this background literature which was visited and revisited during the later stages of the study, I approached this study to draw beliefs, staff development, and school culture together with the hope of finding a way of conceptualizing and describing a successful vehicle for teacher change. I think I have. Chapters IV - VI describe the two schools and their involvement in change.

Before leaping into the case studies, however, the next chapter, Chapter III, presents the methodology I used in this in-depth study of teacher change. This study was undertaken to create a grounded theory about changes in several teachers that can, in turn, be used as a theory in approaching change in other teachers. Chapter III reviews why qualitative research is the appropriate methodology and describes the methodological strategies employed.
CHAPTER III
HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED

This is a study of change--of teacher change, of teachers' relationship to change, and the effects of that change. Teachers change all of the time, their practices evolve, their techniques modify. How does that occur? Why does that occur? What might affect that change? This study examines those questions in a qualitative consideration of a staff development process that occurred in two schools. The teachers, their beliefs, and their school culture were studied to observe and document the change process.

Teachers' beliefs, originating in their experiences as a student, their preservice training, their experiences as a teacher, and their relationships in their school, are greatly affected by the context of the school--its organization (Deal, 1984), its social relationships (Page, 1988), and its leadership (Little, 1982). When studying teachers who are considering change, as many areas as possible that affect them must be considered. Furthermore, teachers may not change in the anticipated direction unless the information presented closely relates to their pre-existing beliefs. How one responds to information depends
upon both individual experience and the cultural context of the school.

Reality is socially constructed (Berger and Luckman, 1966). Individuals and their beliefs are affected by their experiences and the contexts within which they operate. They are also affected by the members of the group they work with and their interactions. To best understand the effects of the teacher change process in the form of the staff development, on the beliefs of the participating teachers within a school culture, this study will necessarily use a qualitative approach. A quantitative study with a need for a large sample simply would not capture the intricacies of an individual school culture. On the other hand, qualitative research emphasizes the importance of meaning and process to the understanding of human behavior (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). It became a choice between an in-depth study of one or two schools, or a large overview of many schools. I chose a small sample. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982), descriptive data "is important to collect, and that analysis is best done inductively and with data collection traditions, like participant observation, and unstructured interviewing and document analysis" (p. 55). Qualitative researchers suggest that their research is a

... loosely structured, emergent inductively grounded approach to gathering data. The conceptual
framework emerges empirically from the field in the
course of the study; the most important research
questions will become clear only later on; the most
meaningful settings cannot be predicted prior to the
fieldwork. (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 27)

Using this methodology, the complexities of individual
belief systems, intertwined with the cultural character of
the school, could unravel to reveal a look at teacher
change. A primary goal was to "understand another way of
life from the native point of view" (Spradley, 1979, p. 3),
hopefully conveying the informants' meanings.

This study was based on the following assumptions
that:

1. A relationship exists between teacher beliefs,
school culture, and teacher change;

2. Teachers and principals state ideas/thoughts that
honestly represent them and their perspectives about life;

3. Teachers' beliefs, school culture, and teacher
change can be studied using qualitative research
techniques;

4. Teacher's beliefs as well as changes in the
classroom can be observed through language;

5. To understand how practical arguments are most
effective in the study of beliefs, they must be examined
within appropriate contexts; and

6. Practical arguments validly reveal an individual's
beliefs.
This chapter presents and explains the research design and procedures used in this study. First, there is a discussion of the qualitative research methodology and its choice as a methodology. Second, there is an introduction to this study, and the project of which it is a part, and the data-collection tools used. This section is divided into two parts:

1. Compilation of the data already gathered as a part of the larger study, and

2. A description of the data-collection processes used in this study.

Finally the data-analysis techniques are presented.

Qualitative Research as Chosen Methodology

Qualitative research involves theory construction from data gathered in a particular setting which provide a rich description (Geertz, 1973). This description weaves a picture of the observable behaviors/events. As a result of the wide range of qualitative research methodologies, definitions for the research, and confusion about how exactly this research might be done, the following section examines its methodological worthiness.

Until the late 1960s, most educational research followed the positivistic tradition (Jacob, 1987, 1988; Koehler, 1978; Lutz, 1983; Lutz and Ramsey, 1974; Smith,
1987) that has idealized investigative models borrowed from the natural sciences (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986). This research, also called quantitative and behavioral (Rist, 1977; Sanday, 1982; Smith, 1978) is straightforward, attempts to represent objectivity (Rist, 1977), a narrow focus (Lutz, 1983), a contrived situation (D'Andrade, 1984), and involves the manipulation of variables to achieve a specific outcome (Linn, 1986). This design purportedly fosters a powerful research methodology (Borg and Gall, 1983; Minium, 1978) devised to maintain internal validity (Campbell and Stanley, 1963), reliability, and objectivity, to ascertain the "truth."

Within the past 20 years, however, this dominant paradigm has been questioned as too restrictive (Fetterman, 1982; Sanday, 1982; Smith, 1978; Textor, 1977) and perhaps unable to properly address certain issues and interests of today's educators (Jacob, 1988). A distinction between the experimental and nonexperimental paradigms proposes that the ideas and relationships tested in qualitative investigations can be only those that occur naturally, not those that derive from controlled manipulations (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986). Accordingly, Kuhn (1970) suggests that research is, in fact, experiencing a paradigm shift, while others advise that researchers have
instead reached a detente (Rist, 1980) or a peaceful cooperation (Smith and Heshusius, 1986).

The "body of work labeled qualitative is richly variegated and its theories of method diverse to the point of disorderliness" (Smith, 1987, p. 173). It has been plagued by a lack of clarity about its definition and direction with qualitative research (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982; Erickson, 1977; Rist, 1977), descriptive research (Koehler, 1978), naturalistic research (Duignan, 1981; Erickson, 1977), field study (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982), microethnographic (Erickson, 1977), case study (Spindler, 1982), and constructivist research (Duignan, 1981), claiming to be on the crest of future research. This, of course, has created controversy. Recurrently, these approaches have been pushed together into one category--ethnography--with one definition, but Wilcox (1982) points out that ethnography is not synonymous with participant observation or qualitative research. What is this research tradition that represents a broader focus (Sanday, 1982), looks for inner understanding (Rist, 1977), and occurs in a natural setting (Wolcott, 1975)? Unfortunately, there is often confusion among educational researchers regarding qualitative methodology, because they seem to borrow techniques rather than a methodology from the social sciences (Fetterman, 1982).
Responding to an approach that seemed too restricting to cope with the problems, ideas, and interests (Smith, 1978), several anthropologists and sociologists published studies on schooling attempting to look at school from various perspectives (Erickson, 1977; Metz, 1978; Wolcott, 1973). This research documented, at least to a certain extent, the daily lives of the school(s) they were studying. As the impact of these studies reached the federal level, conferences were sponsored to examine the value of qualitative research for education (Koehler, 1978); projects were funded; and qualitative studies began to proliferate (Fetterman, 1982; Rist, 1977; Spindler, 1982). Traditionally, education has borrowed from the social sciences (Smith, 1978), so bringing the methods, measures, and ideas of anthropology and sociology to bear on the teacher, classroom, school, and curriculum seemed appropriate (Smith, 1978). Unfortunately changes in research perspectives and the availability of funds occurred so rapidly, that the new questions being asked and theoretical underpinnings were overlooked (Rist, 1980).

In the social sciences several disclaimers were proffered. Spindler distinguished between educational ethnography and anthroethnography, socioethnography and psychoethnography suggesting that people who were unacquainted with anthropological research and not familiar
with the cultural process, claim to be doing ethnographic studies (Spindler and Spindler, 1985).

Rist (1980) asserted that the popularity of ethnography brought with it the alteration of both its epistemological foundations and its methodological implementation. He further described the methodology used by many educational researchers as "hit and run" or blitzkreig ethnography. Wolcott (1975) warned that clarity of approach was needed, while Ogbu (1981) claimed that most, if not all, of the studies done in the schools were not ethnographies, because they did not attend to the wider social context. The sociologists were less vocal but also warned of the misuse of methodology (Metz, 1983). Even the educational researchers (Fetterman, 1982; Lutz and Ramsey, 1974) discussed at length the lack of cohesive methodology in the qualitative work done in the schools.

Most recently Evelyn Jacob (1988) suggested that educational researchers have assumed that qualitative research meant one alternative, ethnography, rather than many choices. Although viewing it as their only choice, they have attempted to use that methodology without knowing how to use it (Jacob, 1988). Educational research, she continued, can benefit from qualitative research methodology because it asks new questions and looks in new directions offering researchers a richer and fuller
understanding of education. One of its most salient characteristics is that the researcher is a research tool (Wolcott, 1975). Because all data are filtered directly through the eyes of the data-collector, who finds that detachment can stop discourse and impede data collection (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986), they adopt a "disciplined subjectivity" (Erickson, 1973) that requires self-conscious and rigorous examination for bias along each step of the research process. They also seek dialogue with the other researchers on the project and/or study participants (Borman, Lecompte, and Goetz, 1986). Furthermore, methods are used inventively, tailored to the situation (Smith, 1987), flexible to meet the unique needs of an investigation (Stainback and Stainback, 1984) and require thorough preparation on the part of the researcher (Vacca and Vacca, 1980). Flexibility in qualitative research is essential to its exploratory, discovery orientation (Patton, 1980; Stainback and Stainback, 1984; Taylor and Bogdan, 1984); however, it is important that the researcher not become totally engulfed by the experience. Researchers "learn how the subjects think but they do not think like the subjects. They are empathetic, but also reflective" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982, p. 119).

Qualitative research involves the "process of deliberate inquiry in a setting" (Erickson, 1986, p. 141).
with the researcher engaged in "data collection as progressive problem solving" (p. 141), beginning in the field with the research questions that guide the study. Erickson (1986) suggests that three issues are critical at the onset:

(a) Identifying the full range of variation in modes of formal and informal social organization (role relationships) and meaning-perspectives;

(b) Collecting recurrent instances of events across a wide range of events in the setting, so that the typicality or non-typicality of certain event types with their attendant characteristic social organization can later be established; and

(c) Looking at events occurring at any system level (eg. classroom, the school, the reading group) in the context of events occurring at the next higher and next lower system levels (e.g., the classroom, the school, the reading group) in the context of events occurring at the next higher and next lower system levels. (p. 143)

As the researcher focuses on a more restrictive range of events within the setting, she begins to look for possible patterns between settings and contexts.

The qualitative researcher must attempt to describe the setting studied so vividly that the reader can almost see and hear its people, keeping in mind the theoretical framework, at least providing descriptions of settings (Glaser and Strauss, 1965). Qualitative research can be used for testing ideas and for establishing relationships, as well as generating theories and hypotheses well grounded in data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Whatever data
collection strategies are utilized, qualitative research is concerned with the discovery of substantive theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1965) which can be derived from data. As the researchers' hypotheses evolve, they quickly become integrated to form the basis of a central analytic framework.

In qualitative research there is no clear distinction between data collection and analysis (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983), which involves a reflective process (Glaser and Strauss, 1965) and is more sensitive to and adaptable to many influences and patterns that are encountered (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). These researchers find it important to be certain that their work really speaks with the voice of their people (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). As Glaser and Strauss (1967) note, these facets constitute an aspect of the data which, when considered together, generate a total picture.

**Present Study**

This is a descriptive study of twelve teachers in two schools participating in the RIS Project during the first nine months of the Project's second year. The RIS Project, a three-year Office of Educational Research and Improvement study of teachers' research-based instruction
of reading comprehension, plans to assess the degree to which teachers use research-based practices in their teaching of reading comprehension; to determine what affects their use of research-based practices; and to test a school based staff development model designed to change teachers' reading instruction practices (Anders and Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

This study extends the work of the RIS Project. Its purpose is to explore the possibilities of the teacher change process, examine teachers' beliefs and the influences within the school setting which may affect that process, and observe the practical argument staff development process as a way of revealing teachers beliefs to themselves and as a vehicle for teacher change. An essential and perhaps most difficult aspect, methodologically, of the design is the determining of teachers' beliefs, using each teacher's beliefs to construct a representation of their teaching, analyzing the beliefs data, highlighting emerging patterns of thought, and comparing those patterns. The next section focuses, therefore, on beliefs and how they are elicited.

Many of the beliefs studies conducted in educational research fail to define beliefs or employ methods that more closely examine behavior (Hollan and Anderson, 1987; Munby, 1983; and Wodlinger, 1985). Past research has also
created categories for the teacher, generating categories and providing leading questions rather than allowing the teachers to generate their own categories for beliefs. A review of belief studies conducted in anthropology and sociology reveal several solid definitions of beliefs and workable methodologies, illustrating that the social sciences can inform educational research (Metzger, 1973; Needham, 1972; and Rokeach, 1968). Researchers like Cancian (1975) and Black (1973) warn against the investigation of beliefs without first providing a definition. They further suggest a method that maintains the informant's point of view. From this research we can learn that we need to be attentive to the people we study, taking into consideration their own thinking rather than the researcher thinking for them.

It is difficult to establish what someone believes and to study those beliefs for a variety of reasons:

1. Conscious and unconscious interactions between subject and researchers can affect objectivity (Devereux, 1967);

2. Subjects often respond the way they think the researcher wants them to respond; and

3. Beliefs can be unconscious to the subject.

Much of the methodology relies heavily on the person(s) being researched with the hope that they would,
in the process of participation, reveal their beliefs. In this nine-month study two schools were examined. Methods of data-collection included participant observation and informal and formal interviews of teachers and principals. Video and audio recordings were made of the formal interviews, teachers' language during classroom observations, and the staff development program. Decisions about what to observe were based on my research questions, data gathered during the interviews, and findings from the literature review. Drawing from this experience, I suggest that school context characteristics at least partially determine the kind of access I had to the normal routines of school life--either through direct observation, indirectly through interviews or both. The two cases discussed in this study describe how an initially unstructured field researcher role evolved differently in two sites because of variance in school context.

The following section is divided into two sections: (a) a discussion of the data compiled as a part of the larger study; and (b) a description of the data-collection strategies used in this study.

**What Has Been Done Within the Project**

Because this study is an offshoot of the RIS Project, much of the preliminary data had been gathered prior to the
beginning of this study. A literature review of research-based practices, district baseline data, teacher questionnaires for each school, initial teacher and principal interviews, and teacher observations had already been completed.

**Literature Review**

The literature review was undertaken to identify research-based reading practices and yielded a collection of research-based comprehension instructional practices and levels of confidence for each, providing empirical information to the teachers in the staff development process (Anders and Richardson-Koehler, 1988). The foundation of the literature review was built upon:

1. **Reviews and syntheses** of reading comprehension research, 1980-current--read by members of the project most experienced in the field of reading. They read and analyzed each synthesis/review, locating reading comprehension instructional practices that were believed to be supported by research. Seventy-six syntheses and reviews were read and approximately 70 practices were identified, rated, sorted and categorized. At present there are 17 categories of practices.

2. A **computer search** for research on reading comprehension published 1984-1987--which produced original
sources. This was read only when a confidence rating could not be rendered or the article was too recent to appear in a synthesis/review.

3. An ongoing hand search of key journals from mid-1984 to present—to determine the extent that professional materials contain and describe research-based comprehension instructional practices including (a) journals of teacher practice regularly read by teachers, (b) reading methods textbooks, and (c) teacher's manuals of basal reading textbooks for the intermediate grades.

**Baseline Data**

After gaining access to six area schools in two school districts, information was obtained on the teachers, schools, and districts. Qualitative data on each of the schools was collected from the onset of the project. School level data was also gathered by classroom observers at individual schools and by the principal investigators across the schools.

**Questionnaire**

A questionnaire designed by P. Placier, research associate, was administered to every teacher and specialist in each of the participating schools. It was derived from Bachrach and Conley's (1987) Organizational
Climate Survey used in 83 school districts in New York State, addressing the organizational context of schools, qualitative descriptions of the school climate, and organization and nature of the reading curriculum. It was selected because the questions appeared "teacher friendly" and the reliability was reasonably high.

This data was synthesized with school information provided by teachers during their belief interviews and observations of the school climate, and developed into case studies. These case studies provided descriptive information about each school which afforded a context for the staff development.

Belief Interviews

Teachers' beliefs about reading and reading instruction were gathered from interviews given by the Project's co-principal investigators. A protocol was developed to guide the interviewers in this process. It began with questions concerning the educational and teaching experience background of each teacher and was designed to elicit teachers' "declared" and private beliefs about reading comprehension (Goodenough, 1971). Questions about teachers' backgrounds, classrooms, schools, and fellow teachers were also asked. The interviewers had
neither observed these teachers, nor had they read the transcripts of the observations.

Categories of analysis were developed by randomly selecting six interviews, analyzing each of these separately, and then looking across analyses to determine common categories within which to organize responses. A common coding system was then developed, and chunks of teacher dialogue in each of the interviews were coded using the categories. The categories of "Teaching Reading," "Reading," "Reading Comprehension," "Learning to Read," and "Questioning" were then examined across all interviews to develop a sense of each teacher's theoretical orientation to reading comprehension and the teaching of reading. The teachers' comments within these categories suggested two dimensions. The first focused on teaching reading and learning to read, moving from a "word and skills" approach to a "literature approach." The second dimension focused on reading/purpose of reading. After the dimensions were developed, each teacher was placed along the continuum to represent their theory of reading (Richardson-Koehler and Hamilton, 1988). Examples of all interview protocols can be found in Appendix A.
Principal Interviews

The principals of each school were interviewed to uncover their beliefs about the reading curriculum, teacher practices, and change.

Classroom Observations

Descriptions of reading instructional practices were obtained through observations in the participating teachers' classrooms. Transcripts of the reading comprehension lessons were analyzed at two levels. The first level described the nature of teacher behavior while teaching reading comprehension and was categorized into various focus levels that paralleled the focuses of researched reading comprehension practices. The second level of analysis matched teacher practices with specific researched practices.

Findings indicate that teachers are using many reading instructional practices that have been researched, although they are not always using them well or appropriately.

What Has Been Done for This Study

This study was built upon the original results with follow-up interviews with the teachers and the principals plus classroom observations and observations of the practical argument staff development processes over a
period of eight months. Across schools the data collection process included considerations of setting, selection of subjects, participation of researcher, and data collection.

**Settings**

Everyday life is organized in slightly differing ways from one setting to the next (Erickson and Wilson, 1982). What is learned at a site is always dependent on the interaction between investigator and context (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Settings are important to the study. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) have suggested the need for appropriate settings is representative of the topic studied. It has also been noted that relevant conditions such as time and physical and social characteristics operating in a setting(s) may influence the data collected (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). Thus, when conducting qualitative research, it is essential to recognize and account for such conditions in order to accurately reflect and analyze the data collected (Stainback and Stainback, 1984). Conducting field research in a school is a social activity where the researcher can expect it to be constrained, enhanced, and shaped by forces similar to those that influence other sorts of social activity in that setting (Corbett, 1984).
For this study the settings were prearranged. They were the two schools where the staff development programs occurred, the classrooms of the teachers involved, and the location of the staff development within the school or external to the school. I, therefore, had to consider the appropriateness of the setting to the topics begin examined.

Selection of Subjects

Selection of subjects is another important aspect of qualitative research. For the researcher, it is important not to make assumptions about subjects' perspective and to guard against the association with certain subjects, that may reduce the accessibility of other subjects. Similarly, subjects who gravitate toward the researcher in a setting may be atypical, which could result in biased data (Stainback and Stainback, 1984). Qualitative researchers (Stainback and Stainback, 1984) caution about subject choice suggesting that "Whom one selects to study, while initially guided by the research topic, undergoes changes based on what data are being collected" (p. 38) and the direction of that data. The choice of subjects is critical to the study being undertaken (Filstead, 1979).

For this study, which provides an in-depth examination of the change process, two teachers from each
of the two schools were selected for in-depth study from
from the 12 participants. After an analysis of the belief
interviews of each teacher in the school, two teachers were
chosen on the basis of their expressed philosophical
perspectives on reading. Their philosophical statements
were compared with the theoretical orientations described
by Hardste (1984) and their perspective were arranged along
a continuum. These teachers represented the philosophical
range of the school, from a whole language orientation to a
skills orientation. I chose to highlight these teachers,
because in the initial interviews they appeared to be the
most secure in their beliefs and the most articulate about
their practices and their choices about using them. I
chose these teachers prior to the beginning of the second
year.

In retrospect I can say that the choices were good
ones, but not necessarily for reasons already stated. For
example, Fd seemed squarely entrenched in the basal reader
and the skills-transfer model of reading in her belief
interview. Over the summer, however, she began a
conversion that continued throughout the year to a whole
language/ transactive model of reading. And Af was chosen
because of her affiliation with whole language, which
became less and less clear during the program. Af was also
chosen because I felt her advanced degree, a Ph.D., might
make her more interested in and aware of the reading research. As it turned out, this was not the case. In fact, of all the teachers she was one of the least willing to consider certain research findings. Although these teachers were the focus of an in-depth examination, the other participating teachers were also observed to provide a full perspective for each school.

**Participation of Researcher**

Spradley (1980) described three degrees of involvement with five types of participation for use in data collection. The degrees of involvement are high, low, and no involvement; and the types of participation are complete, active, moderate, passive, nonparticipation (p. 58).

This study employed three types of participation observation:

1. **Active participation** where I, as researcher, attempted to do what informants were doing, hoping not just for acceptance, but to fully learn the teachers' rules for behavior;

2. **Moderate participation** where I, as researcher attempted to maintain a balance between the emic and the etic, between participation and observation; and
3. **Passive participation** which included being visible at the setting but not interacting with others to any great extent.

**Data Collection**

**Observations.** Classroom observations substantiated data gathered during the interviews and the staff development programs. The teachers were observed periodically during their designated teaching of reading, as well as other, randomly chosen, times. Classroom practices and organization were noted as well as any changes that might have occurred over time. The highlighted teachers were observed for at least 15 hours each in the classroom, and the other participating teachers were observed for at least five hours. The observations extended over the entire eight months of the project. (Appendix B details the observation and interview hours spent on this study.)

School observations were also conducted, for at least five hours at each school, to substantiate data gathered during the staff development program. These observations often occurred during the classroom observation visits. These observations focused on school/classroom observation designs, communication patterns, hallway patterns, and interactions in the school lounges.
Staff development observations were a major focus of this study. The interactions of the teachers, staff developers, and research associates; the staff development design, the patterns of interactions; and non-verbal communications were documented as well as the handouts and other contacts with the Project. These observations are explored in greater depth in the videotape section, page 103.

Field notes. Qualitative researchers suggest systemically recording interpretive and analytical comments along with, but distinct from, descriptive field notes. In this way reference points concerning time and place, as well as the stimulus for specific conclusions, are retrieved and subjected to testing against possible disconfirming evidence (Borman, Lecompte, and Goetz, 1986). These notes taken during field observations represented a condensed version of what actually occurred, including phrases, single words, and unconnected sentences. An expanded version came soon after each field session, when details were added and occurrences recalled that were not recorded at the time of the observation. Lofland (1971) recommends the use of two sets of field notes: descriptive and reflective.

My descriptive notes were kept in an Observation Journal. A journal was kept for recording events observed
in each school and Project meetings that had bearing on the course of the Project. Only those events relevant to the research questions, or that appeared important to the portrait of social context, were described. This record helped focus future observations as well as generating new questions and data-collecting strategies. It began with a clear statement of what questions were under investigation, which data sources were used, and how the site and persons studied were defined (Borman, Lecompte and Goetz, 1986). Understanding came through detailed description and analysis of naturally occurring happenings in concrete situations of everyday life (Erickson and Wilson, 1982). In short, much of the data collected should contain concrete, precise, verbatim accounts of what people say and do (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982; Lofland, 1971; Pelto and Pelto, 1978; Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

My reflective comments were kept in a Researcher's Journal. The researcher's journal monitored unfolding theories and shifts in focus and recorded personal impressions and speculations. The reflective part entails the researchers' notes of her own speculations, feelings, ideas, hunches, and/or impressions. Patton (1980) also suggested that these notes be kept separately because, while the observer's interpretive comments are essential in data analysis and synthesis, it is important that there
also be a great deal of "low-inference" data available to report. The fieldwork journal recounts a record of experiences, ideas, mistakes, and problems that arise during fieldwork. There was also a literature review which, as an ongoing process, continually added perspective and suggested other issues for consideration. Topics, concerns, and questions raised in the journal writing was pursued in the literature review process.

**Videotaping.** Audiovisual equipment has been utilized since the 1970s as a data-gathering device to overcome certain shortcomings in conventional field studies (Cicourel, 1974), preserving research materials in close to their original form. Events depicted on videotape are not equivalent to school events, but they do preserve events in close to their original form (Mehan, 1978). In some studies these materials are transcribed and serve as support for interpretations (Mehan, 1979). Videotape also serves as an external memory that allows researchers to examine materials extensively and repeatedly, often frame by frame (Briggs, 1986; McDermott, 1976; Mehan, 1979) yet rigor of the study warns against using audiovisual materials by themselves (Mehan, 1979). "Tape and videorecording has greatly increased the precision of data collection and a great deal of attention has focused on the
range of contexts in which recordings are made (Briggs, 1986, p. 17).

A videotaped record provides an exhaustive record that permits careful analysis of what happened. Films made as a primary data source are similar to research films made in the natural sciences, for example, the daily cycle of the flower (Erickson and Wilson, 1982). The continuous aspect of recording does not emphasize any specific aspects of life. Furthermore, Erickson and Wilson (1982) warn that audiovisual documents of everyday life should be minimally edited, particularly if they are to serve as primary research documents.

Cicourel (1974) found that audiovisual materials helped clarify the basis for research decisions. The camera was set up in full view of the participants so that its presence was explicit and could be routinized as part of the activities. Exposing the video camera limited the amount of settings that could be captured, dependent upon the activities being taped. Further, locating speakers in a group session involved difficult camera moves, while individual voices were often unidentified if the camera was focused on another part of the room (Cicourel, 1974). While problems of selective attention in the researcher's observations and notes were not eliminated, the audiovisual equipment enabled the researchers to focus on interaction
details that might be missed in participant-observer studies (Cicourel, 1974).

There were also difficulties in transcribing from the videotapes because of the disjuncture between what can be seen and what is heard (Cicourel, 1974). Participating in the original videotaped session means that the observer can continually add information from her memory of the setting to enhance or alter the impression possible from the transcript. It is difficult to separate the materials presented or analyzed from the remembered experience (Mehan, 1974).

Although audiovisual documentation records the fine details of the setting and allows "vicarious revisiting" (Erickson and Wilson, 1982) at later times, the best way to do this research is in conjunction with other fieldwork strategies. It is also useful in discovering new insights about the setting that might be overlooked because of their subtlety and/or familiarity of those involved.

The main criterion for a videotaped record is that it contains as complete a record as possible of the continuous sequence of action as it occurs in real time (Erickson and Wilson, 1982). To achieve this, Erickson and Wilson (1982) recommend setting the camera for the widest angle shot and filming continuously from shortly before to shortly after the event. For filming, the camera remains stationary and
positioned on a tripod. Variations are possible, if minimal editing occurs, provided that:

1. The camera remains on for the entirety of the action; and

2. The wide angle includes all the participants engaged in the event's interaction.

Such minimally edited footage does not look like completely locked-on, stationary video footage. It is important to preserve the sequence and duration of events for them to be useful as primary data.

For this study the video camera was placed on a tripod toward the back of each group or at the back of each classroom. Since the sessions naturally involved the camera, they were easy to record unobtrusively. The participants knew they were being filmed and gave their permission in advance. Only a few teachers reported that the cameras made them nervous. In each case, this occurred only at the beginning of a session, either individual or group. Although awareness of the recording equipment decreased over time, the participants did not become oblivious, as evidenced by references to the presence of the cameras. It is important to note that video equipment can be vastly more intrusive than small tape recorders. To counterbalance this, these intrusions discussed specifically what the teachers wanted to have
videotaped and how they wanted me to behave in their classrooms. The point was not to eliminate the effects of the camera's presence, an unachievable goal, but to minimize them. When taping the group component of the staff development process, it was impossible to include all participants within the field of focus, so the camera was focused on the person speaking and as many other members of the group as possible. There were also times when the camera was just focused on the group without directing it toward the speaker. Audiotapes and observational notes carefully complemented the videotaping. During the taping I took notes, as I monitored the camera, including dates, times, and the individuals involved.

The individual component of the staff development process included an interview that used a videotape of the classroom lesson as a conversational device. After a classroom lesson videotape was made, often within three weeks of filming, the teacher and the two staff developers viewed the videotape together. They could stop the videotape wherever they wanted and comment on what was happening at that point. Their comments were audiotaped. We carefully noted the teachers' response in order to check their interpretations with our own (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). This became an analysis of the teachers' accounts. Prior to the actual viewing of the videotape,
each teacher was given an opportunity to state their feelings about the videotaping and brief the interviewers on the event to be viewed. Instructions were then given about stopping the tape, which they could do at any time. This strategy formed the backbone of the analysis of the teachers' practical arguments.

My work depended upon a combination of participant observation, where I was a moderate observer taking running field notes, and an analysis of the videotapes of the staff development sessions. The first step in analyzing the materials involved locating recurrent activities in the sessions (Mehan, 1986). The sessions were usually composed of two possibilities:

1. In a group there were five or six teachers, two staff developers, two or three research associates, and an administrator, perhaps, floating in and out, where the staff developers lead the group in various discussions; or

2. Individually there was the teacher, the principal investigators, a project notetaker, and audiovisual specialist. Once the transcript was summarized and indexed it served as the basis for examining what occurred in the staff development. The transcripts were searched for all statements that the teachers made about the various aspects of teaching and/or reading. When isolated, these statements were extracted from the transcripts and labeled
to become the materials upon which the analysis was conducted. The analysis included categorizing what occurred on videotape. My work involved an interface between the machine's information storage and the human ability for information-processing, while looking at/listening to the audiovisual record (Erickson, 1982).

**Interviewing.** An interview, a conversation with a purpose (Lincoln and Guba, 1985), is often employed as a methodology to establish peoples' views of issues through questions that can be open-ended and informal or very formal and structured, depending upon the intent of the researcher. This methodology is chosen because it elicits personal opinions, knowledge, and feelings. Usually the questions are established prior to the interview and are then coded and analyzed, and a portrait is drawn to authenticate the subject's view after the interview's completion. In educational research, Bussis et al. (1976) employed a semiformal interviewing to engender confidence (and truthfulness) in their subjects. Kleine and Smith (1987) utilized in-depth interviews to gather life history information, while Hollan and Anderson (1987) used interviews to establish personal knowledge and examine self-reinforcing beliefs.

One variation of the interview methodology is the elicitation procedure. Using this, the researcher attempts
to elicit a subjects' assertions to produce a description for at least one pre-selected domain. It is (a) comprehensive; (b) reliable across informants and valid over time; (c) readily analyzable; and (d) replicable. It implements a question/answer pair which establishes the same assertion. In other words, they would ask a question, and then the answer would be fit into another question to verify terms. This can be used to establish belief systems through semantic procedures. Anthropologists developed this method (Black, 1969, 1973; Black and Metzger, 1969; Cancion, 1975; Kay and Metzger, 1973; Metzger, 1973), which formulates questions in the native language, a crucial aspect of the process, to elicit native beliefs in the native's language.

In education, Eisenhart et al. (1987), also attentive to the subject's language, used Stefflre's Eliciting Heuristic methodology (HEM) to establish categories. They used the HEM because it was devised to elicit subjects' own categories in their own language. Establishing a category system, however, is extremely time consuming and is too far-reaching for practical use. Even those researchers who once employed it put it aside because of its tediousness (Tyler, 1978). This procedure of eliciting responses was, however, adapted for this study to draw out the language of
teachers when describing their philosophy and their practice.

There were two forms of interviews used during this study, informal and formal.

Informal interviews are natural ways of getting information which usually take place in more relaxed social settings and are used to help clarify issues and create a complete picture of what was happening for the informants. They also provide opportunities to question things seen and heard, as well as question the informants themselves. Informal interviewing helps validate the observations made by the researcher and confirms "the generalizations which the members hold" (Sevigny, 1980, p. 70). They serve as a check on inferences made and add new information to the data collection.

Formal interviews, as structured procedure for invoking information, help establish a subject's position on the topic covered. They are used to elicit perceptions, meanings, and thoughts from various informants on specific issues. Lofland (1971) argues that the interviewer must take the time to:

1. Assemble self-consciously all materials on how problems are handled by those being observed;

2. Tease out the variations among her compilation of strategies;

3. Classify them into an articulate set of strategies; and
4. Present them to the reader in an orderly manner. (p. 42-3)

Formal and informal interviews were an important portion of this study. Interviewing in this study ranged from informal to formal, occurring in a variety of settings and conducted according to Spradley's model (1979). The time spent in each school helped establish collegial relationships with teachers that, in turn, created a workable interview climate. Furthermore, anonymity was guaranteed, identifying each teacher by letter code in the text of the interview and the text of this study to facilitate a positive interview climate. Each interview, either formal or informal, contained non-directive questions that were designed to trigger responses touching on a particular broad area. They were open-ended rather than expecting the interviewee to provide specific information or respond yes or no (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). The formal interviews were taped, and whenever possible, the informal interviews were taped as well.

**Triangulation.** Triangulation, a variety of data collection procedures used collaboratively, is the indication of good qualitative research (Stainback and Stainback, 1984). Mathison (1988) suggests that "Good research practice obligates the researcher to triangulate, to use multiple methods, data sources, and researchers to
enhance the validity of research findings" (p. 13) with the hope that it will eliminate bias by supporting "a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or at least, don't contradict it" (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 235). In fact, Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest

... triangulation is a state of mind. If you self-consciously set out to collect and double-check findings, using multiple sources and modes of evidence, the verification process will largely be built into the data-gathering process, and little more need be done than to report on one's procedures. (p. 235)

Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) suggest that triangulation amounts to "checking inferences drawn from one set of data sources by collecting data from others" (p. 198), while Vacca and Vacca (1980) warn that studies engaged in direct observation must use other strategies and informants to supplement their observation. It involves employing multiple indicators to measure a single concept using numerous sources of information to verify a single event, thus strengthening its credibility (Stainback and Stainback, 1984). Moreover, Patton (1980) says that "triangulation is a process by which the researchers can guard against the accusation that a study's findings are simple--an artifact of a single method, a single data source, or a single investigator's bias" (p. 332). Each piece of information gained, or each conclusion reached, must be considered provisional or unusual until it has been
validated by information collected by other means or from other sources (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986; Denzin, 1978).

Denzin (1978) and others identify three types of triangulation:

1. **Data** - involving the intersection of data gathered from an assortment of subjects, settings, and conditions to expose patterns and rationales across data (Patton, 1980);

2. **Investigator** - using other researchers and/or participants for verification (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982); and

3. **Methodological** - intertwining multiple data collection strategies with the hope of alleviating concern about the findings (Wolcott, 1975) by comparing and contrasting data collected (Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

Mathison (1988), expressing her concerns with Denzin's and others' definitions of triangulation, suggested that:

1. The bias of a particular method, data source, and researcher will be eliminated, when used in combination with other methods, data source, or researcher;

2. The results will lack clarity; and

3. The results will, in fact, contradict themselves.

To counter these concerns she asserts that "In practice, triangulation provides a rich and complex picture of some
social phenomena being studied" (p. 15), but does not suggest a singular view of what was observed. Furthermore, she believes that it is

... a technique which provides more and better evidence from which researchers can construct meaningful propositions about the social world. The value of triangulation lies in providing evidence such that the researcher can construct explanations of the social phenomena from which they arise. (p. 15)

Similarly, "all outcomes of triangulation--convergent, inconsistent, and contradictory, need to be filtered through knowledge gleaned from the immediate data, the project/program context, and understandings of the larger social world" (p. 16).

In a study that is investigating how each participant perceives what is occurring and how each participant defines the situation, triangulation is imperative. Without a system of checks and balances, misrepresentation could easily occur. With Mathison's warnings in mind, Denzin's three types of triangulation were utilized to develop a whole picture of events. There were various data-collection strategies used which gathered data from a multiplicity of subjects and sources. In turn, the data were verified and re-verified by the participants and researchers involved in the Project. This meticulous collection, hopefully, created an honest picture of what occurred over the ten month study.
The case study. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), a case study should include: (a) a description of the problem; (b) a thorough description of the setting; (c) a thorough description of what was observed; (d) a discussion of the importance of elements; and (e) a discussion of the outcomes. The information gathered from this study, although presented not in a neat package, but spread through this text, does present a case study written about each school providing the rich description (Geertz, 1973) necessary for a grounded assessment of context. For example, the description of the problem was elaborated upon in Chapter II; Chapter IV contains a description of the settings and the teachers; Chapter V presents the staff development programs; and Chapters VI and VII examine the findings.

Role as researcher. While almost any data are worthwhile, it should be stressed that the data collected and the conclusions drawn from the data are qualified by the researcher's role within the research site (Lecompte and Goetz, 1982). Generally speaking, the better the rapport developed and the relevance of the role assumed by the researcher, the greater the understanding of the data gleaned about the subjects' perceptions (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). It has been recommended that the researcher select a role in which the subjects can come to value and trust
the researcher enough to be willing to act as they
typically do, share intimate thoughts, and/or answer the
questions asked by the researcher (Bruyn, 1966; Stainback
and Stainback, 1984).

At the initial meetings at each school in Year II, I
was presented as the project evaluator. I described myself
as the individual who would be checking with the teachers
from time to time to find out if the Project was succeeding
and generally whether or not the teachers were using the
material/ideas presented in their classrooms. My
experience as a teacher in the public schools and a staff
developer, who worked previously with intermediate
teachers, provided a common background and entree into the
teachers' classrooms. To fulfill my position, I observed
in their classrooms and interviewed them formally and
informally over the nine months.

This study followed a cycle similar to, if not
identical to, the ethnographic research cycle presented by
Spradley (1979; 1980). In ethnographic inquiry, data
collection and data analysis is a never-ending process of
question-discovery. Rather than coming into the field with
specific questions, the ethnographer analyzes the field
data compiled from participant-observation to discover
questions. Participant-observation and recording
fieldnotes, are always followed by data analysis, which
leads to finding new questions, more data collection, more
fieldnotes and more analysis. It is, therefore, important
for me to point out that data-collection/data-analysis did
not occur in the study in a linear fashion as it is
presented here on paper.

**Analysis of Data**

Qualitative data analysis involves organization,
classification, categorization, a search for patterns, and
a synthesis of patterns, as well as the determination of
missing information which requires a further search to
achieve an extensive, realistic cognizance of what was
observed. Findings are generated and systemically built as
each piece of information is gathered (Stainback and
Stainback, 1984). It is an ongoing activity that occurs
throughout the investigative process. Furthermore, data-
collection and analysis occur in an alternating manner of
data-collection, the analysis, more data-collection and
more analysis, until the research is completed (Bogdan
and Biklen, 1982; Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

The analysis of data is a continual process and occurs
from data-collection to a study's conclusion. Field notes
were written to substantiate the observations and
interviews. An inquiry was undertaken either as
reflections or organized analysis. All occurred in a
cyclical pattern similar to the pattern suggested by Spradley (1980) for ethnographic studies. An example of the pattern can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. **Qualitative Research Cycle**

- Collecting Qualitative Data
- Asking Qualitative Questions
- Analyzing Qualitative Data
- Making an Qualitative Record
- Writing a Qualitative Study

Adapted from Spradley (1980)
Initial analysis took place during data-collection allowing the evolution of ideas between the existing data and the creation of potentially better strategies. This reflection uncovered possible oversights. It also enlivened the data-collection process (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 49). Moreover it generated more questions and pointed to new directions. Data-collection was monitored accordingly (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). The literature review also remained ongoing while in the field (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). Once the data are collected, the transcripts, field notes, and other collected materials were organized into manageable units and examined for conceivable patterns (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). The tapes were all transcribed. The analysis involved:

1. The labeling of the parts of the meetings and interviews that contained pertinent information;

2. The coding of those segments; and

3. The categorizing of those portions, grounded in the data and the language of the teacher.

This was done in an attempt to identify the recurring patterns of information processed.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that generating a theory involves a process of research. The analytic inductive strategy, for example, quickly develops tentative hypotheses or theory and expands and modifies as greater
detail is gained from a number of cases. On the other hand, the constant comparative strategy, generated from data collected and then analyzed from patterns and categories, builds a pattern of relationships that evolves into the formation and refinement of theory.

There are four stages of the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967):

1. Comparing incidents applicable to each category, with previous incidents in the same and different groups, and coding the incidents, consisting sometimes only of margin notations;

2. Integrating various categories and their properties;

3. Curbing the theory and the categories takes place as more incidents occur to fit into pre-existing categories; and

4. Writing the theory that ensues when the researcher has the data analyzed.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) also present the dimensions of data-analysis as:

1. Deductive/inductive—where deductive analysis begins with theoretically-based hypotheses which are confirmed or disconfirmed through reference to empirical data, while inductive analysis begins with the data from
which categories are derived by inductive reasoning processes;

2. Verification/generation--strives to verify hypotheses derived elsewhere, whereas generation analysis attempts to ascertain constructs using the data as a starting point;

3. Enumeration/construction analysis--enumeration analysis takes already established measures and lists and/or counts what is seen, while construction analysis generates the analysis from actions/behavior observed; and

4. Objective/subjective--objective analysis uses already existing categories to present what was seen, whereas subjective analysis reconstructs categories used by participants to present their view.

In their presentation of the data it is apparent that Lincoln and Guba (1985) support the creation of theory from data. They suggest that a researcher must engage in continuous data analysis, so that every new aspect of their research considers what has been previously learned so far.

Spradley (1979; 1980, p. 87-88) offers an alternative with four types of formal analysis that have been used in a number of educational research studies (for example, Guilfoyle, 1988):

1. Domain analysis--involves the identification of cultural domains and the terms associated with it using
semantic relationships. A cultural domain is a category of cultural meaning that includes other smaller categories which are made up of three basic elements: a cover term—the name for a cultural domain; included terms—the names for all the smaller categories; and a semantic relationship—the linking together of two categories. It provides "an overview of the cultural scene and some idea as to how the surface structure of that scene was organized" (Spradley, 1979, p. 174).

Researchers can take a sample from an interview and develop possible categories of symbols leading them to develop hypotheses about possible relationships. There are two types of domains: (a) folk domains which include terms that come from the language used by the informants; and (b) mixed domains which include terms from the people and the researcher.

Often cultural meanings remain tacit and must be inferred from peoples' actions, language, and their artifacts. Steps of analysis include: (a) selection of a semantic relationship; (b) selection of sample fieldnote entries; (c) search for cover/included terms that fit the semantic relationships; (d) repeat search for other semantic relationships; and (e) list all domains. This is often repeated during data collection.
2. Taxonomic analysis—entails a search for the way cultural domains are organized and focuses on the similarities among symbols. This analysis establishes the internal structure of a domain by generating a taxonomy that develops subsets within a domain and the relationship of those subsets. It is arranged around a semantic relationship and shows the relationship among all the included terms within a domain. This analysis helps look for the relationships among the included terms in the domain and the steps include: (a) selection of a domain; (b) a search for similarities in a semantic relationship; (c) a look for additional included terms; (d) a search for larger, more inclusive domains; (e) a construction of a tentative taxonomy; (f) a focused observation to check out your analysis; and (g) a construction of a complete taxonomy.

3. Componential analysis—involves a search for the attributes of terms within each domain. An attribute is any element of information regularly associated with a symbol. Each subset within a domain has terms that are both alike and different. Componential analysis includes searching for contrasts, sorting them out, grouping together dimensions of contrast, entering this information onto a paradigm, and verifying the information. The steps include: (a) a selection of a domain for analysis; (b) an
inventory of all contrasts previously discovered; (c) preparation of a paradigm; (d) identification of contrast dimensions in a binary design; (e) a collapse of closely related contrast dimensions into more representative groups; (f) preparation of contrast questions for missing attributes reveals the information you need to collect; (g) observations to discover missing information; and (h) preparation of a complete paradigm.

4. Thematic analysis--comprises a search for the relationships among domains and for how they are linked to the cultural scene as a whole. It is the last step in identifying themes or patterns across domains. For Spradley (1979) a cultural theme is any principle that recurred in a number of domains, tacit or explicit, and served as a relationship among subsystems of cultural meanings. Most cultural themes are tacit.

The analysis for this study was guided by each of these perspectives. Glaser and Strauss's (1967) constant comparative method was used, Lincoln and Guba's (1985) notions of the dimensions of data analysis were utilized, and Spradley's (1979) specificity of data-analysis was employed.

Another important aspect of the analysis process involved charting the teachers' change processes.
In early work as a part of the RIS Project, Richardson-Koehler and Hamilton (1988) suggested a two dimensional space within which to place each teacher's theories of reading. The horizontal continuum, representing learning to read, which spread from skills/word to literature, and a vertical line, representing the purpose of reading, which spanned from finding the meaning in the text to the construction of meaning. Once the two dimensional nature of the continuum was established, the teachers were arrayed according to their perceived orientations.

In search of a way to chart teachers' change processes, I first established my own interpretation of the teachers' initial orientations. To do this I reviewed the teachers' belief interviews and my early contacts with each teacher, including observations in their classrooms. Once these interpretations were established I reviewed the research on reading theories. Although there was an assortment of prominent theories of reading, the theories discussed by Harste and Burke (1977) and Harste (1984) most often represented the orientations of the teachers. At that point I reexamined Richardson-Koehler and Hamilton's (1988) work to decide how best to present my data in this study. Whereas I understood the thinking, I decided that the Harste and Burke (1977) definitions included both
dimensions and therefore decided to use a single dimension continuum. The three theories are:

1. **Information Transfer Orientation**: Harste and Burke (1977) labeled the *decoding orientation* as identifying reading as an offshoot of oral language, with its key function dependent upon the relationships between the sounds and symbols. Reading is, primarily, the mechanical skill of decoding symbols into sounds into meanings. Harste and Burke (1977) described language from this orientation as "a pyramid, the base of which is sound/symbol relationships, the capstone of which is meaning" (p. 35). The word, its definition and use within a text, held the utmost importance. This orientation was later renamed the *information transfer* or the bottom up/skills approach to reading (Harste, 1984). This theory follows a behaviorist model starting with the smallest unit, the letter, and working out from there until finally the meaning can be found in the text. Also these theorists find that the skills have a hierarchical order. A reader, for example, cannot understand the word until the letters and sounds are understood. Furthermore, reading is a process by which the readers must transfer meaning from the text to themselves, hence the standard for reading success becomes the amount of information
transferred. Finally, reading is a skill which needs to be practiced with little or no deviation from the text.

2. Interactive Orientation: The second orientation labeled by Harste and Burke (1977) was the *skills orientation* which defines reading as one of the language arts—listening, speaking, reading and writing. Followers of this orientation believe that the *word is the key feature to reading success as contrasted with the previous orientation that identified the sound/symbol as the key feature*. Additionally, a student is taught to classify words and relate them to meaningful context through the development of a basic sight vocabulary and word recognition skills. This orientation, updated as the *interactive orientation* (Harste, 1984; Stanovich, 1980), contends that reading is an *interactive process between the reader and the text*. The reader begins with the printed text, considers that text against what the reader knows and returns to the text in an ongoing operation. The measure for reading success is the suggested ideal reader's strategies for recognition of text features. This view of reading considers that the reader, with the reader's knowledge and background experience, and the text each contribute to the reading process. The interactionist view of reading suggests that the text has a meaning independent
of the reader. Stanovich (1980) asserts that information is synthesized from a variety of knowledge sources.

3) **Transactive Orientation:** The third orientation labeled by Harste and Burke (1977) is the *whole language orientation*, which assumes that not only are the systems of language shared, "but that they are interdependent and interactive aspects of a process" (p. 37). Reading is always focused on comprehending with the reader not looking to reproduce the text but to create it newly. Harste (1984) renamed this orientation the **transactive** orientation which suggests that meaning is relative, the result of the reader's contact with the text in a particular context; *social construction* is emphasized; reading is a process of interpretation. Readers use text to investigate and enlarge their world, and learning is the standard for a successful instance of reading. In one analogy Rosenblatt (1978) suggested that the reader in combination with the text produces a poem, a new text which unites the readers' experience with the text's information.

Often when teachers discussed the instruction of their students, they mentioned word attack skills and vocabulary at the information-transfer end of the continuum and the use of novels and/or other literature to encourage student interest in reading at the transactive end of the
continuum. Teachers could frequently be placed along the continuum without effort. For example, the teachers affiliated with the information transfer orientation might use texts other than the basal to encourage their students, but not to teach them reading. These teachers would be placed approximately one quarter from the information transfer terminal. Similarly, the teachers affiliated with the transactive orientation might use the basal text and/or workbooks because of perceived parental pressure or district mandate, but not to teach their students reading. These teachers were moved an appropriate distance from the transactive terminal.

The nature of meaning was also discussed by a number of teachers. On the Richardson-Koehler and Hamilton (1988) framework, the vertical dimension spanned from meaning generated from the text to construction of meaning between the text and the reader. By using the Harste and Burke (1977) definitions, the nature of meaning falls within the theories already presented. Hence, the information transfer orientation suggests that the meaning is in the text, and the transactive orientation suggests that meaning is constructed. For those teachers who appeared to waffle in their responses between the construction of meaning, when discussing questions, and the text-bound meaning, when discussing content-area reading, I chose the predominant
orientation. Table 2 presents the reference sheet devised to examine teachers' orientations.

To help monitor the change process I affiliated the teachers with a specific theoretical orientation so that shifts in orientations could be identified during the observations of the staff development program. These labels by no means indicate that the teacher falls squarely in the middle of an orientation or that they do not use practices associated with other orientations. Rather, it means that at the beginning of the staff development the teachers were affiliated more with one orientation than another. Throughout the staff development process, then, the teachers could be examined according to the language used that was associated with their particular orientation.

I have introduced the focus of this study, the change process which underlies teachers' involvement in the practical argument staff development process, and the influences of school culture on the beliefs and practices of the participating teachers; the literatures that substantiate it as a problem worthy of consideration; and the methodology which best reveals potential answers to the problem. In Chapter IV, Schools A and F are presented in case studies, so that the problem can be appraised in concrete form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF FOCUS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Transfer Orientation</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Considers sounds/symbols to be the basis for understanding language</td>
<td>The meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Transferring meaning from the text to the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Orientation</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Considers the development of skill hierarchies as crucial</td>
<td>The meaning is in the mind of the reader and in the text</td>
<td>Two meaning systems interact with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactive Orientation</td>
<td>Language (larger than the word)</td>
<td>Considers the reconstruction of meaning from language to be the key relationship</td>
<td>The meaning is the result of the reader connecting with the text in a unique context</td>
<td>Interpretation by the reader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Harste and Burke (1977).
CHAPTER IV
THE SCHOOLS AND THE TEACHERS

This chapter marks the beginning of the case study of School A and School F, and describes each of the two schools observed in this study. The descriptions of the schools are drawn from the teachers' language and direct observation, and provides a sense of the participating teachers' backgrounds and the environment within which they work.

Each section first presents a description of the school culture, its physical plant, and the people, other than the participating teachers, who interact there. Second, the participating teachers are introduced. They are briefly summarized from the information drawn from their initial belief interviews, my observations of the teachers, and further conversations throughout the year. It is here where the highlighted teachers in each school are introduced for the first time. Full descriptions of the participating teachers are provided in Appendix C.

For the sake of text brevity as well as a sense of continuity, I decided to only summarize the teachers' beliefs and orientations in this chapter.

Finally, I discuss issues of concern that, interestingly, were raised by the teachers, implicitly
and/or explicitly, and the school culture literature presented in Chapter II. These are issues of teacher isolation, collegiality, and a discussion of practice.

This information is necessary for providing a full picture of the change process that occurred in the two schools as a result of the staff development program. The next chapter, Chapter V, explores the staff development itself and the teachers' participation in it. It is there that the highlighted teachers are presented in greater detail, following their metamorphosis through the staff development process. The final chapter incorporated into the case studies is Chapter VI. Chapter VI explores the changes undergone during the period of staff development, including teachers' comments, my own observations, and the observations of the other research team members.

**The Schools**

The two schools that participated in this study are located within one school district. Table 3 provides background information on this large Southwestern urban school district that consists of over 70 elementary schools, 20 junior high/middle schools, and 15 high schools (including programs located in alternative facilities). The total student population reaches nearly 55,000 with over one-half the students classified as Anglo;
Table 3. **Background Information on School A and School F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Size (K-6)</strong></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Size (Avg)</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35% (K-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free/Reduced Lunch</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51% (K-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa Scores (4-6)</strong></td>
<td>District Mean</td>
<td>4-6 Above Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Features</strong></td>
<td>Simple, neighborhood program</td>
<td>Complex, desegregation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly new building</td>
<td>Older building, under repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-contained LD program</td>
<td>Fine arts resource, computer rooms, curriculum specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td>8 years (avg)</td>
<td>14 years (avg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward school</strong></td>
<td>Positive about school, leadership, students</td>
<td>Somewhat negative about school and its leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Relationship</strong></td>
<td>Collegial, but not collaborative</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response toward SD</td>
<td>Receptive initially, but eventually cautious</td>
<td>Cautious but eventually interested and quite involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of reading</td>
<td>Diverse, some differences in practices, not a source of discussion</td>
<td>Similar views of reading and practices, a source of discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>3rd year principal</td>
<td>4th year principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading bkgd</td>
<td>Strong (Ed.D. in rdg/language)</td>
<td>Limited to undergrad and tchg experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on instruction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Project</td>
<td>Congruent with own instructional goals, &quot;history-making&quot; teachers could be &quot;lobbyists for change&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Pipeline&quot; to the U., a &quot;carrot&quot; for neglected intermediate teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position on reading</td>
<td>Whole language, current</td>
<td>Not coherent, outdated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on achievement tests</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High (reinforces skills emphasis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to district</td>
<td>Positive, w/caution, emphasis on instruction</td>
<td>Negative, focus on finance and politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in SD</td>
<td>Less than promised, but reinforcing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Bkgrd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position on reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked as a teacher and administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended many conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resistant at first, then quite strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Add-ons&quot; to the basal instruction; wanted &quot;hands-on&quot; materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eclectic, pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wavering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong, attended all meetings but one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from data gathered and compiled by P. Placier, 1988.
approximately 30% Hispanic; and Black, Native American, and Oriental students representing the remaining 15-20%.

School A

School A was situated on a quiet street in a neighborhood of tract homes and expanding development on the fringes of the community, not far from two American Indian reservations, horse property, truck and assorted family farms. The surrounding area at the time of this study was so new that the shopping areas were not completely rented and development continues. Furthermore, new small businesses were cropping up and large housing development signs permeated the major thoroughfares.

The seven-year-old building site, atop a rise with a spectacular view of the city, was clean, well-maintained, and well-lit. It had four buildings connected by corridors that enclosed a courtyard of picnic tables and planters, that from time to time held plants. The red brick structure and the grounds appeared stark and barren, with little frill and only few trees scattered around.

Outwardly, there were no warm, inviting aspects of the school--no signs of welcome or decoration. Once inside the school complex, however, there were colorful displays everywhere. In the office building there were signs and maps by students and a warm friendly staff. The teachers'
lounge had comfortable chairs and signs offering insights and information around the room.

In the classroom buildings there appeared to be an abundance of pride in the student pictures, posters, writing and/or other student projects that brightened the hallway walls with each classroom responsible for a certain area. Decorations varied according to the season. Commercial posters of Pee Wee Herman and animals also were scattered through the hallways. The sounds of students, school, and fun echoed in the halls.

The intermediate teachers (grades 4-6) and the Learning Disability/Special Education programs had one hallway which was well-lit and had bathroom facilities for boys and girls. Each room was identified by a number and teacher name on the door. Across from the fourth grade rooms was the computer room with at least ten computers for the students and its walls decorated with computer art and instructions. Another door, opening off the computer room, led to the library. The library was a very large area with tables both rectangular and circular and chairs that could seat 35 individuals. If pushed back, as they were for special occasions, many of the intermediate students could sit comfortably on the floor. The walls were decorated with student art about books and/or seasons. One table was set aside for special books, designated by author, topic,
and/or holiday. Atop the book shelves there were other special books and sometimes commercial items (e.g., dolls) associated with those books. Because there was only a part-time librarian, the library was not a bustling hub of activity; however, students did have access to the library for book choices. There was also a movie screen and a variety of outlets for audiovisual equipment. There was a sense, in the library, that funding cuts eliminated services, because it was clearly designed to be a well-used area.

The student population of 380 students was 50% Hispanic, 47% Anglo, and 1% each of Black, Asian, and Native American. While the principal described a majority of student families as low average to average SES, with many first time homeowners, 33% of the students qualified for free or reduced lunches, an indicator of low SES. Student mobility rested just below 20%. Most students came from the immediate area with a few bussed-in special education students. On the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, the students scored close to the district mean.

There were 14 regular classroom teachers, K-6, and several specialists, 2 Learning Disability teachers, and a hearing impaired teacher. Despite the high percentage of Hispanic students almost none were classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP). One classroom at each grade
level provided "bilingual," actually Spanish-as-a-Second-Language (SSL), instruction, as an enrichment program highly supported by the parents, with the part-time assistance of aides.

There were six intermediate regular classroom teachers and one intermediate Learning Disability teacher participating in the RIS Project. Their classrooms were similar in design with a doorway to the hallway linking the school, and an exterior door exiting onto the playground. The rooms also had collapsible walls, decorated with school art, although they were never observed to be opened. Instead they served as bulletin boards which, dependent upon the classroom, displayed commercial art, student-generated art, or a combination of both as well as students' work accomplishments. Each room also had a prominent set of classroom/school rules which specifically stated rules of conduct and consequences for disobedience.

In each room there was a teacher's desk often piled high with papers, although not all of the teachers used it during the day. Sometimes teachers used tables around the room as their action centers. There were, however, clearly indicated teacher areas where the teacher sat or stood for activities. The students' desks were arranged usually in groups, rarely in rows. Students were allowed to move around during activities rather than be chair bound. As a
body, the students seemed polite and well-behaved with few discipline problems. When there were problems, they were dealt with quickly.

**Principal**

The principal of School A was female with an Ed.D. in reading and language. This was her third year as the principal of this school. She identified herself as promoting whole language while not enforcing its use in the school. The teachers who were interviewed agreed that she supported the teachers in every undertaking and did not pressure them. For example, as she stated in one of the staff development sessions, she did not emphasize the standardized achievement tests. According to her own self-report and the teachers' comments, she did check their lesson plans, which was a district requirement, and she did emphasize instruction.

Early in the Project she expressed an interest in having her school participate. She felt that her teachers would benefit and that this was an opportunity to strengthen the link between the University and the schools. She also viewed the Project as congruent with her own instructional goals. Moreover, she expressed great enthusiasm about the project and strongly guided them to participate in it. She told them that the participation in
the Project was their chance to "make history" using the Illinois Reading Test and encouraged them to take the "opportunity to be lobbyists for change."

Principal A perceived teacher change as a "little bit of a mystery" where teachers must "step out and do." She labeled the teachers involved in change as "risk-takers." Less experienced teachers, she suggested, first had attempted to work with the whole class and progressed to varying their instructional approaches for different types of students. Some teachers, she thought, more readily ventured beyond the textbook with their instructional strategies. Whereas some teachers simply proclaimed "materials" problems, and looked for new materials rather than change their strategies.

When discussing the teachers' relationship to research, Principal A said,

I think it's like oil and water. I think it's like an allergy. Even when Staff Developer 1 (SD1) and Staff Developer 2 (SD2) came by here and talked to the faculty, I saw some real vacant eyes at the time when SD2 was talking about research.

She suggested that teachers do not want to hear about research and would get a much better response if "mini-opportunities for teachers" were arranged to replicate some of the research in the teachers' own classrooms. This way the teachers would not recognize it as research. She thought that "if teachers can have a little experience like
that process of finding out, that maybe they'd become less allergic. She felt her teachers' "youth and lack of experience" meant they would be more open to change. Most of her teachers, she observed, had the "self-image as professional where they see change as part of the job." In fact, the teachers were always willing to attend inservices and programs that would affect their teaching.

**Description of Students**

The teachers of School A described their students as "having a full range of academic ability" and were often alert, curious, and good to each other. They felt that most, if not all, of their students would make it through high school--"The gray matter was there." The really bright students were willing to work with their peers. They, in general, were very well-behaved and polite with an interest in pleasing the teachers and getting their work in on time.

**Teachers' Description of School A**

In general the teachers of School A stated there was no characteristic way of teaching/teaching reading at their school. Teacher Aa said, "I feel like a teacher will be of the most benefit to their students if they're teaching a way that make sense to them." However, he also said he
detected that the principal "encourages the whole language
type of approach, and she is pleased with the way that I'm
doing things in reading, but I have no indication that she
discourages my colleague." Teacher Ab suggested that he
knew "that a lot of people do different things. I can't
say that not everybody goes and just follows the basal
readers day by day." Teacher Ac claimed that some of her
colleagues had been in teaching for a while" and "they
just get tired of being creative." In her opinion, "A lot
of people do rely on the basal because it's easy--you don't
have to think." Teacher Ac asserted that "If Principal A
saw that it was nothing but basals, I think she may say,
'Why don't you try a little bit of variety?'." In her
discussion of the characteristic way of teaching reading,
Ac was concerned about "the boring aspect of basals" and
was distressed that her colleagues depended upon them too
much. On the other hand, teacher Ad claimed to be unaware
of his colleagues' approaches to reading. "I haven't a
clue. I'm so tied up in my own room and what I'm doing.
I've talked to other teachers, but I wouldn't say that
there is a characteristic way." Teacher Af suggested that
there "was, but it's gone. When I came last year, they
had, I think, a strong basal orientation, very strong in
the basic skills. . . . She let me and another teacher do a
more whole language kind of thing."
Summary Descriptions of Teachers

See Table 4 for a brief listing of the background information on the teachers of School A.

Teacher Aa. Although Aa's teacher training was dominated by phonetics and workbooks with little interest in comprehension, he defined his philosophy as bearing a similarity to the whole language orientation. The conflict represented in his training and his self-identification carried through all of Aa's teaching. On the one hand, he was very structured and skills-oriented, suggesting that the only meaning for the text must be derived from text. Yet, on the other hand, he viewed reading as a private act where no one coached you about your experience.

Aa recently became a sixth grade bilingual teacher after ten years experience elsewhere in the school district. He used the basal reader as a reading text because the students were familiar with it. He also felt that the parents wanted him to use it because they, too, were familiar with it. When he tested students' comprehension, he used the questions provided by the basal.

Placing Aa on the theoretical orientation continuum, described in Chapter III, offered some difficulty because he floated back and forth among orientations. Table 5 presents the Theoretical Orientation Continuum for School
Table 4. Background Information on the Teachers of School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Program/Training</th>
<th>Training in Reading</th>
<th>Student Teaching/Cooperating Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biling</td>
<td>Biling</td>
<td>Elem Ed/</td>
<td>Bil Rdg</td>
<td>Worked w/several tchrs due to bil interest, phonetics training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bil Ed/</td>
<td>Child Lit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LibSci (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biling</td>
<td>Bil Ed (AZ)</td>
<td>Some WL, some rdg courses</td>
<td>Trained in use of basals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>ElemEd (AZ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Had negative experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ElemEd (AZ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used basal and manual because was modeled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>ElemEd (IL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility was stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ElemEd (CA)</td>
<td>One rdg course</td>
<td>Coop tchr used basals and manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>LD/Int Spec Ed</td>
<td>Spec Ed</td>
<td>SpecEd (MT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>One year program in both regular &amp; spec ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5. Theoretical Orientation Continuum for School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TRANSFER</td>
<td>INTERACTIVE</td>
<td>TRANSACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. I placed Aa around the interactive orientation because he used library text/other text quite often during his reading program, although he used the basal as well. Moreover his assertion, that to understand a text the reader must comprehend the author’s meaning, also placed him between the information transfer and the interactive orientations. Whereas he did think the meaning was in the text, he also indicated some interaction with the text as well. Table 6 provides a brief description of how Aa’s (and the other teachers of School A) theoretical orientation fits into the orientations presented by Harste and Burke (1977).

Teacher Ab. Ab, a fourth grade teacher, had eight years of teaching experience as well as most of the course work completed for a Master’s degree in Special Education. When he described his teaching philosophy he observed that he had background in basal readers and workbooks as well as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF FOCUS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Students need to understand the words they are reading</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills, including vocabulary</td>
<td>Meaning is drawn from the author's words, but it is a &quot;private act&quot; as well</td>
<td>Students get information from the text with some interaction from students' experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Students need to know the meaning of words and their place in context</td>
<td>Emphasis on vocabulary skills</td>
<td>Meaning is a synthesis of the text and the students' world</td>
<td>Students read from the text and consider it in relation to their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>Students need to grasp the main idea, making it relevant to themselves</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills but not necessarily on knowing &quot;every single detail&quot;</td>
<td>Meaning is drawn from the text and its relevance to the students' lives</td>
<td>Students attempt to make their reading relevant to their lives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF FOCUS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad (information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to recognize sounds as well as words</td>
<td>Emphasis on practice and with skills and word pronunciation</td>
<td>Meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Students draw information from text and author's language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As (information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to pronounce words and figure out what they mean</td>
<td>Emphasis on word attack skills</td>
<td>Meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Students must understand the words to understand the author's purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af (transactive)</td>
<td>Students need to make their &quot;own sense of things&quot;</td>
<td>Emphasis on prediction and sense-making from the text</td>
<td>Personal meaning is blended with the text</td>
<td>Students interpret the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag (information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to know pronunciation and word patterns</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills, pronunciation and patterns</td>
<td>Meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Students draw their meaning from the text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"positively oriented" methods that helped build self-esteem. In his teaching he used basal readers but went beyond them. He felt it was important for students to look for meaning in what they were doing.

At the beginning of the year he gave them books to read that encouraged their interest in reading. He defined reading comprehension as a synthesis between what the students had read and what their world was like.

His typical reading lesson involved a comprehension check where students reviewed the story's questions. Along with that they did dictionary work and placed the words in context. When his students were reading, Ab wanted them to draw meaning from the text while bringing their own experience to the text.

For Ab reading comprehension was a synthesis of the text and the student's world. Meaning is derived from the synthesis, and to achieve that synthesis he used basal readers and skill workbooks. He, therefore, fell between the information-transfer and the interactive orientation terminals.

Teacher Ac. Ac was a second year teacher who felt it was important not to "con kids." She firmly believed that a teacher had to "let the kids know where you stand." She set her expectations high but also surmised that personality had "a lot to do with reading."
In her fifth grade classroom she approached reading "positively" and expected her students to be exposed to "different kinds of reading." For Ac making reading "relevant to students' lives" was of the utmost importance. She, therefore, did not emphasize knowing "every single detail," rather emphasis was on grasping the main point of the reading.

Her reading lessons involved brainstorming and reviewing the questions, so the students were prepared for what they needed to know at the end of the story. "Reading takes time," so once the students read the story, Ac reviewed it and the vocabulary that might have caused problems. Although she used the basal, she used other texts as well.

Ac was interesting to place on the continuum. Although she believed in making reading relevant to students' lives, she used the basal and emphasized skills.

Teacher Ad. Ad, a sixth grade teacher, attributed his approach to teaching to his cooperating teacher, who worked from a manual, and to the many other teachers he had known. He observed that he had chosen his strategies "like picking a baseball team," you picked what you liked and discarded the rest.

In his four years of experience he felt burdened by time constraints, suggesting his students could not have
recess anymore because of demands on their time. To learn to read, students had to read everyday. They just needed to practice. Interestingly, though, he considered reading sometimes "mindless work." He emphasized skills, how the words sounded and what words they knew. In his classes he usually used the basal, although he did "not live and die by" it. His lessons consisted of reading the basal and working in the workbook.

He defined reading comprehension as reading rate. To understand what you read, a student must read at an average speed. He felt that reading too fast or too slow caused problems in understanding.

Ad had an information transfer orientation and appeared to locate meaning almost solely in the text.

**Teacher Ae.** Ae was a fifth grade teacher who had been teaching for three years. When students entered her classroom, she expected them to have a "pretty good-sized vocabulary" to be able to work with "context clues," to "read without stumbling," and "be able to read with more understanding." She also wanted them to have word attack skills. As a matter of fact, when she thought about reading, she thought about skills. Any student who had problems reading had simply not developed "skills for attacking words."
Ae defined reading comprehension as the ability to explain what has been read in a person's own words. A student "internalized" the story when they read it. To teach reading comprehension involved reading each day and responding to questions. She also used the workbooks but provided assignments beyond that. She liked to "stay close to my basal" because "it was a security blanket."

Ae appeared to have an information transfer orientation with some relation to the interactive orientation because her interest was in vocabulary, not just sound/symbols. For Ae meaning was found in the text. She emphasized word attack skills and understanding the word.

Teacher Af. Af, a fourth grade teacher, had a Ph.D. in education and three years teaching experience. While her cooperation teacher had trained her with basals and workbooks, Af preferred other approaches to reading. She wanted students to "make their own sense of things" and stressed that knowing word meanings was important if it added to the context of the story. By the end of the fourth grade she wanted to heighten a students' interest and excitement to the fifth grade level of "sophistication."

For Af a student having difficulty with reading was simply "afraid of words." A good reader recognized, in
fact, that not all words were vital to the story. Teaching reading comprehension involved these skills as well as prereading strategies.

She used basals but did not emphasize phonetics or word attack skills. She also used the workbook because some of the information it contained was on the standardized tests.

Af wanted her students to make their "own sense of things." She used basals, as well as other texts, but stressed the students' interpretations of the reading. She also emphasized skills because they were necessary for tests.

Teacher Ag. Ag, a Learning Disabilities teacher, had been teaching for nine years. From his experience he felt the greatest problem for the learning disabled child was reading. To compensate for that he continued to follow the training he received from his cooperating teacher to use dittoes and the basal text.

He defined reading comprehension as getting the author's meaning out of the text. A good reader also needed good skills. To teach reading comprehension he worked with ability groups, followed the teachers' guide, had weekly word patterns, and expected the students to do the comprehension checks. Yet, Ag had great concern about his ability to teach reading. Although he felt practice
was important, he wondered if there were other more successful approaches.

Ag had an information transfer orientation and found the meaning in the text.

**Issues of School Culture**

**Teacher isolation.** The teachers of School A were isolated. They did not share students, team teach, or collaborate; nor did they often go into each others' rooms except to socialize and sometimes to share materials. One of the few times that classes united, and teachers came together as a group, was during special projects, as when the Arts team took up residence for a week, the classes grouped together to create an African Village. Otherwise, teachers appeared concerned that "everybody's overloaded" and did not intrude or discuss practices.

When teachers did meet for lunch or after school, they often discussed social and/or personal issues rather than school-related issues. Ac observed that the talk at lunch was only "superficial talk." Another teacher commented that they did discuss issues like "teacher talent night." If they did discuss school, they discussed individual students and ways to relate to them. One teacher suggested that the isolation related to the differences in teaching philosophies.
Their classrooms appeared to be their own territory for which an unspoken "hands-off" policy existed. When asked whether they got together as a group, the principal and several teachers responded that they came together for social events. The teachers also said they did not often consult with each other about classroom activities.

**Teachers' Collegiality.** Collegiality (Little, 1987), which involves a shared relationship among people who work together, did and did not exist at School A. Socially they worked well together. At any staff development the teachers could be found joking together and engaged in congenial conversation. They shared any number of "war stories," stories about students, and jokes among themselves. They also discussed teacher association issues and district expectations. On a social level these teachers had a good relationship.

They did not have a collegial relationship about practices. One teacher said he did not "talk too much about these things [practices] with other people" because he did not want to "overload" his colleagues. Only one teacher claimed to share practices with her colleagues; the rest claimed, for a variety of reasons, that they did not. They also did not collaborate on ideas or lessons.

**Teachers' Talk of Practices.** The teachers of School A had a variety of concerns, not all related to reading. In
the realm of reading several teachers expressed concerns about the basal readers meeting the needs of students. Ac felt, for example, that the basals were not "relevant to the students' lives." Ab wanted to know how to go "beyond the basal." In addition Ag simply wanted help in finding the best methods for teaching reading. All were concerned with how best to reach the students.

Another concern was with the lack of good role models for students. If the students wanted to succeed they needed good role models, according to the teachers, and School A's students did not have very many good models at home. Ab felt it was his duty to model good reading behavior for his students, while Af often felt certain students were hopeless. Additionally, Aa felt that students had to read in order to be good readers, and without good models to push them onward, the students did not always keep up their reading.

There was also a concern about meeting the parental expectations. Several teachers, Aa in particular, felt constrained by parents. He claimed that he adapted his reading program to accommodate parents' concerns. Furthermore, he felt that he used the basal so the parents would have a reading program with which they were familiar. Others also felt in order to have a successful school year they must comply with the wishes of the parents, and in
their estimation the parents wanted basal readers and workbook work.

**School F**

School F sat on a semi-busy four lane street surrounded by small businesses. At one time this area was just residential, but times had changed and apartment buildings and townhouses, as well as small businesses, had infiltrated the neighborhood. The original building was built in 1929 with a wing added in the 1950s. The school looked drab, old, and well-worn with no attractive views from any window. The sound of traffic and sirens permeated the hallways from the street and the fire station nearby. There was little student noise heard. The original complex formed a large square surrounding a lovely, very green courtyard with a huge evergreen tree to one side, a picnic table and a stage. From time to time teachers took their classes out there to work. The new wing was attached to one side of the old building. There were additional classrooms in portables on the playground. Upon entering the front entrance of School F, the art work was immediately visible. The special attention given to the arts was apparent in the quality of the students' work. It decorated the main hallway as well as the main office. The office area was a small space packed with desks, file
cabinets, and the accouterments for running a school. The curriculum specialist's office was particularly cramped with equipment, such as the copy machine used by the teachers. The courtyard area was very sterile--no posters, art or decorations of any kind. A faculty bathroom labelled private, was accessible from the courtyard. It was a point of pride among faculty and staff with its decorations of straw fans, decorator tissue boxes and air freshener. No other room/area in the school received as much acknowledgement.

The teachers' lounge was very cramped. It was dark, unattractive, with too much furniture; however, the furniture did appear new. Teachers were rarely in the room. Even during lunch, it was either empty or peopled by the staff. There was a phone in there and a tiny bathroom with broken fixtures and very little light. It did not appear conducive for facilitating conversation and/or mingling.

There were 13 regular classroom teachers with a staff including a curriculum specialist, half-time counselor, fine arts resource teacher, speech/hearing specialist, and teachers for a special program for multiply-handicapped students. All primary grade and special education classrooms had teacher aides and bilingual classrooms (all
primary) received additional aide time. There were 360 students, K-6.

The school population had been affected by the district's desegregation program. Some students came from the surrounding neighborhood that was once middle-class and now was working class and highly mobile. The primary students, because of the desegregation program, were 35% Hispanic and Black and 65% Anglo. The minority students were bused in from another area. Intermediate classes, on the other hand, had only 10-12% minority students because the bused-in students returned to their home school for fourth grade. Fifty-one percent of the primary students (grades K-3) and 20% of the intermediate students (4-6) qualified for free-reduced lunches. Students were also bused-in from an affluent, mostly Anglo neighborhood.

The intermediate teachers' classrooms were scattered throughout the school. The sixth grade classroom was near the principal's office, the fourth grade classes and the fifth grade class were accessible off the courtyard and the special education classroom was in the new wing. The doors of the classrooms were blank and unidentified. Upon entering each classroom the large windows were visible. The classrooms, with an average of 27 students, were similarly laid out with a prominent teacher's desk and brightly colored bulletin boards. The bulletin boards were
often decorated with student work and art appropriate to the topics being studied. They varied with the seasons and the topics. Many of the classrooms had the students' desks organized by rows, where they sat unless given permission to move around. One focus of the teachers was discipline. In general though, the students were good-natured and friendly. The ceiling of each room, because of mandatory asbestos removal, was a mass of exposed ductwork, pipes, heaters, and coolers. Even the lights were hung from the ceiling by chains, a result the asbestos removal, giving the room a look of an industrial complex with a foreboding, closed-in look.

The library, with a part-time librarian, was a small, dark, crowded room with audiovisual equipment obscuring access to some of the books. There were a few tables and chairs scattered around the room. Most of the books were available, but sometimes reading the titles was difficult because of the poor lighting. There were no welcoming signs or informational displays. This library appeared to be an afterthought created from a classroom.

Principal

Before becoming principal of School F four years ago, Principal F worked as an elementary teacher. When hired as principal of School F, he was mandated by the district to
turn the school around. His focus, therefore, was on maintaining a smooth running school. Unfortunately, the teachers often expressed great discontent with him and his policies. They did not feel supported by him in any way. In fact, they often felt as if he worked against them. Principal F felt he spent an excessive amount of time on procedures and paperwork related to student discipline. He blamed his focus on student discipline on the "wide diversity of students" at School F. Although he wanted to spend more time in the classroom, paperwork and other intrusions kept him busy elsewhere. He observed that he was not "as much the instructional leader as I should be, I would like to be." In turn, he shifted much of that responsibility to his curriculum specialist who could be "totally immersed" in instruction.

Prior to the initial contact with the Project staff, the teachers and the principal had little information, most of which was gathered by the curriculum specialist. When the research team was introduced to the teachers, the principal explained that the teachers wanted to know what the "carrot" or incentive was for their participation. The principal politely supported the Project, identifying it as an opportunity to have a "pipeline" with the University and to gather more resources, but he did not encourage the teachers to participate or promote the
Project in any way. At a later time the principal suggested that working with his teachers would be a "trial by fire."

His view of reading was directed toward the basal for both academic and social reasons. While Principal F found that "the basal reader is not the be-all and end-all, and [students] do much better without it . . .," he advocated its use, at least to a certain degree. When asked if he recommended discarding the basal in favor of language experience at School F, he replied, "No, it would have to be a combination. We do have some youngsters with one and two stanines, very, very low." He believed that his students were socially deprived at home, "socially bankrupt," did not bring very much to the classroom, and that the basal offered the students information that they needed. "Besides," he argued, "it would be very difficult for veteran teachers to give up their basal readers, or even to incorporate something new into their basal-centered program."

Principal F suggested approaching teacher change carefully and cautiously. Rather than directly talking to his teachers, he made suggestions. His focus was on school structure and maintenance. He viewed change as something teachers did if the incentive was right. He felt his teachers would only work with research if it was "presented
in a non-academic sort of way, not an ivory tower approach." If it was made relevant to the teachers, they would only produce "blank stares, 'My god, how did I get into this situation' looks."

**Curriculum Specialist**

The curriculum specialist had been an elementary teacher, teaching K-4, and had been a curriculum specialist for three years. She was a key person with the teachers, because she had the most contact with them, going into their classroom, providing resources, and promoting programs. She also did some modeling in their classrooms. Her interest in reading was evident, as demonstrated by her frequent appearance in the classrooms promoting reading involvement and the reading groups with which she works. She also attended many conferences to expand her knowledge base in reading.

She suggested that research should be incorporated into the staff development through lessons and "let teachers see that this is the way it should be done rather than say that this is what research says." She encouraged a "hands-on" approach. "If it's too complicated to demonstrate," she felt, "it can't be turned into something they can use," and they would not use it.
She was quite supportive of the staff development program. She felt the intermediate teachers needed attention and that this program would provide that. She felt they were ready to learn new buzz words, programs, and information in reading. Moreover, this fit into her plans for their development.

**Teachers' Description of Students**

The teachers described their students as being relatively average but sometimes hard to handle. Several expressed concern about the students making it through school. It's not "so much that they couldn't, it's whether they want to," blaming it on the home situations. They expressed concern that the home situation more than school affects school performance. One teacher felt that school was not the most exciting thing in her students' lives. She found that "parents . . . tell me that school is important, but yet, don't give them a place to study."

Furthermore, she thought that many students had "parents that both work, a lot of them have single parents, and they just don't have the time. . . . They're also not connected to school. . . . It's like, that's school, and this is home. They don't weave it together."

On the other hand, another teacher suggested that the students of School F were, on the whole,
from homes where they're expected to do well and a lot of emphasis is placed on education. One of the things I attribute to being able to work with them so easily is the fact that their parents are behind me 100%.

While there was a contradictory image of the studentbody at School F, there was also a shared image of certain students. For example, the sixth grade students had a "bad student" image throughout the school. The teachers conversed at length about the individual students and the class as a group with stories of their misbehavior. They had, in their years at the school, developed a history.

Another shared aspect of the school was the apparent isolation of the teachers from their colleagues. They did not mingle and, from their comments, did not know the teaching philosophies of their colleagues, at least in reading.

**Description of School F**

The teachers agreed upon their perceptions of the school. Teacher Fa described the teachers as

fairly traditional and they use the basal readers with a few extra things. . . . I think they feel extremely pressed for getting all of the various objectives that they must fulfill at different grade levels, and it's all laid out for us in the basal reader.

Teacher Fb confirmed this, saying, "I don't really know. To tell you the truth, I haven't been in any of the
classrooms. ... I think most everyone, with the exception of one or two people, use the basal reader." And Fc said, "I feel that way, more than ever." Fd had no comment. Fe said she did not know, "You see, we're so isolated, that I really can't tell if there is. There probably is, though. I can tell in terms of what the kids do who come to me."

Summary Descriptions of Teachers

See Table 7 for a brief listing of the background information on the teachers of School F.

Teacher Fa. Fa was a 17 year veteran teacher, presently teaching a class of multiply-handicapped students. During her years of experience she felt she had gathered an "eclectic" groups of methods including her phonics-oriented basal exposure during student teaching.

Her teaching of reading philosophy, she felt, related to the students she taught. She used the phonics approach because it produced the best results with her students. She also felt it was important to promote self-esteem, because it would help their interest in reading. Because her students needed to keep moving, she created lessons that kept them actively moving around the room.

Fa defined reading comprehension as the recognition of a main idea and the ability to express that. She taught reading comprehension by prompting her students in advance
Table 7. **Background Information on the Teachers of School F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Program/Training</th>
<th>Training in Reading</th>
<th>Student Teaching/Cooperating Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MultMan Int</td>
<td>Spec Ed</td>
<td>SpecEd (AZ)</td>
<td>Eclectic methods</td>
<td>Coop tchr was phonics-oriented and used basal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>(IL)</td>
<td>Trained to use manuals &amp; remedial rdg mats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fc</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coop tchr was very structured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fd</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ElemEd (AZ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coop tchr taught by manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ElemEd (AZ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coop tchr used basals &amp; rdg grps w/lots of waiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CurSpec</td>
<td></td>
<td>ElemEd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coop tchr was phonics-oriented and used basal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and letting them know which ideas were important. She also introduced main vocabulary words. For her lessons she did not always use the basal, but she did use them often and depended upon students' discussions of what they read, because her students sometimes had a problem with writing.

Fa had an information-transfer orientation with her students because she felt it worked the best with their abilities. (Table 8 presents the theoretical orientation for School F teachers.) She did not discuss her interpretation of meaning, but it appeared that she found the meaning in the text. She, therefore, most often used the basal, although she from time to time used literature books. Table 9 provides a brief description of how Fa's (and her colleagues) theoretical orientation relates to the orientations presented by Harste and Burke (1977).

Table 8. Theoretical Orientation Continuum for School F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fb</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Fd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRANSFER</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERACTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRANSACTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF FOCUS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa (information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to understand the words they are reading and the skills necessary for reading</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills including phonics</td>
<td>Meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Students gather information and meaning from the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fb (information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to recognize the pronunciation of words as well as their definitions</td>
<td>Emphasis on pronunciation and definitions</td>
<td>Meaning is in the text</td>
<td>Students draw their meaning from the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fc (information transfer/interactive)</td>
<td>Students need to know the meaning of many words</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills —in particularly the need for vocabulary</td>
<td>Meaning is generated from talks with students about what they will read &quot;so that it will be interesting to read</td>
<td>Students understand &quot;what the author was trying to tell them&quot; as well as how it fits into their own experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF FOCUS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa (interactive/transactive)</td>
<td>Students need to make sense of their reading for themselves</td>
<td>Emphasis on a reading's relevance in students' lives as well as skills</td>
<td>Meaning is derived from the sense students make of their reading as well as the meaning in the text</td>
<td>Students attempt to relate their reading to their own lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe (interactive/information transfer)</td>
<td>Students need to interact with the text</td>
<td>Emphasis on skills including vocabulary</td>
<td>Because reading is not a &quot;passive activity,&quot; meaning is an interactive process</td>
<td>Students read the text, understand the words, and interact with them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Fb. Fb was a 22 year veteran teacher teaching fourth grade for the third year at School F. Students entering her classroom were expected to read at least at grade level and write a complete sentence. She also felt it a duty to instill a love of reading.

Fb defined reading comprehension as being able to understand what has been read and explain it. To teach reading comprehension, she did not always use the basal, but used it quite often. She was very comfortable with it. In addition, she used the Reader's Digest skill builders as well as a literature book.

Her reading lessons, which usually followed the manual, began with definitions of the glossary words as well as a look at pronunciation. Then they read the story which was followed by a comprehension check.

Fb observed the information transfer orientation. She also appeared to find the meaning in the text.

Teacher Fc. Fc, with nine years experience, taught the fifth grade. She felt her teaching was greatly influenced by her University course work and her cooperating teachers who were very structured.

Students entering her classroom should have "word attack skills" and be "able to read orally at their grade level without stumbling" as well as understand what they read. They should also have a large vocabulary and an
appreciation of different types of reading. For Fc self-esteem was an important component of her reading program. To build that self-esteem she felt is was her job to "hook them" into reading and books. She had to provide them with the motivation to read.

She defined reading comprehension as "understanding what is read" and being able to "give that back."

Typically, when teaching reading, she began with a discussion about the book to interest them in the reading, establish what they already know about the subject, and set them up for what they needed to know. She felt the next step was to work on vocabulary words, both their meaning and pronunciation.

Fc actually combined the information transfer and interactive orientation. She was very word focused, stressing the importance of word attack skills and the importance of defining words. Yet, she was also concerned with the students' understanding of the text and the background knowledge they could contribute to it. Her placement on the continuum came almost into the middle.

Teacher Fd. Fd was now teaching fourth grade after a varied experience from kindergarten through fifth grade. She said, in her initial belief interview, that her cooperating teacher used the basal manual for reading and that she used her as a model.
Students in her classes were expected to "have a sense of reading" that expanded "to include" their own experience. She felt it was important for stories to have some relevance in students' lives.

She defined reading comprehension as coming up "with an answer about something that they read that's not the same as mine." She wanted creative students. To teach reading comprehension she worked on skills and worked on the basal readers, but she also felt that just reading was important. She had them reading plays and stories along with their work in the basal. When she chose basal stories, she looked for stories that related to students' lives.

Fd fell between the interactive and the transactive orientation terminals. She wanted her students to develop their own sense of reading that related to their own lives. She also felt that there was an interactive process between the reader and the text.

**Teacher Fe.** Fe, a sixth grade teacher, had taught for nine years. During that time, her philosophy evolved. She incorporated both basals and other literature into her reading program. She felt that reading literature would increase students' interest in reading. Moreover, she did not see reading as a "passive activity" but as an interactive process.
She defined reading comprehension as the "ability to take information and then use it." She used the basal to develop skills, but she also used other literature. She had her students working in the basal every day yet felt that most of their reading time should simply be spent reading.

She felt that reading was an interactive process and used skills and a variety of stories to interest her students.

**Issues of School Culture**

**Teacher Isolation.** The teachers of School F rarely had an opportunity to talk to each other. They almost always remained in their rooms, and when they ventured beyond them, they made trips to the office or to the "pit" for a cigarette. The two teachers, who smoked (one had a serious habit, frequenting the "pit" whenever there was a break, and the other only smoked occasionally), talked together rarely when in the lounge. When in the room together they often engaged staff members who were there at the time. According to them, the teachers did not even meet for regular faculty meetings. These teachers appeared quite comfortable working alone with students as their only commonality. Because the teachers had been at the school for several years, they knew the students and from time to
time discussed them, building a shared portrait of their behavior, accomplishments, and needs. Otherwise, there was little contact.

**Teacher Collegiality.** The teachers of School F did not experience collegiality. They were polite to each other and talked with each other when passing in the hall, but they were not often observed having long discussions of any sort. However, their feelings of animosity toward the principal were shared. Their conversations about him were laced with complaints about style, lack of support, and cooperation. They felt heavily pressured by him to teach a certain way and follow a certain code of order which they resisted.

**Teachers' Talk of Practices.** School F had a variety of concerns related to reading and other issues. One concern was how to incorporate literature into their classrooms. Fd had begun to use more literature in her classroom, and other teachers were interested in what she was doing and how she is doing it. Fb, in particular, wanted to observe her class yet felt constrained by time and the principal. Although they found value in the basal, they were looking for alternatives, but again they felt that the principal did not cooperate with them.

These teachers were concerned about the students' home situations. According to the School F teachers a student
needed a solid home situation to succeed. Furthermore, they felt that without a successful home experience, students would never succeed. They seemed to feel that if a child had both parents working or monolingual parents or parents who did not restrain them, that the child was doomed to failure.

Another concern was parents. The teachers felt that they needed to justify what they did, because not only might the principal confront them, but the parents as well. In the spring there was considerable concern about test scores. The teachers taught to the test and worried about student failure, not, however, for the students' sake, but because a parent, the principal, or the district might challenge their competence and/or their teaching style.

Summary

Schools A and F were very different in appearance and in culture. School A appeared bright and open with a faculty that was friendly and collegial, while School F seemed cold and institutional with a faculty that was distant and isolated. As the staff development programs proceeded in each school, these differences became more and more apparent. Interestingly, though, except in obvious cases, the teachers' philosophies about teaching reading
were similar. Many of them were using both the basal readers and the workbooks.

I have now introduced the schools, their culture, the participating teachers, and their beliefs. The next chapter presents the staff development programs in each school. As the school cultures and the teachers differed, so did the staff development programs. Although the basic information dispersed was similar and the thrust of the Project remained toward research-based practices, the programs in practice varied.
CHAPTER V
THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

This chapter first presents a short description of the actors involved in the programs. Second, it explores the initial planning stages of Year II, providing a general overview of the process and its two components—the individual component and the group component. Third, the staff developers and their beliefs about the staff development program are investigated. Although certainly not the focus of this study, the staff developers had vital roles in the facilitation of the changes that occurred/did not occur. Finally, each school's staff development process is described, including section on the individual component, which focuses on the two highlighted teachers, and the group component, which focuses on the summaries of the process.

This final section is comprised of summaries of the staff development individual components and group component. Complete descriptions appear in Appendix D. In the individual component passage, each highlighted teacher's practical argument interview is summarized to illustrate what issues were discussed and the strategies used by the staff developers to encourage the teachers to articulate their arguments. In the group component
passage, the staff development program is summarized in segments rather than by sessions.

The staff development program appeared to follow certain stages, each stage taking different lengths of time in the two schools. Initially, there was the introductory stage where the teachers familiarized themselves with each other, their philosophies, and their ways of thinking. During this time they did not ask questions of each other, but rather politely listened to the conversation. Also during this time SD1 and SD2 talked quite a bit about general practices and pressed the teachers to describe their classroom practices. Fd, for example, discussed at length what she was doing to establish a whole language classroom. Mb contributed to this conversation when she often asked Fd to describe what occurred in her classroom, or she described it herself. Fa also characterized her classroom practices and her interactions with students. There were similar discussions at School A. These teachers served as models for the other teachers.

The next stage of the staff development could be labeled the "breakthrough" stage. A breakthrough occurred when a person or persons moved through a line of thinking, or a way of doing things to a new way of thinking about the topic. Sometimes there were hesitancies and concerns as a result of the newness of the experience, yet recognition of
that newness served as an affirmation of change. At this stage the teachers asked "do you" questions. "Do you do literature groups?" or "When do you do skills?" were questions that they asked. When these questions were asked, all the teachers began to offer their opinions and suggestions. At the same time the staff developers participated less. They were more often listening than talking. This was not to say that they were not engaged; rather they became participants rather than leaders.

Finally there was the stage of empowerment. In this stage the teachers claimed ownership of the staff development itself. It was in this stage that the staff development conversation was dominated by teachers. They arranged agendas, asked the questions and/or answered the questions and generally directed the sessions' focuses. Table 10 illustrates the staff development process stages for both School A and School F.

The Actors

There were three sets of actors involved in the staff development programs, which included the RIS Project Research team and the participating faculty from each school. The research team included four people, the two Staff Developers (SD1 and SD2), discussed at length later in this chapter, one research associate who was the Project
Table 10. **Stages in the Staff Development Process: School A and School F**

---

**SCHOOL A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Introductory</th>
<th>Breakthrough</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Introductory</th>
<th>Breakthrough</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
liaison (there was one per school) and followed up with information and resources discussed during the staff development sessions, and one media specialist, myself, who was responsible for all audio and video equipment.

At School A and School F the actors varied. The School A actors included teachers Aa - Ag (seven teachers) discussed in Chapter IV. The principal of School A also participated whenever her schedule permitted. The actors of School F included teachers Fa - Fe discussed in Chapter IV. The curriculum specialist, Mb, also participated in every session. She too was discussed in Chapter IV. Principal F, however, did not participate.

The RIS Project Staff Development - A General Overview

The design of the staff development program accommodated both individual teachers and groups of teachers in each school and was devised to help teachers examine and possibly change beliefs about and practices in the teaching of reading comprehension. Although it incorporated information about research on reading instruction, the process aspects were meant to be generic. The school-based aspect of the program intended to develop school faculties' skills in the processes of reflection and the use of practical arguments with the hope that this
process could be continued in other content areas (RIS Project second year report, 1988).

The development of the staff development program took place in two stages. The first involved the development of the specific practical argument process for teacher change; and the second, a school-based model for teaching school faculties the practical argument process and materials for the reading comprehension research knowledge base. The development of the specific practical argument process was guided by examples set by Fenstermacher (1986, p. 44-45) when he discussed the use of practical arguments in changing the beliefs and practices of a teacher who examined individualized instruction and learning centers; and Morine-Dershimer (1986), when she used interview data to determine teachers' practical arguments and indicate how some of the empirical premises were not research-based.

The second stage involved an elaboration of the individual practical argument concept to include work on a group level.

As aforementioned, a practical argument is a heuristic device used to assist teachers in examining their beliefs which consist of three types of premises: value, empirical and situational. These arguments represent an intention for action. Importantly, teachers do not consciously think in practical arguments (Fenstermacher,
A second person is required to listen to the teacher, talks with them, and helps them lay out their arguments. In this staff development process a videotaped lesson from each teacher's classroom was used to solicit information from the teacher about what they do in their classroom. The listener asked questions which helped the teachers tease information and ideas out that, until that time, possibly had been tacit. Often the teacher pronounced "I haven't thought about this before" or they recognized inconsistencies.

At the group level the teachers in a more traditional staff development atmosphere were asked about issues important to them. Their responses became a group practical argument of sorts and a chance for the teachers, as a group, to explore change in their classrooms.

**Individual Component**

The individual component of the staff development varied from participant to participant and school to school. Although the topic of the videotaping was chosen by the staff developers from the observations made the previous year, the way in which the teachers chose to represent that topic was their own choice. For example, when a lesson that included work on reading comprehension,
not skills, was requested, one teacher, nevertheless, presented skills. The teachers' interpretations of the staff developers' requests, as well as the lessons that were videotaped, became substance for the individual sessions.

The practical argument process involved the videotaping of teachers performing an activity or a task. Because teachers do not consciously think in practical arguments, a viewing partner was required who listened to the teacher, talked with them, and helped them lay out their arguments.

Meichenbaum and Butler (1980) suggested that such a process is useful because both verbal and non-verbal cues were available.

Prior to the individual sessions the Staff Developers (Principal Investigators) previewed the videotaped session to prepare and pinpoint certain segments on which they wanted to focus. These segments provided the staff developers with an entrance into a discussion with the teachers about their tape. The research associate appointed to that school and the media specialist were also present.

The staff developers intended the sessions to be as informal as possible. To that end they arranged for them to occur at the convenience of the teacher, before,
during, or after school. Further, prior to the session, the teachers were asked to view the videotapes by themselves, although they sometimes did not do so. This helped eliminate concerns that might arise from their appearance and/or their students' behaviors. (The first few teachers did not view their tapes first, and the staff developers noticed their anxiety. An astute member of the research team then pointed out the potentially confrontive nature of the tapes and suggested that the teachers be given an opportunity to view the tape before the meetings. The advice was heeded.) The sessions themselves took place in the teacher's classroom, if before or after school, or in a small meeting room if during school.

The staff developers had not established a prescribed way to undertake the individual component, however, a certain format was usually followed. Initially, either SD1 or SD2 described the purpose of the meeting, which was to discuss the tapes in some detail, exploring what was done and why, with the hope of establishing areas the teachers wanted to improve. The project operated on the notion that teachers wanted to be the best teachers they could possibly be and, therefore, were looking for improvement strategies.

It was explained to the teacher that s/he or the researchers could stop the tape whenever they wanted to discuss what occurred. The videotape was shown, and the
actions were discussed. In particular, the teacher was often asked to describe her/his rationale for her/his instruction and to respond to questions about their performances. This discussion provided practical arguments for his/her actions in teaching reading comprehension. Each session culminated with the teacher identifying areas of practice that he/she would reconsider in terms of both her/his understanding and the implementation of that practice to facilitate comprehension. The research associate assigned to the school, then provided follow-up in the form of suggested alternative practices within the area of focus that had been demonstrated by research to be effective.

**Group Component**

The second component of the Staff Development Program involved group meetings with all of the intermediate grade teachers in the designated schools. In these meetings, teachers talked about the practices they implemented during reading comprehension instruction and reflected, in a group setting, on these practices. The Staff Developers served as catalysts for these discussions, and also as models for reflection. Furthermore, they provided the knowledge base that teachers used for both reflection and implementation, such as knowledge about theories of reading
comprehension, and examples of practices that were supported by those theories. The group component had a more traditional staff development atmosphere, which included sitting in a circle, focused discussions, and agendas based on topics that the teachers identified as important to them. The teachers' responses became a group practical argument of sorts and a chance for the teachers as a group to explore change in their classrooms.

The school-based staff development process incorporated:

- A procedure for self-assessment of organizational factors that affected teachers changing their practices;
- A stipulation that all relevant faculty be involved in the process (in the case of the reading comprehension program, grades 4, 5, and 6 teachers and reading specialists, and for certain aspects of the program, the principal); and
- Material that analyzed recent reading comprehension research that, in a simplified manner, introduced the teacher to the assumptions, context in which the research took place, processes of conducting the research, and findings in the form of practices.
Staff Developers

An important aspect of this project was the staff developers, themselves. They played a major role in each staff development program. They probed, suggested the change process, and, as that happened, appeared to undergo change themselves. During the sessions their reflections were increasingly intense, the staff development structure evolved, and, even more importantly, their practices transformed. Moreover, the transformation was not simply an increased level of confidence, but an intense exploration of changes and the practices that affected change.

The staff developers were the principal investigators of the project. Staff Developer 1 was from the Division of Teaching and Teacher Education, and Staff Developer 2 was from the Division of Language, Reading and Culture. Each brought their specific expertise to bear on the staff development program. Together, they and the research team developed the staff development process, incorporating the notion of the practical argument into an exploration of reading comprehension and the practices used to teach reading comprehension. The staff developers combined well their expertise to draw out the teachers' theories about what they do.
Early in the Project's second year of the project the staff developers were interviewed to establish their beliefs. As was done with the participating teachers, a sketch of each staff developer was drawn from the interviews and can be found in Appendix E. What follows below is a summary of these sketches.

**Staff Developer 1**

Prior to her involvement with the Project as a staff developer, SD1 had extensive experience in education from high school to college, from Africa to an Eastern inner-city. During that time she had major impact on the tenor and direction of teacher education.

Her staff development experience had also been expansive, entailing workshops, consultation, and individual work. As a result of these experiences, she defined most staff development programs as "blow in, blow off, and blow out" and recognized that she did not want to perpetuate this philosophy. Instead, she identified staff development as a process that leads to "changes in beliefs, understanding and, possibly, practices."

A reason for her interest in staff development programs was her commitment to teachers. She observed that teachers had, in the past, been reluctant to work with research, and she wanted to try a different approach. She
proposed, instead, providing alternative frameworks for teachers which encouraged teachers' thinking. She felt it was "important to focus on ways of thinking rather than on practices." Furthermore she felt it was important to actively involve teachers in the program.

She also believed that elements of reflection and beliefs were important in staff development programs. The reflection aided in the consideration of ideas and looking at beliefs, while bringing certain ideas to consciousness. The practical argument process helped both reflection and the revelation of beliefs. With the practical argument process, a teacher considered what is happening before them and the revelation of beliefs encouraged to become conscious of their intentions to act.

Her goal for the Project was to encourage change. She wanted to do that through practical argument interviews and discussions with teachers. A cue to recognize change would be a shift in the language teachers used to describe ideas. She also wanted to reverse the trends of putting down teachers and draining their power. Rather, she wanted to empower their processes.

Staff Developer 2

Staff Developer 2 had substantial experience as a public school teacher before working at the college level.
At the college level she had worked both in the classroom and in the field, serving as a consultant to teachers and districts. Much of her work had been in the literacy field.

During her years of experience she had become concerned with research practice dichotomy and hoped that this Project would bring them "closer together." She was concerned about the lack of shared language among teachers and how "unempowering it is to have such limited language." Moreover, she identified this as the crux of teacher empowerment.

She also felt that teachers were too dependent upon worksheets and grades, rather than encouraging students through more independent methods. Some of this, in her opinion, was generated by education's heavy focus on testing.

SD2 felt that a successful staff development could not be a "short-term, one-shot deal." Rather, it should involve commitment from all levels. It was there that the notion of practical argument fit into the staff development. It helped the teachers become aware of the issues to which they were committed. Its function was to provide a new framework about which to think.

SD2 was committed to teacher change. She would measure that by shifts in teachers' attitudes and teachers'
abilities to take over the SD process. She also wanted to create a new model for others to follow.

The staff developers obviously brought their own beliefs and personal theories into the staff development process. Having designed the Project, they had ideas and plans for the staff development program and directions for the practices they employed in that staff development. Doubtless the biases and beliefs of the staff developers affected their entry into the project, but importantly, these biases and beliefs did not appear to greatly affect the directions and topics that the teachers chose to focus upon in the staff development programs, which was one of their intentions for the process.

As the staff development programs progressed, the staff developers seemed less inclined to talk about their ideas and more inclined to ask, "Well, what do you think?" even as the teachers pleaded for information about the "right way" to teach reading. Of course, their beliefs were apparent and acknowledged, but they did not attempt to sell the teachers on their ideas. Rather, they took great efforts to listen carefully to what the teachers said. Moreover, they brought in and examined topics of concern expressed by the teachers, and veered away from discussions about their own beliefs.
School A, for example, always wanted to know about the "right way to teach reading," and several teachers at various times asked SD1 and/or SD2 to expound upon that. Sometimes the teachers would be quite adamant. In response the Staff Developers would always emphasize that there were many ways to teach reading, and that they were not promoting any one particular theoretical perspective. In session six of School A's staff development process, for example, SD2 said that the important point about this staff development was that it was "not a staff development program that comes in with all this stuff packaged" for teachers because they "don't care to present any of this unless there is a question about it. We are responding to the questions that you have."

The staff developers were introduced to illustrate that the staff development process was designed, not just with the staff developers' good ideas and intentions, but with the ideas of the teachers as well. The original plans belonged to the staff developers, but the participating teachers extended and adapted those plans and made them successful.

The staff development component of the RIS Project had a specific focus on the exploration of change, that is, the change of teachers' practices in reading comprehension, but not a specific program. In other words, there is no
formula that could be quickly described and undertaken. Rather the staff development program at each of the two schools must be described. It is important to note, however, that patterns emerged across schools.

**Staff Development - School A - Individual Component**

The participants in the staff development program at School A were the six intermediate teachers plus the Learning Disabilities teacher. Their participation was voluntary, although the principal lobbied hard to generate their interest. Besides the principal's encouragement, they were also offered an incentive in the form of University credit or money.

All of the staff development sessions took place in the library, which had a large area where the tables and chairs were moveable. It was a large, bright room, that had a large assortment of media accessories and was easily accessible to the intermediate teachers. The actual arrangement of the tables and chairs varied, dependent upon the meeting, although the variations were not consciously managed, except that SD1 and SD2 made a conscious decision not to sit together, and after the first two sessions, the participants did not sit behind tables. In addition, for each session, a research assistant brought snacks for the teachers.
Prior to the beginning of the staff development program an initial meeting was held. This meeting had several focuses: (a) to introduce the teachers to the research team, (b) to reaffirm interest after the summer break, (c) to explain incentive options, and (d) to establish the date for the first staff development.

In the following section, to best describe the individual component of the staff development program, I briefly summarize the highlighted teachers' sessions, Aa and Af in School A. It is important here to emphasize that these teachers were chosen because of their clarity in elaborating their personal theories.

Teacher Aa

The lesson videotaped for Aa's practical argument interview session centered around a basal selection excerpted from the *Wind in the Willows*. This lesson used both whole group and small group settings to address issues about the reading.

During the practical argument interview SD1 and SD2 and Aa covered a wide variety of issues, but focused more specifically on:

1. Story Choice: SD2, pursuing her concern with background knowledge, attempted to uncover Aa's reasons for choosing this particular story. She also wanted to know if
he had warned the students about the language used in the story. In response, he said he had only reminded them about getting meaning from the context rather than the dictionary. He did not necessarily see the importance of prior knowledge or, for that matter, importance of knowing every word.

2. Act of Reading: Aa identified reading as a private act performed by one person for one person. A person did not read for someone else. He found that reading was "a lonely adventure" where "you can read concurrently with somebody, but that's still not reading with them."

3. Choice of Literature: Aa distinguished between classic literature and popular literature. In his opinion students did not really experience an emotional bond with more popular literature, like Judy Blume. Furthermore, he felt that popular literature was not as good for the students as classic literature.

4. Assessment: Aa was concerned with the assessment of both teachers and students. He felt as if he always had to worry about how parents and the district perceived his reading program. In his opinion, there was a "reading to answer the questions" mentality that actually drove the educational system. As a result students had to learn to read "for somebody else's purposes," and he had to teach using basals and their comprehension checks.
These were themes that Aa actually carried through his participation in the staff development program.

At the conclusion of the practical argument interview Aa defined areas of concern which he would like to follow-up. First he wanted to learn more about prereading activities and ways to "launch" kids into reading. Second, he wanted to know more about background knowledge. And third, he wanted to more closely investigate assessment and its processes.

**Teacher Af**

The videotaped lesson involved a basal selection entitled "Benny's Flag," which she presented to her class in a whole group setting. The story was chosen because it coordinated with the students' social studies unit on the Pacific states. Prior to reading, Af and the students previewed it, discussed possibilities, and made predictions.

During her practical argument Af addressed very specific, mostly student-centered, issues:

1. Act of Reading: Af wanted her students to view reading as challenging and exciting and hoped they would develop a "different direction of thought" in the process. Further she wanted them to make connections between the
stories and their own ideas and find a more "fruitful way of looking" over the reading.

2. Personal Experience: Af found personal experience important in her own view of reading and important to a student's interpretation of what had been read. Every aspect of Af's theories of teaching linked with her personal experiences as a student. These personal experiences also related to prediction, because students could draw on those personal experiences to make predictions.

3. Assessment: Af was concerned particularly about the assessment of students. She encouraged her students to predict what teachers wanted and predict test behaviors, because she felt the tests determined a large portions of a person's life choices.

4. Personal achievement/self esteem: personal achievement and self esteem was a great concern for Af. Fourth grade, according to Af, was a "bridge", a time when students found "out about themselves." Labelling would cause problems. To counteract negative labelling, she had devised Terrific Readers In Training (TRIT) that would raise self-esteem and teach necessary strategies.

5. Questioning: She did believe in using comprehension check questions, unless you worked on them before the story. These themes were initially presented by
AF in her belief interview and were carried through the Staff Development program.

At the conclusion of the practical argument interview Af decided to pursue two areas. First, she wanted to work on questioning, particularly in relation to predictions. Second, she wanted to consider ability grouping and its usefulness.

**Staff Development - School A - Group Component**

The group component of the School A staff development looked, at superficial glance, much like any other staff development. The teachers met in the school library with the staff developers as group leaders. The School A teachers chose when the meetings would be held and the frequency of the meetings. They decided to meet three times per month unless school schedules conflicted. Prior to the meetings, there was time for socializing and snacking on treats brought in by a research associate. Scheduled to begin at 2:15 p.m., ten minutes after the end of school, the meetings usually began at 2:30 p.m. About 2:30 p.m. SD1 or SD2 would say, "OK, let's get started," and the staff development began.

In this section, I summarize School A's staff development. For each meeting I briefly describe the topics discussed and feature teacher responses with
particular attention to the highlighted teachers, Aa and Af. The brief summary of the staff development sessions focuses on the evolution of thought taking pace for the teachers. The complete description of the staff development sessions can be found in Appendix D.

**Introductory Stage - Sessions 1-8**

From the very first moment of the first session, the Staff Developers encouraged the teachers to set their own agenda. Interestingly, the teachers did not seem to believe them. Throughout the first session and continuing through the introductory stage, the teachers kept asking for directions for the right way to teach reading.

The first session simply introduced the Project to the teachers and the teachers to the Project. Observation of these sessions also identified Aa and Af as powerful forces within the faculty.

During the second session, the teachers were asked to begin to talk about their beliefs. These revelations come in the discussion of their belief interviews. They responded to a request for volunteers to discuss their interviews. As one teacher asked a question about teaching reading, the group responded, both staff developers and colleagues.
This session also focused on questioning as an area of interest identified by the teachers. There were lists made and charts drawn, but time precluded a long discussion.

A perpetual theme, "Doing it right", was addressed during this session. Each teacher seemed quite concerned about doing it right. In fact, they appeared hesitant about sharing their practices because of that fear.

In the third session, one teacher, Ad, flare up when pressed to discuss his practices. He accused the Project of promoting one right way of teaching reading. Although SD1 assured him that was not the case, Ad appeared strong in his conviction. In a later conversation it seemed that Ad was actually upset with colleagues who, in his opinion, were misrepresenting their teaching practices to please the Staff Developers.

After a continued discussion of belief interviews, the topic turned to questions. A list was drawn and the teachers discussed the purposes of questioning. Many of them agreed that they asked questions to develop and assess students' work. It was also during this session that Aa mentioned accountability for the first time. This later became a major focus of discussions. He mentioned it in the context of wanting parents and principals to be able to recognize his reading program.
As the sessions progressed, the teachers' beliefs about teaching and reading became more apparent, particularly for those who participated. For example, Af's student-oriented approach and Aa's concern for pleasing the parents became obvious. At this point the teachers were still not discussing their practices at great length, although they quickly began to mention them practices periodically.

In session 4, SD1 once again underscored the importance of teachers generating their own ideas for the staff development. She attempted to reassure the teachers that the staff developers felt it was imperative for the teachers themselves to establish what to consider as the right way to teach reading.

The topic then turned again to questioning and a matrix designed from the teachers' information. Quickly, however, it moved to accountability and grading. Concerned as they were with teaching the right way, they were also concerned with grading correctly. The teachers told a story about how the principal and the district "made" them do certain things. The principal, who was present in that session, refuted this allegation. Yet, the teachers went right on believing. The teachers appeared uncertain about grading, confused about the purposes, and under a great deal of pressure, seemingly self-inflicted, to please
parents, principal, and students. Listening to the discussion, it appeared that grading may be the driving concern in their teaching beliefs.

This theme continued in session 5. There was an initial attempt to return to the activities matrix, but the topic quickly returned to assessment. The teachers had many horrors to share about grading and accountability, but no one seemed to agree on either issue. A continuing theme for Aa emerged in his concern that reading was subjective, but you needed to fit into an objective mold for success. A theme for Af also emerged, that of objectifying grades when she recognized them as objective.

The teachers in this session were also manifesting some hostility. They seemed anxious, fidgety and unwilling to discuss their own personal experiences. It would appear that the perceived powerlessness made them very uncomfortable.

Session 6, a session actually cancelled after the research team arrived because of an overload of teacher commitments, was more of the same. After cancelling the meeting, several teachers stayed around to discuss feelings of powerlessness and the inadequacies of the grading system.

In the midst of this discussion when the Staff Developers asked the teachers to direct the next session,
they asked, "What do you want to work on?", again attempting to relinquish their power. SD1 and SD2 reassured them that they (the Staff Developers) would not present anything except topics chosen by the teachers.

Session 7 began in the new year. The teachers appeared renewed when talking about the Project. That, however, was quickly thrown aside when the teachers again asked the Staff Developers to tell them (the teachers) what they thought was exciting. Aa stepped in and suggested that the teachers bring in their "pet concerns," and he would discuss quality versus quantity approaches to reading.

Since the last session, the teachers were given an article to read on assessment, but they did not read it. The topic, therefore, moved toward a discussion of what Ab was doing in his classroom with activities designed from his participation in this Project.

The teachers next launched into an intense discussion of the students' inadequacies. Most of the problems were blamed on the home. SD2 responded vehemently to comments made by Ag about his students. Although she apologized immediately, many people appeared uncomfortable. In his defense, Ac said the Ag was "just speaking the truth."
SD2 then expressed her frustration about not conveying the importance of certain strategies. She wanted teachers to use them and they were not.

As turned the topic in a quality/quantity of reading direction. He presented his practices, and the teachers questioned him. Interestingly, this was one of the first times that practices were shared.

Breakthrough Stage - Sessions 9-10

Session 9 was devoted to assessment. SD1 pressed the teachers to elaborate on their beliefs about grading. She questioned the tests and the grading system. Both SD1 and SD2 continuously attempted to draw out beliefs and have them elaborate on their strategies. Unfortunately, the teachers appeared unwilling to consider alternatives and appeared quite angry about being pressed to elaborate on their beliefs.

In session 10 the teachers moved into the breakthrough stage. They expressed their feelings about the last session, and their feelings that the program was, in fact, not working. They were still waiting for the staff development program to "present a best way of doing reading." They said they wanted structure and boundaries. They also wanted specific assignments.
Furthermore, they addressed the revealing nature of the staff development. Ag described his vulnerability, because there was "more emotion in this one" and ordinary staff development programs were cut and dried. Ab claimed that his awareness had been awakened; he was not as comfortable with his reading program as he had been. There were still teachers, however, after complaining about the control of the Project, who asked for a "bag of tricks."

After the critiques and complaints were all heard, SD2 quickly discussed reading practices. She expressed her own frustration about not being able to discuss the reading practices materials the research team had gathered.

This session was a breakthrough session because the teachers had made the step to assert themselves. They expressed their feelings, revealed themselves, and revealed their beliefs.

Empowerment Stage - Session 11

During session 11 the teachers, once warmed up, began to talk about their practices in the context of authenticity. The topic raised was the definition of an authentic teacher. Ac, for example, talked about her concern for controlling her classroom. Aa revealed his attitudes about reading.
In this session the teachers decided that this should be the final session. They each discussed the impact of the Project on their teaching. Several talked about the importance of the discussions. Others were quiet. Aa appeared the most affected by the Project from his comments.

The themes that flowed through the staff development program at School A were accountability and the desire to do it right. From their comments and their responses, they appeared far more concerned with these issues than any issue related to reading. It seemed as if these concerns permeated the teachers' decisions and actions. One theme related to practice was questioning. During several sessions, questioning was addressed and explored.

Staff Development - School F - Individual Component

In the following section I briefly summarize the individual component sessions of Fc and Fd. The complete case study can be found in Appendix F. These summaries illustrate the personal theories held by these highlighted teachers.

As stated earlier under School A, the practical arguments of the teachers were not consciously constructed by the Staff Developers. These summaries represent,
therefore, the direction of the conversations rather than the formal practical argument.

**Teacher Fe**

Fe chose to present a basal story about a beekeeper as the lesson to be videotaped. She began with prereading strategies and background knowledge. She also provided activities which encouraged them to talk about all they knew about bees and honey. For the prereading activities, the students were in a whole group setting, and for the reading process itself, it was a small group setting. Throughout this lesson it was clear that both the teacher and the students were having a good time.

During the practical argument interview several major topics were addressed:

1. **Motivation:** Fe used props and prereading activities to motivate students. She liked to "draw from the kids everything that they could know." She also felt that self-esteem was important as well. She believed that a student could not feel motivated, if their self-esteem was low. All of her activities were aimed at raising self-esteem.

2. **Questions:** SD2 wanted to know the types of questions that Fe liked to ask. They also asked about her
use of comprehension check questions and how she chose which questions to use.

3. Skills: Fc emphasized the importance of skills. She felt they contributed a great deal to successful reading.

4. Assessment: Fc discussed her own assessment process done by her principal. She did not want to worry about grading but felt compelled to do so, because of the principal's expectations. The themes addressed here carried through her participation in the staff development program.

At the conclusion of the practical argument interview, Fc indicated that she wanted to pursue two areas further. First, she wanted to investigate inferencing. Second, she wanted to examine whether the use of literature in her reading lessons would be valuable.

Teacher Fd

For her videotaped lesson Fd combined a picture book and a basal reader. She read the picture book to introduce the subject, Halloween, and then had the students move into the basal to read. Early in the lesson she had the students doing predictions of and discussions about the story, but a main purpose in her lessons was the development of a love of reading.
1. Use of Literature: Fd used literature because she felt it "grabbed" the students. She believed it was important for students to be motivated and wrapped up in their reading to love it.

To develop a recognition of authors and their literary styles, she mentioned authors' names whenever possible. This helped students recognize favorite authors.

2. Prediction: Fd felt strongly that prediction had to be incorporated into the reading level. She also felt that work on predictions enhanced writing, where students always predict.

3. Assessment: Fd mentioned assessment to point out that she did not feel intimidated by parents or principal. She spoke honestly with parents about what she was doing, and she felt they supported her.

4. Skills: Fd appeared in a quandary about the importance of skills. She found them important to some degree, just not necessarily for reading comprehension.

These themes were important strands throughout Fd's discussions in the staff development program.

At the conclusion of the practical argument interview Fd acknowledged her interest in the Project. Over the year she hoped to continue exploring the whole language approach to reading and the use of skills in her reading program.
As in the description of School A's staff development program, this section recounted School F's staff development program. For each session I present the topics discussed and feature certain teacher responses with specific attention to the highlighted teachers, Fc and Fd. The evolution of teacher thinking and participation is illustrated in the teacher's language. The complete description of the staff development program sessions can be found in Appendix D.

**Staff Development - School F - Group Component**

The participants in School F's staff development were the four intermediate grade teachers and the special education/multiply-handicapped teacher. These teachers volunteered for the program although both the principal and the curriculum specialist suggested that participation would be a good idea. These teachers were also offered incentives from which they could choose.

The staff development program, occurring once a month, took place at SD1's home. This location was chosen because it was accessible and because the teachers felt it was imperative to meet off-campus both for their well-being and for their comfort in revealing issues. SD1's home had a large living room area where the teachers met. There were comfortable chairs with coffee tables arranged in the area
for books and a large glassed-in area that provided a lovely view. Certain qualities of the living room area, where the staff development took place, were less than conducive to a staff development. For example, although there were large windows with a beautiful view, the lighting was not balanced with areas that were quite dark. Two couches were very squishy and began to enfold you as you sat there. Additionally, the teachers often seemed tired and relaxed into the furniture. There was also the added ingredient of Brownie, the dog, who drifted in and out of the meetings according to whim. At least a small portion of each meeting was devoted to him. Off the living room was the open dining area. On the clothed table there were usually treats of various sorts, either provided by the teachers or the research staff. Often, prior to the meeting, the School F teachers met together for lunch.

The initial meeting, held several weeks before the staff development program began (a) clarified the purpose of the staff development; (b) reaffirmed teachers interest in participating in the program; (c) established the initial meeting time; and (d) introduced the research team.
Introductory Stage - Session 1

This first session began with a description of the Project. The teachers were reassured that the Staff Developers wanted "to figure out" the areas teachers wanted to cover.

One teacher, Fd, was the first to begin exploring the teachers' interests. She expressed concern about the evaluation of students. Others followed. Fc wanted to know how to meet the needs of a diverse student population.

The teachers seemed fascinated to hear each other speak. The similarity of beliefs surprised them. Prior to these meetings, there was little cohesiveness. They seemed to be thrilled by the new discoveries of colleagues.

Even in this session, the teachers, although apparently just getting to know each other, engaged in an exploration of practices. The teachers of School F appeared committed to using the staff development program to gain as much information and as many ideas as possible.

Breakthrough Stage - Sessions 2-6

Assessment was a major focus of session 2. First SD1 had the teachers first look at the activities students did when they are learning reading comprehension. They defined reading comprehension, explored the purpose of skills, and
looked at ways to evaluate reading. Then the issue shifted to assessment and the problems related to it.

Next, the use of the basal reader was explored. Each teacher had their own opinion of the basal, some positive, some negative. Clearly they had thought about these issues a lot.

During this session the teachers seriously engaged in an exploration of practices. They spoke their mind about the basal, skills, and the purposes of reading comprehension. They also explored the issues of accountability and assessment.

It was also during this session that Mb became simply a participant rather than an administrator. When SD1 and SD2 challenged her statements and modelled challenging her direction, the teachers no longer acquiesced to her control. As they took control of the meeting, the breakthrough stage began.

The breakthrough stage carried over into session 3. The initial discussion centered on the disruption of classes during reading. The teachers felt that they too often had interruptions.

Next, they discussed the focuses and SD2 clarified their purpose. Prior knowledge and other reading research issues were also discussed. Several teachers followed up
by stating the importance of developing shared knowledge among teachers and students.

Many of the topics discussed involved "do you" questions. The teachers were almost desperate to find out what their colleagues had done. When a teacher brought up a subject, the others seemed compelled to discuss it and offer suggestions. They discussed journals, book reports, and formula answers.

The topic then turned, as usual, to assessment. How powerful were the parents, and what were the test criteria. Each had their experiences to relate, yet the similarities were strong. Along with these similarities, there was a discussion of the "power of the test-makers" and how often they gave the power of knowing students over to the standardized test people.

Finally during this session, a videotape of a teacher was viewed. The teacher was observed working successfully with students in groups. A discussion ensued that looked at the "traditional ways of teaching," as well as other aspects of teaching.

In session 4 the teachers began to talk more. Although SD2 initially provided an agenda, the teachers monitored it. They also requested modelling in the classroom done by Project staff.
An initial discussion for this session observed the differences between the use of the basal text and literature books. They each talked about their concerns and purposes for using the texts that they used.

Other issues of practice were discussed, including the use of vocabulary, writing, evaluation of students, and how to reach students. SD2 suggested that knowing the history of the classroom propelled the students faster along the path of knowing.

In session 5 the discussion began with an exploration of Fa's use of concept analysis and how it worked. The Staff Developers developed her practical argument as they proceeded, and the teachers listened and discussed ways of using it in their classrooms.

Next, they discussed the district gifted program at length and speculated on why that sort of process versus outcome teaching was not done throughout the district. The teachers discussed their opinions and could not come to a resolve.

From here the discussion turned to grading and how to approach it. Several teachers addressed the importance of recognizing prior knowledge and what the students knew as they entered the classroom. They also condemned the school reward system, because it set up a bad self-esteem problem. Further, at School F they were required to have a certain
number of grades. Several teachers expressed fear that the principal would not support them if the parents challenged their grading. They also discussed grading alternatives.

One final discussion centered on an exploration of modelling done in Fb's classroom. The research associate explained why she thought it worked/did not work as well as the participation of the students. Fb followed up with her concerns about certain students.

In session 6, after a brief discussion of a conference attended by two participants, the teachers explored the used of literature versus basal approach to reading in the classroom. The issue centered on the activities that followed reading. There were questions about comprehension checks, variations in students' questions, the suffocation of creativity, and providing feedback. Grading was another issue raised.

They also discussed the videotape of a research associate modelling brainstorming in Fb's classroom. It was a mapping activity. First, the research associate discussed her experience, and then Fb discussed hers. It worked quite well in the classroom.

The session ended with an assignment. Each teacher was to go their students and ask them what they thought reading was, so that the teachers could begin to elaborate on those ideas.
**Empowerment Stage - Sessions 7-8**

In session 7 the discussion leaned toward literature. Fd talked about the use of novels in her classroom as did Fe. Mb talked about the literature-based basal programs and their potential value. Fd then raised the issue of authenticity between a basal and literature piece. Fa brought up a question of skills.

Then they discussed the value of outlining to help students explore their lives. Outlining could help organize students' thinking as well as organize students' views of reading. As they discussed this the topic turned to reading and making sense of the text.

During a break in the meeting the teachers planned the next session. It would be a literature group, so that that type of discussion group could be modeled for them. They decided on book choices, dates, topics, and strategies. They were quite excited.

After addressing the issue of a good reading practice, the discussion moved into a look at students' views of reading. Many students had a different view of reading. As the discussion proceeded, teachers revealed their own learning to read stories. Interestingly, there appeared to be a connection between them, and the ways teachers taught reading. The teachers also made connections between their own processes and students' processes. This led to an
insightful discussion of different students and their needs.

The shift from breakthrough to empowerment was subtle. The teachers did not simply take over. Rather, they eased into the empowerment stage and suddenly seemed to be directing the action. The level of excitement and interest seemed to raise in this process.

The final session began with a recounting of teachers activities. Four of the five teachers were working with novels. Their students were quite happy with that, and the teachers were pleased as well.

A literature group discussion followed, revolving around their book choice. They discussed the book, its important issues, and then ways they would use it with their students. Given the different interpretations in the room, it was certainly a testimony to the interactivity between the text and the reader. There was also a focus on the important of prior knowledge. The teachers appeared pleased by the discussion.

A final discussion turned to assessment and how students might be graded when literature was used. Each teacher offered suggestions. The key for most of the teachers was that they were professionals, and whatever decisions they made about assessment should be appreciated in that light.
As the meeting closed, the teachers talked about its success. They had revealed a lot about themselves, but were grateful for it. They realized the importance of knowing their own beliefs.

The themes for the School F sessions were varied. Specifically the struggle between what best served the students appeared to be a focal point—literature or basal. The teachers were also interested in the practices and the strategies used by their colleagues. This contact-starved faculty seemed glad for any tidbit of attention given to them and were willing to make the best of it. It appeared they wanted to make every moment count.

Summary

Clearly there were differences between schools A and F. Whereas School A was totally preoccupied with the notion of doing it right, school F was grateful for the opportunity to share ideas. The School F teachers were willing to reveal themselves and consider themselves professionals as compared with the role of victims that School A's teachers seemed to take.

While the staff development and the Staff Developers were geared toward serving the teachers in any way that suited them, the schools took advantage in quite different ways. The School F teachers jumped in immediately
questioning their practices and exploring possibilities. On the other hand, the teachers of School A did not take charge until the last session, after they had gotten angry with the Staff Developers. They could never accept that the Staff Developers were not trying to drive the staff development program.

It also appeared that social collegiality may have hindered the staff development process in School A. In School A teachers were very social and pleasant. They seemed to have a very polite bond, but one that did not permit revealing beliefs and practices about teaching. On the other hand, there was no code for School F. The teachers rarely saw each other. Thus, the code of social collegiality may have inhibited the change process in School A. Furthermore, holding the staff development program away from school may have been essential in breaking that code. Away from the school and its constraints, the teachers might have felt more comfortable revealing themselves. Although that opportunity was afforded School A, they declined.

The next two chapters investigate these issues in greater detail. Chapter VI looks at the change process from the teachers' language and teachers' perspectives. A look at shifts in language, style, and practice is taken. Chapter VII reviews the change process and the staff development process in general.
CHAPTER VI
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE

Thus far, descriptions of the schools' cultures, the participating teachers, and the staff development process have been presented. In Chapter IV the schools and their cultures were described as were the teachers in each of the schools. This introduced the setting and the participants in the study. Chapter V presented the individual and group components of the staff development program. The individual component allowed the teachers to explore their areas of interests and concerns and the group component drew out those interests and concerns so they could be explored in a group. Furthermore, the group component for each school was presented according to the stages at which each school participated--introductory, breakthrough and empowerment. Chapter VI takes the description one step further. It examines specifically the change that occurred within the school and among the teachers.

One method for determining change in practice in this study was from listening to teachers talk about the practices and what they were trying, both with the staff development group and individually. Another method used observation in their classrooms. This chapter, therefore,
includes discussion of each school, A and F, containing sections that describe:

1. Changes in practices in the teachers' own words in the staff development group, in individual interviews, and from observation;

2. Changes in the ways the participants' think about themselves as teachers;

3. Changes in the relationships with each other; and

4. Expanded descriptions of change in the highlighted teachers.

This data will be extracted from the formal and informal interviews, transcriptions of the individual and group staff developments, and classroom observations.

Finally, there is a section which examines the differences between School A and School F. Table 11 briefly describes the changes experienced by the teachers of each school.

School A

School A had an intensive staff development schedule. The teachers were drawn together three times a month to discuss their practices, something they had not often done as a group before. The reactions to this process and the change observed in the teachers of School A varied considerably. Some were hesitant about change, some
### Table 11. Changes in Teachers' Practices, Perceptions, and Relationships across Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Practices</td>
<td>While the teachers were often not willing to discuss their classroom practices with the group, they, nevertheless, were willing to attempt a practice presented in a staff development session in their classrooms. They had also begun to adopt the language of the Project when discussing the teaching of reading.</td>
<td>The teachers were willing to discuss their classroom practices as well as question others about what happened in their classrooms. They were also willing to attempt different practices presented in the staff development sessions and adopt them if appropriate. Interestingly though, these teachers wanted to see the practices modelled for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Teachers' Perceptions</td>
<td>The teachers felt that changes had occurred in their classrooms, but they each judged those changes differently. When questioned, several teachers claimed they had experienced little change, yet when observed, all the teachers except one, Ad, demonstrated a shift in practice.</td>
<td>Several teachers over the course of the staff development process had experienced apparently large shifts in their teaching practices. Rd, experiencing major changes as the staff development process began, had, by year's end, revolutionized her practices. Fc andFa were using literature-based experiences for their students. Some teachers had shifted their views of themselves as teachers from a skills-based program to a literature-based view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Teachers' Relationships</td>
<td>School A's teachers appeared enmeshed in collegial expectations which did not allow them to share their practices. They did share their thoughts, though, as long as it did not infringe on others' privacy. These teachers were always congenial with each other and that did not change.</td>
<td>These teachers were willing to participate fully in the staff development program and take a leadership role almost immediately. Because they previously had not had the opportunity to share their practices with their colleagues, they looked forward to the staff development sessions to consider new possibilities with each other and learn from each other. As a result, they also seemed to talk more with each other in school about practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Highlighted Teachers</td>
<td>The teachers highlighted, Aa and Af, were veteran teachers of more than three years, who had been reflecting on their practices and their beliefs for a long time and had perfected, for themselves, a satisfactory way of doing things. Consequently, there was significant movement in the clarity of their public conversation about their practices and beliefs, but a smaller amount of change in practice.</td>
<td>School F's highlighted teachers were also veteran teachers who had reflected upon their practice. Fa initially appeared to be a masterful teacher who worked in reading solely through the basal reader, while Fd seemed to be a teacher in change. By the end of the staff development program, both teachers had experienced major changes in both the ways they talked about their classrooms and how they employed practices in their classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
welcomed it, and some viewed it as an affirmation process rather than a change process.

Initially, the teachers were uncomfortable with the staff development format. Throughout the Project, several teachers requested the "hands-on" approach of a typical staff development in which they were provided with information to take away with them. The teachers commented that they "didn't want to think about it." They wanted "hands-on materials" that would describe "the one best way of teaching reading." This did not happen. As a result, some teachers, like Ac, mistook the staff development sessions for a "rap session" and did not catch on to the reflective nature of the program. Some wanted to come away with the right answers about the teaching of reading.

What they received instead was an opportunity to discuss their practices, to challenge each other, and to hear about alternative practices from each other and the staff developers. Unfortunately, at School A the teachers seemed to have difficulty sharing their practices. Ac and Ae, for example, rarely gave accounts of classroom strategies, and consequently, the staff development process was viewed as a highly sensitive undertaking in which they hesitated to participate with varying degrees.

It was true, however, that several of the teachers were much more receptive to change than others. Ab, for
example, previously involved in other staff development programs and identified by the district as a mentor teacher, almost immediately adapted ideas and practices presented into his classroom. The student question-writing practice mentioned in Chapter V which offered the description of the staff development, was just one way he made use of the staff development program, and one way he changed his classroom practice. Other teachers as well, such as Aa and Af, were willing to be challenged and consider change. Aa seemed to enjoy being challenged to describe his thinking about issues raised, and Af appeared to appreciate confronting the Staff Developers on points of information.

**Changes in Practices**

As suggested in Chapter V, the teachers of School A did not often talk about their practices in a full group. When someone questioned what they did or asked for elaboration, they stopped talking. Ae was a case in point. During session 9, Ae, who had not contributed much in any session, began talking in detail about her grading system, how she set it up, and upon what it was based. When she finished her explanation, SD2 probed to find out why, for example, 44 grades were important each quarter for each report card grade and why she emphasized certain skills.
Rather than reflect upon her practice, Ae stopped talking. Although she continued to rationalize what she did, she would not pursue the issue in any more depth. In fact, Ae did not really participate again in any of the succeeding sessions.

Ab, on the other hand, did present his practices. He was particularly proud of the questioning practice he adapted for his classroom that entailed having the students generate their own questions. In fact, he not only talked at length about this practice, but during one session, he brought in a transparency with which to better explain the practice. Interestingly, though, SD1 and SD2 were the only ones to explore the practices. His colleagues did not question the practice or attempt to investigate it further.

It was the purpose of this staff development to encourage reflection upon and possible change in practices. This involved questioning and dialogue for the purpose of drawing one's beliefs into the conscious realm. For some teachers it seemed to be cutting in too close to their private edge, and they did not engage in much dialogue. They did, however, consider possible changes in practice. Ae, for example, was willing to use practices discussed during the sessions. During several opportunities to observe in her classroom, I saw her successfully use different questioning strategies. Unfortunately, it was
not clear that she connected the practice to any personal or research theoretical base. Ae, as stated in session 2, did consider herself an "immature" teacher, just developing her practices, and therefore, seemed willing to try anything once. It was not clear, however, that these new practices became her own, because she would not discuss them.

Three other teachers, Ac, Ad, and Ag claimed to be relatively unchanged in their practices when interviewed toward the Project's end. They felt they were not doing many things differently in their classroom. Given these claims it was particularly interesting to note in observations toward the culmination of the Project that they were employing practices quite different than the practices they used during their initial part in the Project. Ac, for example, very carefully addressed the background knowledge of her students when preparing for a reading assignment which, rather than coming from the basal reader, was drawn from popular literature. Ag also spent considerable time drawing out what his students knew before undertaking his reading assignment. On the other hand, changes in practice were not observed in Ad's classroom. Significantly, however, their language was different. They were each aware of the importance of prior knowledge to their students' participation in the reading process, as
well as cognizant of the importance of questioning their students, and why some questions may work better than others. In particular Ac, Ad, Ae, and Ag claimed to be thinking more than ever before about reading and how to teach it successfully in the classroom, adopting the language of the project like prior knowledge and reflection into their vocabulary. One of the purposes of the RIS Project was to produce more reflective teachers, teachers who thought more about their practice. Although new practices were not necessarily adopted, they did, in fact, become more reflective.

**Changes in Teachers' Perceptions**

There were varied responses to questions about the impact of School A's staff development program on the teachers' own thinking and classroom practices, but they all agreed that the project had impact. It was the strength of impact that varied. Ab found that he had "been integrating some of the ideas" that the Project offered. He remembered it as helpful, specifically where it related "to such things as questioning" and "finding out what kinds of background they needed to be aware of in their own minds before they read." He still liked the idea of the students doing their skills, but he found that since he had been doing these other activities, he did not enjoy the
structured activities of the basals as much as he had been. He also thought about how he might design his reading program for the next year and felt strongly that he would include literature-based activities.

When asked about the Project Ac found herself reflecting about questions as well as the "dysfunctional behaviors in the classroom." She found that

...you want to go into all these theoretical viewpoints on how you view your teaching and how you reflect on it, but if you start to do that, you start becoming blanketed with all these questions and perspectives and a lot of fears start coming in and you can't do that because then you start doubting yourself and the insecurities set in. And once that happens, then it affects your whole outlook on how you teach. So I mean you can reflect but not dwell.

She felt that the Project had made her think. She compared it with "jeopardy questions. It's like you've got to be right there. When you ask questions, it's interesting. ... It's funny how powerful words can be." She felt she had reflected "on things over this project, and how they've made us really take a look at ourselves, a real searching inventory of who we are and why we do what we do."

She observed that the teachers were asked to look at issues beyond their certificate and not just because they were teachers. They were, according to Ac, asked philosophical questions that made "people uncomfortable sometimes," because they were not usually asked to do something like that or "asked to even look at ourselves."
This year Ad reflected about a variety of issues like "whether or not the workbook pages do any good." He concluded that while it may not be reading as such, they are some of the skills that go along with reading," and so he still assigned them. He also cut down on reading groups, because it seems to cause considerable noise. When he was not reflecting, he was grading because he felt grades were very important. Ae found that as "far as reading, just through these classes, I have been more conscious of thinking about doing a prior knowledge activity." Although she did not always do the activity, she made herself "think more of how" she could "pull out their prior knowledge." On the other hand, Ag found "there were a lot of ideas that came up that I would like to try and intend to try. . . . I didn't get to them mainly because I didn't think the class and I were ready for all the change."

The teachers of School A all found themselves doing things differently in the classroom this year. For example, Ab has begun to integrate questioning techniques into his Social Studies plans. Ac discovered that she had "learned a lot from the reading program as far as when the kids can relate to the story and you bring in stories like that." She felt she had always known that, but she did not realize what an impact it had until she really started
noticing it with her students this year. She had taken "more risks this year than I did last year with reading." Ad had also noticed a change in his reading activities. Now he had a 20 minute period per day of silent reading time. During that time he was "charting what they're reading and keeping a list of that, so that I can send it on to the next school." He wanted to know how much his students read, plus he wanted to catch one of his students doing the same book report four and five years in a row." Ae acknowledged that she used novels this year, "their own independent novels," which she had never done before. She was "doing a lot more reading activities" that were not basal related. She felt she was making some changes in her classroom without abandoning the basal reader. She was just "doing more of things" that were not directly related to it." Ag observed that he attended more to the questions he asked and to the background knowledge of his students.

The teachers found that in response to their shifts, the students had mixed reactions. Ac and Ae did not think their students noticed, Af found her students really liked her student-led discussions, while Aa did not know the responses of his students. Ab, on the other hand, found that his students were really enjoying the changes, as were Ad's students, who "like the stories that I'm choosing
more" and liked his questions better than the book's questions.

One teacher suggested that change from the Project could really be observed next year, because teachers' agendas for the current year had already been drawn out, and it would be hard to implement major changes now. When asked about that possibility, they all concurred, although some felt they noticed small changes now as well. Ac, paraphrasing Ab, said that "a lot of times people are fearful to implement something right away, because they have their set agendas, and teachers are known for becoming somewhat perfectionists." She felt she noticed some effects even now, "So, I think subconsciously changes are taking place." Ad, following in Aa's footsteps, planned to have his students read more and had begun to institute that now. Ae talked about the ease of doing things the same way because "it's easier to do something the same way that you've done it before, and you know it will work, rather than trying a new approach or a new strategy." She suggested, though, that she may change her practices after she thought it through during the summer. Ag concurred that summer was the time to develop their "ammunition supply" and revamp, redo, and come ready to set up new lessons. He said, "Some of us may take several months to
try to manipulate, to work out the kinks, and tailor it [the project information] to our form of teaching."

**Changes in Teachers' Relationships**

An important aspect of the staff development was the relationship of the teachers with each other. In fact, several teachers over the course of the staff development talked about baring themselves to, "being naked" in front of, their colleagues. Although they identified themselves as a highly collegial group, and the principal concurred, their responses about their relationships were, at best, contradictory. Aa, for example, claimed he did "a good deal of TEA (the teachers' organization) sharing," but he tried to "really avoid lengthy discussions of students." And when asked about discussing practices, he said, "I really don't talk too much about those things with other people. . . . I'm just not sure how compatible I really am with other teachers." Ab said he shared "war stories" about students and classes as well as some "different strategies" for the classroom, but the sharing was with people outside the school. Ac suggested her exchange with colleagues was "just superficial talk." According to Ac, talk with colleagues depended "on what kind of mood" your colleagues were in, when you were around them, and "how much you trust them." She felt that "just because they're
your colleagues doesn't necessarily mean that you are friends." Some of this was because "you don't have a lot of time to sit down and talk with them, when you're running-off papers, and people are thinking about their day and stuff like that." Ad had figured his collegial relationships statistically. It was

... more often social than academic ... half the time would be personal/social talk, and the other half would be about particular students, and maybe once in 20 times would be something that I'm trying or something that I've heard that they're trying that I want to find more about.

In discussing collegial relationships Ad noted that

... we talk a lot about things that we're trying and how they worked ... when something works really well, not so much in terms of product as in terms of process. People in this building are not so interested in having letter perfect writing or perfect art; they're more interested in really creative kinds of things that kids do.

She felt she and her colleagues talked often about the

"need for more time for some collaborative planning either within grades or across grades, and trying to figure out how to do more of that." She said,

Frequently, you get to hear what people do: it's a lot of sharing successes and asking. You see something up in the hall, and you go and say, "What were you doing? How did you do this? How did you get to that?"

She found that the RIS Project, in an unintended result, had drawn "camp" lines for the teachers around reading philosophy with some following the whole language philosophy, some following other philosophies. These lines
fostered an initial unwillingness to talk among "camps." Yet she also suggested that her colleagues realized it was

harder to talk about that because . . . we were all so very different, a little defensive . . . and that's been loosening up . . . I think that the sharing that we've done in the workshops has loosened people up a bit, to feel that they could share more across philosophic lines, and were a little afraid to ask about it, to ask about something you see someone's doing, and not necessarily have to say, "Oh, yeah, I do that too," but be able to ask in awe or wonder, "what are you doing?"

Changes in Highlighted Teachers

Teacher Aa

Aa was fascinating to observe. He was interested in teaching, committed to teaching "the right way" and reflective about his practice. One member of the research team described him as "reflection gone mad," because although he reflected on his practice, it was rare for him to change anything. His reflections served instead as a means of validating what he had done. Aa knew what he was doing in the classroom and why he was doing it. Consequently, from the RIS Project's initial contact with him, Aa could describe this practice, and continuity between his thinking and his practice were clearly visible.

When asked if he had noticed any change during the staff development process he responded,

In terms of my overall methodology, I haven't really changed much. Just any changing that has happened is a result of the changing needs of various classrooms
that I'm in and how I'm going to adapt to that and adjust to it.

He did realize, though, that his ideas had evolved from his initial days of teaching where he started by "doing things pretty much by the book." He would use textbooks and "felt obligated to be faithful to them and make sure" that he covered a certain scope and sequence of materials. Quickly, though, he found he could adapt them to raise the enthusiasm of his class. As a result he began slowly to eliminate "things that killed my audience, bummed people out. And that's still a process that I'm involved in."

Additionally, he felt certain that he had a "pretty firm agenda" with which he was presently working, and he wanted to see if they would be over the long term. In other words, he was "not going to just try something one year and then quit."

He was confident that his way of teaching was successful and offered the ITBS scores as evidence. He claimed that he was a diplomat with parents and district policy and that his program

... seemed to satisfy the most areas, taking in the wide range of district goals and parental expectations and my own desire to teach in certain fashions, you know--all that mixed together. Yeah, I'm looking for the most comfortable way to satisfy all that. Yeah, comfortable I suppose would be a good word.

He did not "know how much it [the staff development] is going to change my agenda."
From the beginning to the end of the staff development, Aa maintained several notions that did not change: (a) reading was a private act; (b) the quantity of reading, rather than the quality of reading, increased a student's reading comprehension; (c) a student must figure out the author's meaning to understand a text; (d) every teacher taught her/his own way; and (e) assessment, both district and parental, drove his reading program. These notions did not change, they did not disappear and did not decrease in his interest. Tracing his comments through the staff development, it became apparent that these were the issues most often addressed by him.

What did change was the level of articulation and elaboration of these issues. He liked being challenged, and he enjoyed reflecting on the issues addressed. He found the staff development had "been very affirmative to my own approach to the classroom." He felt he had gotten "many more encouraging kinds of impressions from the class to let me believe that the methods that I use are in harmony with the research." Furthermore, he found the largest benefit was simply the opportunity to "talk professionally for a couple of hours a week and to have these interviews, and to be tape recorded . . . I don't mind being put on the spot. I enjoy it. . . . It gives me a professional excitement or an enthusiasm." He felt that
made him "feel like I have something to care about and that my profession is something intellectual and developing, that there's research going on there and I'm part of an effort of some kind." In fact, he would really like "a two-hours-a-week session . . . in this kind of a format, as just a standard part of my teaching life."

**Teacher Af**

Af identified herself as doing "a more whole language kind of thing." Her classes flowed through themes with no distinctions made between subjects. In other words, the themes spread throughout the day, and the subjects fit within them. Af was committed to her students and provided them with the best education possible.

In accordance with that, she stressed work on the students' self-esteem and positive achievement and promoted an enjoyment of reading. Af, from the beginning of the Project, appeared confident in her way of doing things and specifically with her view of reading. Yet, throughout the staff development process, she kept searching for the better way of teaching that would "just give us some strategies to use . . . the ones you like." Even to her students, she described the project as presenting her "with a better way to teach reading." This conflict, between her apparent belief in what she was doing and her belief that
authority had a better way, generated great tension for herself and her colleagues during the staff development process.

As a teacher, Af was reflective, examining whether practices worked for students, even reflecting aloud with her students about the practices she employed. Her lessons were often very organized, structured, and well-planned. In the classroom, Af was observed to be a veteran, expert teacher.

In contrast, she took on a hostile presence with the staff developers, as if she had to make amends for being a teacher with Ph.D. status. For example, in her initial belief interview Af clearly had based much of her teaching philosophy on personal experience, describing her public school teachers and her reactions, as a student, to their approaches. This was also true for the practical argument session in which she further underscored her personal theory connections with personal experience. She talked about her 70-year-old teacher, who talked to her and her peers about what she did in the classroom. Af's philosophy had a very personal touch to it. This was not to say that her philosophy was not grounded in research. One has only to read Harste's (1977) or others explanations of whole language to recognize the threads of formal theory running through Af's work.
By mid-term of the staff development sessions, Af seemed compelled to offer citations, mentioning the works of Gagne, a variety of anthropologists, and Pogrow, to name a few. In an interview with me, she said, specifically, that she tried not to do "the graduate student number and throw studies and stuff around," but implied it was quite difficult for her. She also talked quite antagonistically about college professors, implying for example, "that they sat around" all day at their desks. Interestingly, she seemed to set herself up against the Staff Developers.

Over the year Af did not seem to vary much in philosophy, but her directional clarity increased. She realized that she wanted to "integrate my reading and my science, my language arts, and music and art, with the social studies units as I'm doing them, which is one region of the United States a month." She felt that it provided "a lot of relevance for kids, and it helps them have some handles for remembering certain kinds of things, like the southeast region or whatever." She suggested that it was important to help "the kids to make connections, getting the kids to see connections among things that we do in school or between things that we do in school and things in their everyday life." She wanted her students "to keep gathering this information about the country they live in and the environment and all that" as well as "develop
thinking skills, as you make connections." She was concerned with "the kinds of questions and the kind of talking, that we do in here, is, 'Can we make those connections? Can we see relationships between what we already know?' and 'What's in a story?'" She felt that it was important for students to make these connections.

When asked if she noticed differences between last year and this year in the classroom, Af said, "First of all, I'm much clearer about what I want, and how I'm going to go about doing it." She also felt she had "been giving a lot more thought to exactly how one makes those connections. To the point of the study that we're involved in, it seems to me that reading comprehension is a special form of sort of comprehension in general." She observed that questions were important. She suggested, "It would be neat to have about three video cameras in here, so you could get everybody and just really study" the concept of language use. With regard to differences, Af said, "It was interesting, because when we started this concept last spring [in year one], I was ready to start thinking about some of this . . . over the spring and summer I began thinking, "How can I do this?" For Af "a lot of the thinking that I did this year results from having thought about it, about what we talked about last spring . . . thinking about the observation and how would I do that."
She also felt she would use what she learned in year 2 in the next school year.

She also said that retroactive miscue analysis, a strategy learned during the staff development process would not be incorporated this year "because, as I say, I have these other things I'm trying to accomplish, and I want to see what they do."

Her students were enjoying what she was doing this year. They were engaging in conversations with her and, what Af labeled, "student-led discussions." She also "saw a lot of change in the kids over time in terms of their language, in terms of their thought processes." Af showed a lot of personal concern for her students. In fact, her interest in retrospective miscue analysis was an off-shoot of that.

The conflicts and concerns that Af manifested during the sessions seemed to preclude any public announcements about the success of the staff development process and its influence on her teaching and her practices. Yet, the influences were apparent. Af, for example, could be articulate yet provocatively vague, when she wanted to be. But as the staff development program progressed, she could, with prodding, very specifically talk about her practice. The discussion about practice in general also seemed to
affirm for her what she was doing in the classroom and its value for her students.

School A teachers, regardless of apparent hesitation and recalcitrance, did for the most part experience change during their participation in the staff development process. The degree of the impact/change did vary, however. Their approaches to practices, their perceptions of themselves as teachers, and their relationship with each other all seemed to shift as they participated in the Project.

School F

The School F staff development schedule involved a meeting once a month. Until their staff development program, the intermediate teachers of school F did not meet together with any regularity. They were unaccustomed to talking with each other and actually tended to avoid it whenever possible. Their reaction to the staff development was initially quite negative and during the first meeting they indicated that the principal had foisted this upon them. As the staff development process progressed, the importance of the staff development process in the lives of the teachers both publicly and privately became quite clear. By the final meeting, each teacher had given testimony to the power of the staff development process and
its impact on their work. Some, in fact, regretted the year's end.

At the original meeting of the staff development that established the schedule for and introduced the Project, the participating teachers made it very clear that, for the sake of comfort and freedom of speech, they needed to meet off-campus. Originally, the meetings were to be held at a participating teacher's home, but schedule changes inhibited that possibility. Instead the meetings were held in the home of one of the staff developers, who lived relatively close to the school.

Although Mb, the curriculum specialist, wanted a "hands-on" approach from the project that included "activities to try the next day" in the classroom, most of the teachers appeared to participate without expectations about the structure of the process. Rather, they appeared glad for the opportunity to converse with colleagues. As the meetings progressed, in fact, they were more and more excited about attending the sessions and came prepared with questions to ask colleagues. They appeared to reflect upon the sessions' discussions, try out activities and decide for themselves whether they worked. The School F teachers viewed the staff development process as an opportunity they had never had before to enhance their learning and thinking about teaching.
It was also true that they took this opportunity to engage in an examination of their practices. They never shied away from that discussion and were willing to reveal precisely what they had done. As SD1 and SD2 or their colleagues probed for specifics about practices, they always attempted answers and/or gave examples. This was not to say that this was a homogeneous group of teachers. Rather, their philosophies were often contrary, yet they offered possibilities that could be adjusted according to philosophical orientation.

These teachers, early in the sessions, established one shared factor in their school experience, their animosity toward their principal. According to the teachers, he made them do things, he promised things and did not follow-through with them, he checked their grade books, he interfered with their classes, he forced them to keep schedules, he did not back them up with parents, and the list went on and on. No one lacked a story about him, although some had more stories than others. The teachers did not look to him for guidance or resources, but only as the facilitator of district policy and other bad news. Clearly, according to them, he did not provide opportunities to examine practice nor consider change as anything but a mandated occurrence. The positive result of this shared animosity was an immediate comraderie among the
teachers, which they shared with the curriculum specialist, who did not defend him. In fact, the curriculum specialist advocated literature-based reading programs, whereas the principal, as he explained in his initial interview, more or less advocated the basal readers. To no one's surprise, yet no one's overt advocacy, the teachers, over the course of the staff development process, began to move away in varying degrees from the basal program and toward a literature-based program. In fact, the final staff development session was a demonstration of a literature group where the teachers all read the same novel and discussed it in great detail.

Changes in Practices

All of the teachers at School F were interested in change and were willing, in varying degrees, to engage in the process. Fb, for example, was the most timid participant. She was also the oldest participant and the one most often watched over (she said and other teachers concurred) by the principal. During the Project, several lessons were modelled in her classroom and discussed during a staff development session. Her fear was that she might have an inability to properly assess her students. In turn, it was on assessment that the principal most often questioned her.
Fd, the most outspoken of the teachers, on the other hand, was engaged in the change process prior to the staff development, having decided to shift from the basal to the whole language approach to reading. As her change process evolved, she shared her experiences with the group. Moreover, it is possible that she was the impetus for much of the change process engaged in by the teachers, because she was so willing to share her reflection on and engage in the change process.

Many of the practices discussed, like semantic mapping, were research-based, although they did not necessarily label it as that. Over the course of the staff development process the teachers explored, shifted, adjusted, and sometimes changed their practices. An example of this change was Fc. Originally Fc established herself as a basal advocate. She used the stories, the comprehension checks, and the skills work, and she graded all of their work. As the sessions progressed and Fc listened, she began to talk about "doing reading for a day at a time." She also began to think about novels, which she "had never done before." She asked more questions, and as a culmination of the year, she assigned novels to her students where they could choose from three selections. What was more, she borrowed the grading form from Fd, the experienced literature group teacher, and did not expect
absolute letter grades. Instead, it indicated what the students knew from their reading. It was student-generated rather than teacher-generated.

Fc took a great leap from basal to novel, and not without concerns for assessment and student interest. To compensate for some of her concerns, she worked in skills whenever she could. As the unit progressed, however, less and less time was spent on skills and more and more was devoted to reading and discussion.

Not only have the practices changed at School F, the language, that teachers used to discuss them, changed as well. Prior knowledge, questioning, assessment strategies, premises, and reflection laced the language of the teachers. Early in the process, Fd, for example, began talking about the prediction of her students saying, "They are doing it all of the time." Fc talked about the use of literature groups and the use of novels to expand students' interests in reading. Fa began the project with a sophisticated language about reading developed from her years in the Learning Disabilities Program. Also, at the initial meeting in October she recognized herself as a professional and wanted to be recognized as such, especially by the principal. At the final meeting she was impassioned in her statement identifying herself as professional. While the language did not change
dramatically, the confidence and assuredness clearly did. Although Fb remained timid, she began to try practices introduced by the Project like semantic mapping. Fe, wearied by a long year with a hard class, actually stopped complaining about them in the breakthrough period, stopped "just using basals because they need structure," and began working with novels. Even Mb, by the final session, was no longer looking for a "hands-on" experience but realized the importance of knowing the strength of your beliefs.

Changes in Teachers' Perceptions

The teachers of School F all felt that they had experienced change over the duration of the staff development process. Their perceptions of that change and the descriptions that they used were a complement to what they had established with regard to prior knowledge and the variations in that knowledge. Fa felt that she had "done more intense thinking about reading" than ever before and was doing a lot with predictions and vocabulary. While she was attempting to break away from the basal, she was also feeling pressure from several teachers to teach more skills for the Iowa tests. Her compromise was to work in a workbook one day a week. Her changes came in her willingness to change and break away from the basal and try new things. Fb found that she was concentrating more
on reading rather than skills. For her, "The Project at least has made me realize that I would like to try to do reading in a different way," yet she lacked the confidence to undertake any major changes. How she has changed was in deemphasizing skills. Fc felt that changes she experienced during the staff development process were related to skills and where they fit into a reading program. Moreover, she had begun to recognize how "limiting the basal reader is and how safe it was to use it." Risk-taking had become more appealing at her.

On the other hand, Fe, who used novels a lot last year, was relying more heavily on basals this year because her students were unruly and she thought they needed more structure. She did, however, get several "good ideas . . . like building up on what they already know" and "having them brainstorm before we start working on a unit."

Mb, in the role of curriculum specialist, had noticed that with some teachers "there is a tremendous difference because they were motivated and given assurance" that their approaches were good. With the others, "just a spark has been lit, they know they can get started on it. Some have started and some are thinking about it."

Whereas Fd had already been involved in the change process, she used the staff development process to help
her along the change process saying, "I need to see things in action," and the group discussions were helpful.

The teachers of School F had each recognized and identified differences in classroom actions and/or practices over the last year. For example, Fa was "heavier on how much we talk." She had found "lots of kids bring with them to the reading discussion as much background as possible . . . even if they say something that's sort of off-base," and she tried "to relate it so that they buy into the story, so that they realize, 'Hey, this isn't going to be all foreign stuff to me.'" What was more, she was carrying these ideas over into math and science. Fb was skipping stories and skills that she had never done before. In fact, she said, "If I feel that they can already do it, I skip over it." She also thought she had "speeded up" the process. Fc concurred that she "can leave out things now, where I always felt I had to teach it all. Now I can go through and analyze and say, 'Ok, what in here do they really need to know?'" She also felt she was "doing a better job at letting go of all the things that aren't really necessary and just pulling in those top priorities."

For Fd, nothing in her classroom resembled the way it was last year. Although she still used "the basal reader occasionally," she used it more as a means of pulling "out
something that I think fits into the whole picture." Fe's class was also different this year, but her differences related to management issues. Whereas last year she used novels, this year she was using basals to help structure students' behavior. She had, though, been engaged in identifying prior knowledge and "being more deliberate about doing it," as well as "having them brainstorm before we start working on a unit."

Students' responses to change had been positive. Fe's students were enjoying the changes as were Fb's students. Fd's students were excited about her program, even expressing to her that they never wanted to return to the basal readers. Fc said that her students would

rather read the books they bring to school, that their parents check out of the library for them, than read any of the things that we have to. It's kind of like they know that this is what's required for me to teach, so they will do it, so that they can get through it and then read what they want to.

Fa found her students "are so excited about reading. They love reading. They come excited, as a matter of fact, I have to shush them because they come in, 'What are we going to do today?' kind of stuff." Fc agreed that her students were very excited about reading. And she sees "a real turn about there." She saw a lot of progress in their work and their enthusiasm for reading.

The teachers also suggested that SDs come back next year if they would like to see change. That is when the
long term effects could be recognized and observed. Fa wholeheartedly agreed, as did Fd. Fb said, "I think that that might be true especially, if I get a chance to go in and see other people doing it. Then I think I would feel more comfortable. But I kept trying to get into Fd's classroom." According to Fb, Fd did not "use the basal reader," and she wanted to visit her classroom "to see how she works this. And I'm willing to try anything as long as I feel that I know what I'm trying." She felt she needed to know "how to, how to go about" practices, and then "I'm real hesitant to attempt to try it." Fc said,

I think in the summer time you can actually plot what you might be wishing you could do now, if you had more time. But now I'm really going ahead and doing those things . . . leaving out things that aren't necessary, having skills taught at another time, not when we're reading.

She felt that reading and skills were "two different subjects," and she wanted to let "go a lot of the crud that I don't like to teach--I can't think of any other word--unnecessary, frivolous parts that I don't want to teach, I guess. Not that I don't think are necessary." Fe said, "It is hard to do things, when you are in the thick of battle . . . it is not when you plan your grand strategy . . . I may use this stuff next year."
Changes in Teachers' Relationships

The teachers of School F wholeheartedly acknowledge the project for its contribution to collegiality. Prior to the staff development, the teachers did not often have, or take, the opportunity to meet together, let alone discuss practices. However, as the staff development process progressed, so progressed their collegial relationships. Fb found, "I try to limit my conversation about children and not take it into the lounge," and "It's verifying and comparing notes, probably is the majority of my correspondence with colleagues." Fb found that there still was not enough time at school to also talk about practices but was glad for the staff development discussion. Fc said,

I haven't had an opportunity to talk to them about reading or what I'm teaching. I kind of have this unspoken rule at lunchtime that we talk about things that aren't related to school in a way. Most of the time we do that.

She suggested that she and her colleagues talked "about a student who needs help or a situation that needs to be looked into. Support we can give to each other if a student is acting up." She found that "the only time I really feel I should talk about any substance is when we're in these meetings." Fd said, "The only time we really talk is when we meet together on Wednesdays. . . . For me, it's because in the intermediate grades, there's a
lot of complaining that goes on, and I don't want to be part of it, so I just don't." She observed that she minded her own business, which was "the only time we really do talk is when we meet. . . . Mb is really my only resource, because she's the only one who is going to meetings and is in touch with the people who are making changes." Fe said, "There is some sharing of a good way to do stuff."

Fa felt that "I probably would like to have had more staff development. . . . Heavens, I don't have enough time to review the research in special education, let alone reading and fields of math, science and so forth." Moreover, she felt that "when it can be given to you by people who have been able to ferret out the essence, I think that's a plus to keep us current." Fa found that "as a faculty, we don't have time, even in our faculty meetings, to sit and talk about these kinds of things," and she found that the faculty did not have time to talk about philosophy and long range kind of planning. So I think these kinds of inservices are welcomed . . . I think we need more of it. Being able to see ourselves teach on tape is a wonderful thing to be able to reflect on . . . see things you don't have any idea you're doing.

Fc found that in one way the project has been overwhelming, because it's leaving the classroom, it's thinking about analyzing what is really going on, and . . . it was just safe to get out the basal and do the things that I've always done for the last ten years. . . . [The
reading, and I'm always ready to change. I feel like sometimes it takes me longer than I want it to, but being a teacher you have to be extremely flexible and in any of the subjects I have to change.

Fd said,

I think that in regards to the reading project there's been a lot of griping about it. . . . One thing I didn't like was that I was given something to read. I don't think any of us read it. We all just looked at it, and to me reading something that is a lot of theory puts me to sleep.

Fe asserted that her frustration "doesn't have to do with the classroom so much, but it's not being able to contribute very much toward the policy and things that would be different, simpler or just work better if the policy can be different." She got the feeling that when I am introduced to research that proponents are introducing it to me as the way to do it. This upsets me because I don't think it's true that there is any one way to do it. Different situations will retrieve different approaches.

Mb found that the staff development process "gave the teachers a forum to present their ideas and problems, very surprised myself, just as probably SD2 and everyone was, is that how much time we've had to spend on 'what is the problem here at school.'" She thought that the teachers thought they could do anything they wanted. . . . I felt we spent an awful lot of sessions on that . . . and I thought that it was very good, and SD2 was perceptive to know that this had to be worked through because they could [then] make progress to the next step.

Mb had hoped she would have some direct lessons on comprehension and teaching. She found that "When we go to
our inservices and we go to our workshops on the weekends, the teachers get very motivated because they have their teaching methodology, teaching specific things they can take back and do immediately in the classroom." Mb thought that she wanted some direct ideas on what to do so that the teachers "can change the system."

**Changes in Highlighted Teachers**

**Teacher Fc**

Fc was a reflective teacher, who considered ideas carefully and slowly before putting anything into action. It was apparent that she did that for a reason, because she cared deeply about the success of her students. She wanted them to learn and have fun doing that. As a result of her concentrated reflection, there have not been monumental or many obvious changes in Fc's practice. Many of the topics raised by SD1 and SD2 over the year were already a part of Fc's repertoire. Her practical argument lesson demonstrated the use of semantic mapping and her strategies for making conscious use of students' prior knowledge. In a very unassuming fashion, she established herself, early in the program, as a master teacher.

That was what made her change process so interesting to observe. She began the staff development process with a strong commitment to the basal program without a strong
desire or commitment to venture beyond its possibilities. She described herself as "very systematic in the way I teach," because she followed right through the basal reader. This was not to say she did not have concern for her students. She did. She always attempted to establish their prior knowledge when preparing for the story, "so that it would be interesting to read." She assumed there were no other ways to teach reading and simply accepted the basal, trying to make it as interesting as possible.

As the staff development progressed, however, Fc began to consider the possibility of another way to teach reading. When considering possibilities she said, "I'd like to spend a whole day [with her students] just reading." That notion was on her wish list. This wish also created conflict, because Fc felt monitored by the principal and driven by her wishes and desires. Yet, she continued to ponder the possibilities.

During the staff development process, one of Fc's colleagues, Fd, continuously talked about the success of literature groups which also kept the spark alive for Fc. "But how could I do it?" and "How could I assess the students?" were questions that arose. It was clear that risk-taking, trying to do something she had never done before, was very frightening. This slowed her down and
caused many changes in the final lesson, but it did not stop her.

Eventually, Fc decided she would attempt literature groups. She said, "The first time, probably ever, that I'm going to throw out everything I usually do during the day and do something completely different." Because of bureaucratic red-tape, she decided, however, that she could not plan a full day's lesson—only lessons during reading. Yet, she did try to tie in her science and social studies with the reading lessons. She chose a science fiction trilogy which created a three group arrangement in the classroom. She talked with Fd about literature groups and solicited help wherever she could. Often during the lessons, she indicated that she was unsure about what would happen, but she persevered.

She did feel the need to bring in skills, initially, so she would have them read and then work in worksheets. But after the second week, the skills were more or less abandoned for discussion group. Interestingly, although she fell back on the skills, she did not necessarily see their value. She said, "Teaching skills the way we do in the basals, I really don't know whether that's helping them to be a better reader." It seemed to her that she could use skills lessons so many times a week "over areas that I see they need and be more effective than just going through
the paces of doing the basal and the skills each week that
they have laid down." This lesson was experimental for Fc.
She in no way was abandoning the basal and what she thought
it had to offer, but she had begun to see the possibilities
beyond the basal. Moreover, she has felt empowered to try
something of her own design with only little concern for
the principal's opinion.

Teacher Fd

Last year there were no clues that Fd would undergo a
radical philosophical change over the summer months. When
she discussed the importance of skills or stressed the use
of basal and the comprehension checks, she appeared to be a
"do or die" basal user. The only possible clue to the
contrary was her commitment to recognizing students'
experiences as important to the interest level of the
student. Otherwise, her reading units were quite
traditional.

Entering her room in Year 2 was a surprise with
nothing the same except the room number. Nothing, not
even the room decorations, was similar. In a few short
months Fd had experienced a profound transformation of
which she could talk little. When asked about the
motivation, she would say, "I taught that way for 17
years," and it was "time for a change." She said,
Change for me didn't come about because of anything other than what I said to myself. . . . there really wasn't any other influence other than I said, "I really can't do this another year! . . . There is nothing that resembles what I was doing last year. . . . I do still use a basal reader occasionally, and I use it as a means to . . . tie in with a unit.

Last year Fd used the basal reader as her whole reading program, but she was not skills-oriented this year. This year she used the basal when applicable, and otherwise she used novels as a basis for her reading program. She suggested that "I really like it this way, I like it a lot . . . the kids also really like it this way. . . . When I do a story out of the basal, I always tell them why I am using this story." She felt, in fact, quite unsuccessful the other way and with the new-found use of literature groups and whole language philosophy, she felt very successful. She also observed that the students perceived themselves as more successful.

She suggested that some of her motivation came from attending workshops—not just work with this Project, but other workshops as well. Over the course of the staff development year, she spoke to us about no less than four local conferences and two workshops. She said she needed "the constant motivation," and with the staff development program, she left "inspired." She said one of the things about the Project was that, "When we meet together in our group once a month, I always leave there with more
enthusiasm to go back and keep working on it. . . . It has been a motivator." One thing, though, she felt that her changes were "a lot more work than just doing the basal reader and doing it the way that I've done it before."

Observing Fd in the throes of the change process had been informative. She did not jump into the whole language approach fully at first. Instead, as evidenced by her practical argument videotaped lesson, she vacillated back and forth between authentic literature and basal materials. She also felt compelled to work in the skills workbooks. As time progressed, however, more and more of the "old way" dropped away as she found alternatives, and as she became more enmeshed in her new approach. By staff development program year's end, she had student-led groups and was working solely out of novels. Her students loved it, and Fd was very enthusiastic.

It was her enthusiasm and success, in fact, that inspired several of the other teachers. Initially her colleagues seemed skeptical, but as she talked about her classroom and talked about her practices the teachers listened more carefully. It was also true that Fd was the least afraid of her principal and had the most encouragement from the curriculum specialist. Consequently, she was a good model. Both Fb and Fc particularly, asked her questions both in group and
privately with the hope of employing some of her strategies. At each staff development session, Fd would share her latest ideas, successes, and materials. Often her colleagues, after the initial sessions, sat on the edge of their chairs waiting to ask questions. Perhaps Fd was an impetus for the change process initiated at School F, although she was not the only one.

School F teachers appeared to experience considerable change over the course of the staff development process. Although the degrees of change did vary, all appeared to have experienced extensive shifts in approaches to practices, perceptions of themselves as teachers, and their relationships with each other.

**Differences Between Schools**

School A and School F each responded differently to the staff development program. From the onset, their responses to the staff development program and the Staff Developers were quite distinct. School F's teachers appeared more open to the staff development process, while School A's teachers seemed more hesitant to discuss their practices. Although each school and their teachers experienced change, how they experienced it was quite unique. To discuss these differences, I examine each
category presented in the separate school sections and compare them to present a picture of differences.

Changes in Practices

The teachers of School A and School F viewed the discussion of practices differently. At School A they would not often engage in a discussion of an individual's practices, while at School F they wanted to hear about each others' practices. School A teachers' unwillingness to discuss practices did not affect, however, their willingness to try practices presented during the staff development sessions. In addition, the School A teachers began to adopt the language of the Project to discuss those practices.

School F teachers were willing to cooperate with each other, discuss practices, and employ their different practices presented in the sessions in their classrooms. Several teachers did, however, feel insecure about trying them and often asked to have the practices modelled before they tried them.

Changes in Teachers' Perceptions

Several of the teachers of School A, when asked about their perceptions of change in the classroom, observed that change had occurred, while a few felt there was little
change. They each described that change differently. Interestingly, several teachers, Ac, Ad, and Ag, claimed that they experienced little change yet when observed in their classrooms, all of the teachers except one, Ad, demonstrated the use of different practices. Ad, on the other hand, seemed unwilling to engage in the process, either in conversation or in practice.

At School F, the teachers all felt they experienced some change in their beliefs and practices over the year. Fd's changes were the most dramatic, because she willingly shared her process and engaged the others in it. Fc and Fa reflected long about literature-based reading and finally, toward year's end, began to use literature-based practices in their classrooms. Fe, too, adopted literature-based work, but she had previously engaged in those practices and was only rediscovering them. Fb did not exhibit much change in practice, but she did think about it and discuss it in the staff development sessions. She was afraid the principal would not accept her changes. Several teachers shifted their reading practices from a skills-based to literature-based programs.

Changes in Teachers' Relationships

The School A teachers appeared enmeshed in collegial expectations which did not allow them to share their
classroom practices. In fact, they would adamantly not share them. The teachers would, however, share their thinking and participate at a general level in the staff development process. There was, though, no shared intimacy. Interestingly, these teachers entered the staff development program with a congenial relationship, and they maintained that throughout the sessions.

School F's teachers, on the contrary, rarely had the opportunity/took the opportunity to talk with each other prior to the Program. So, when the sessions began they were willing to participate fully, and almost immediately. Because they previously had not had the opportunity to share their practices with their colleagues, they looked forward to the staff development sessions to consider new possibilities with each other and learn from each other. As a result, they also seemed to talk more with each other in the school about practices.

Changes in Highlighted Teachers

The highlighted teachers of School A each talked differently about their participation in the staff development process. Aa and Af, veteran teachers of more than three years, had often reflected on their practices and beliefs and had perfected, for themselves, a satisfactory way of doing things. They were willing to
consider new ideas but had also accrued a goodly number already. Consequently, there was significant movement in their clarity of public conversation about their practices and beliefs, but a smaller amount of change in practice.

School F's highlighted teachers were also veteran teachers, who had reflected upon their practice.Fc initially appeared to be a masterful teacher, who worked in reading solely through the basal reader, while Fd seemed to be a teacher in change. These teachers served as the impetus for a considerable portion of the change process in which their colleagues were involved. By the end of the staff development program both teachers had experienced major changes in both the ways they talked about their classrooms and how they employed practices in their classrooms.

Chapter VI explored the teachers' perceptions of change individually and as a group. Evidently School A and School F responded differently to the change, although each was affected by their participation in the staff development process. The next chapter, Chapter VII, offers an interpretation of the staff development process and explores the effects of the Practical Argument Staff Development Process on teachers' beliefs and their school's culture.
Chapter VII
INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This is a study of the change process that the participating teachers experienced over the course of this staff development program. Change seems to be both a very personal as well as a social process, for the individuals and the institutions involved. In this study observations were made of two schools and the 12 intermediate teachers in these schools during the staff development processes. In the two schools, neither individual teachers nor the teachers operating as a group responded in quite the same way. Changes included the implementation of different practices, the development and use of different language to describe practices, the reformulation of philosophies, and different relationships with colleagues. Additionally, there were teachers who resisted participation. Thus, the individual change processes differed, sometimes dramatically.

At the same time, change also appears to be a social process. It is a social process because the people who participate help construct, through interaction, what happens, how it happens, when it happens, and to whom it happens. Accordingly, they each contributed to the other's change processes. The school culture, the staff
development process, the teachers' theories, and aspects of the teachers' beliefs were socially forged by the participating teachers, their beliefs, their experiences and interactions, as well as input from the larger society. This suggests that a person's social sphere, world view, and the ideology of their society affect and mold their perceptions of their world. Furthermore, their perceptions are constructed in interaction with a social context and with other people. For this study, then, the teachers brought their background, and personal experiences along with the history of the school and their faculty relationships to the staff development process. In fact, the focus of this study cannot be on any one issue alone, but on the interactions among the teachers, students, parents, school, district, and so on.

Berger and Luckman (1966) recognizes that the reality of "everyday life is shared with others" (p. 28), and that language creates a representation of that life in both highly abstract and mundane representation of the "real elements in everyday life" (p. 40). Moreover, they find that language and its symbols are essential elements to our understanding of the world around us. Apparently the transmission of information to individuals, about how to be appropriate members of a group occurs mainly through interaction with peers, teachers, and others (Gearing and
Sangree, 1979). Denzin (1977) expands the definition of interaction to suggest that individual role expectations, role conflict sanctioning, and reinforcement behavior are aspects of interaction that should be studied. He (1977) suggests that interactions are temporally sequenced and spatially bound negotiations between people with talk as its central feature. In fact, it is the "commonsense world of everyday life equipped with specific bodies of knowledge" (Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 41) that affects interactions with others by the "common participation in the available social stock of knowledge" (p. 41). The "social stock of knowledge differentiates reality by degrees of familiarity" (Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 43). Often people take-for-granted their everyday knowledge until a problem arises whose solution is difficult to attain. Everyday knowledge is structured according to relevance, and what might be relevant to one person might not be relevant to another. In fact, "Most conversation does not in so many words define the nature of the world. Rather, it takes place against the background of a world that is silently taken for granted (Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 152).

Teachers are products of what they have been taught in teacher education courses and their previous educational history, but they are more than that. They are the product
of the society. For teachers, there are threads of this production in their thinking that stitch together what they impart to their students and how they present themselves within the school. Operating within this framework, teachers would not necessarily agree upon who had changed, had not changed, and/or how they had changed. Change does not occur in a vacuum. When studying change in action, there are certain aspects that must be considered. The importance of social interaction cannot be underestimated. Thus far, in previous chapters, the school culture, the teachers' beliefs, the staff development process, and teachers' responses to change have been described. It is now appropriate to interpret what took place in relationship to the literature mentioned in Chapter II.

After thorough examination of the data, it appears that the social interaction of experience is the thread that weaves together the many issues raised in Chapter II and the observations of the staff development process that occurred within the two schools. In that chapter, I suggested that educational change should examine a look through the filter of Watzlawick et al.'s (1974) notion of first and second order change, emphasizing a focus on teachers' beliefs. Further I hypothesized that for change to occur for teachers, they must reflect, reframe, and
examine their beliefs. Moreover I hypothesized that this process was done within a context of social interaction.

Consequently, it is the purpose of this chapter to offer an interpretation of the descriptions presented in Chapters IV, V, and VI. This chapter addresses, within the context of social interaction, each of the issues initially presented in Chapter II—change, teachers' beliefs, staff development, practical argument, and school culture. The model of social interactivity suggests that the process of change presented in the staff development program occurs through interactivity among the teachers, their beliefs, their notions of change, and the elements of the staff development process within the context of the school. In this way, the teachers' beliefs affected the social context and, in turn, the social context affected the teachers' beliefs in a circular movement generating this particular look at the change process.

Some Issues Related to Social Interactivity

The following model presents the relationship among teachers' beliefs, staff development, school culture, and how their social interaction may lead to changes in ways of thinking about practice, the discourse used to describe practice, and practice itself. This model is a union of Watzlawick et al.'s (1974) notion of change as adapted by

I have suggested that for transformative (second order) change to occur, change effort is enhanced by the agent's understanding that teachers' beliefs drive their actions in the classroom; that efforts in staff development should focus on teachers' beliefs; and that school culture is the powerful context within which this all occurs. Watzlawick et al. (1974) and Cuban (1988) distinguish between first/second order change, with first order change representing minor change within the existing system, and second order change representing a more significant/transformative set outside of the system. This latter form of change leads, for example, to a transformation within a teachers' philosophic approach to teaching, not just an adjustment in a practice or a shift from one practice to another.

Green (1971) suggested that beliefs and belief systems were important to the change process because without a conscious examination of them change will not occur easily. Furthermore, he claimed that teaching "is an activity which has to do with the modification and formation of belief
systems. If belief systems were impervious to change, then teaching as a fundamental method of education, would be a fruitless activity" (p. 48).

Watzlawick et al. (1974) suggests a process of reframing which is described as changing

... the conceptual and/or emotional setting or viewpoint in relation to which a situation is experienced and to place it in another frame which fits the "facts" of the same concrete situation equally well or even better, and thereby changes its entire meaning. (p. 95)

This, in my opinion, is not enough. It does not necessarily make beliefs conscious, a necessary component to transformative change. I suggest it is Fenstermacher's (1986) practical argument process that draws out beliefs from the unconscious to the conscious state. Richardson-Koehler (1987) concurs, suggesting that the practical argument will help teachers become aware of their "intuitive understandings and beliefs" (p. 42). It is this practical argument dialogue that helps the teachers affirm or disconfirm their beliefs about their teaching, particularly as reflected in current research.

Fenstermacher's (1986) and Richardson-Koehler's (1987) work cite the importance of reflection in this process. Schon's (1983) work confirms it, suggesting that reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action are the ways in which practitioners, in this case teachers, develop their knowledge. He does not, though, suggest that
reflection about beliefs is important. However, for second order change to occur people must become aware of their beliefs, examine them, reconsider them, reflect upon them, and own them.

This model suggests that when teachers within a social context are involved in a particular staff development or change process, social interactivity helps explain the results. This particular process involved an examination of teachers' beliefs through the use of teachers' practical arguments, while fostering the reflective process of the participating teachers. This specific program, with its investigation of private beliefs, generates a powerful experience built on interactivity. Who the participants are and what their experiences are affected by the social context while they, in turn, affect the social context. How teachers became involved and when they became involved strongly depended upon the social interactivity among their colleagues.

The following section examines what happened in each of the two schools in terms of social interactivity. Each school is examined separately for its interactions.
What Happened

School A

School A, on the surface, appeared to be a successful school with satisfied teachers and an involved student body. Late in the Project, when incongruencies emerged between what the staff developers said and what the teachers said, I informally asked the principal to describe the culture of the school. She described it as collegial, supportive, happy and satisfied where "They were always willing to work together... and cooperate with others." That, however, was not how it appeared to the research team. The team observed defensive, sometimes hostile, almost unwilling participants who felt conflicted about their principal. They described her as supportive, while lumping her with the "bad guys" who upheld district policy. In fact, they felt that although she supported a whole language approach to reading, she was guilty by association of wanting them to use the basal readers. When questioned, she categorically denied this possibility.

At School A, many of the teachers did not appear willing to actively participate. Some appeared interested in the Project while proclaiming their lack of time. They said, "I'm happy with what I'm doing," and "I don't need any of this," and maintained that an absence of time precluded collegial work together. They also wanted to be
shown the "right way to teach reading." Numerous times over the course of the staff development process, the teachers requested that the staff developers tell them what to do. Not only did they not want to do much, but they absolutely did not want to discuss practices. As SD2 probed too close to Ae in session 8, Ae closed down completely rather than reveal her philosophy.

The culture of School A was a debilitating one. When explored beyond the surface facade, little more than superficial social strands linked the teachers together. There was no real cohesion. At the group level there was a considerable resistance to collegial work, although at the individual level. Three of the teachers--Aa, Ab, and Af--might have been willing to work together. The teachers did not, for example, ask questions about what other colleagues did, although they did listen quietly when colleagues spoke. Aa, Ab, and Af were the most verbal. As a result, in the final interview the teachers did mention that they had gotten ideas from those who spoke. Ad and Af both attributed change in practices to Aa and the methodology he discussed.

What made these results interesting is that the effective schools research (Little, 1981; Rosenholtz, 1986) would have predicted School A as a successful school with a positive school culture which would produce great
results from participating in this project. Taking School A at first glance, that staff development in School A would be effective. Superficially, the teachers appeared successful, collaborative, and involved. They described themselves as a strong faculty who worked together well. As a result the research team, which was for this aspect of the study lead by P. Placier, initially predicted great success at School A. Unfortunately, this was not the case. After considerable contact, in fact, it appeared that school A was falling apart. The teachers were like little satellites, once in uniform orbit, now all thrown off track, not far apart, but not synchronous. There were no threads of attachment. They engaged in little collegial talk and shied away from conversation that drew upon their philosophic notions. If they did meet together, they exchanged pleasantries and/or materials, not ideas about practice.

Aa, for example, made it very clear in an interview that he avoided his colleagues. They "think differently," and he liked to remain by himself. On the other hand, Aa greatly enjoyed discussing his philosophy and would have long discussions about it. Significantly, though, Aa refused to acknowledge much impact from the Project, and when pressed about his philosophy, he often changed the subject.
Fitting Aa into the social interactivity model, he was quite aware of and willing to discuss his practices, justifications, and theories but not particularly willing to work with them. Although his colleagues spoke with him on a superficial level, he maintained a distance between them and himself.

Af felt very close to her colleagues. She described their relationship as warm and sharing yet also eluded to the "camp" lines drawn around reading philosophy. Interestingly, though, Af liked being different. A self-described whole language person, she was surprised to find out the Aa also described himself that way. Furthermore, she appeared to foster the differences by underscoring the differences between her theoretical orientation and others. For example, she said, "I guess we'll be in different groups, right?" to Ad, when group work was discussed. She wanted to remain by herself.

Another driving force for Af was her concern about the "one best method" of reading. She often asked if the staff development was promoting a best method, starting with the first meeting, and asked the staff developers to give the group their best suggestions on practices. Yet, she complained strongly about not being empowered and against being told what to do.
Af contributed a great deal to the discussions in the staff development sessions. At times, in fact, she appeared to guide, if not direct, the session. It seemed that her sensitivity to being different actually encouraged the teachers to emphasize their differences, creating a social way of taking differences into account. This strongly affected School A's staff development process.

There were changes that occurred for the teachers of School A, with the possible exception of Ad. On the theoretical orientation continuum presented in Chapter IV each teacher shifted at least to some degree toward the transactive orientation. Table 12 details the final positions and overlays the beginning position with the final one. Most teachers seemed to shift to some degree away from skills and toward an interactive, literature-based approach to reading. For example, in final observations several teachers were using non-basal materials, or if they were using basal materials, they were emphasizing the students' background knowledge. Most of the changes were at the individual level, with use of language as a marker, or in practices, with the incorporation of questioning into lesson plans. At the group level, there were the subtle effects of having been in a year-long group program together. They seemed
Table 12. Theoretical Orientation Continuum for School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TRANSFER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Before
■ = After

friendlier toward each other and more protective of each others' feelings. Yet, when asked about changes, some teachers denied that there were any change. Interestingly, though, interviews and observations revealed at least some degree of changes.

School F

School F, on the other hand, appeared to be a school with problems. The teachers did not like the principal, they rarely met together as a faculty to discuss practices. Each operated in her own world, yet there was
a shared culture. It was a culture of individualism and of distrust. The teachers discussed their students, creating a shared perception of the student body. Because the school was small, the students, once together, stayed together as they moved through their primary years. The teachers observed the students, formed opinions, shared those opinions, and consequently, generated a history for each student which was known upon entering a teacher's classroom. Teachers did not need to read records, they just listened to the school grapevine.

This year, an often heard discussion among the teachers in the staff development process revolved around the apparently horrorific 6th grade class. The teachers would shake their heads, nod when the class was mentioned, and say "I had them. I know how that class is." Interestingly, when a member of the research team entered that classroom as a substitute teacher, she found the students delightful rather than demonic as often described by their teacher. She had no preconceptions. Clearly, the teachers had a shared, if questionable, picture of the students.

Although the teachers did share a perception of many students, they shared little else. Each teacher was very isolated and liked it that way. They seemed to value their ability to do their work on their own. Initially, when
establishing the staff development process schedule, it was almost impossible because the teachers were so protective of their time that they were unwilling to negotiate. Their focus was on themselves as individuals rather than on themselves as members of a group. As a result, it took them considerable time to negotiate a time that worked.

As the Project progressed and the meetings were held, a shift occurred. The teachers began to talk to each other, ask each other questions, and discuss more than their students, enjoying the meetings for the opportunities to discuss and share their experiences. When asked informally what they found most valuable about the staff development, each teacher said resoundingly that it was the opportunity of getting together with colleagues. Unfortunately, they felt that time was elusive and once the project finished they did not know whether they could/would take the time for continued meetings. Yet, they did feel that their experiences in the staff development process had opened new collegial vistas.

Another aspect of their culture was distrust. They distrusted their principal, feeling that he would take away/ not allow their creative work. "He won't let me do that" was a theme throughout their talks about school. They felt that if they undertook any innovations, the
principal might interfere and/or make them change or stop that innovation.

At the same time, these concerns were complicated by the curriculum specialist. She was often in contact with the teachers encouraging them to do their work and be creative, setting a serious contrast with the principal. This generated a dilemma for the teachers, because they did not always seem to know to whom to respond. It also appeared that the curriculum specialist was in competition with the principal for power and support. She wanted to control the teachers and their participation in the program, as well as convince them that she would help them innovate. In fact, she hindered possible innovation, because of the mixed messages that came from each of the administrators.

Fc, at first quite resistant to the staff development process, came to enjoy the meetings. During her practical argument session, the staff development sessions, and privately, she acknowledged that no one had ever before asked her about her philosophy. In the seventh session, she affirmed that she found it "very important" to be aware of one's philosophy when thinking about her teaching. Also in the seventh session, Fc revealed her personal history which, in turn, revealed many of her beliefs and theories for her practices. She discussed her personal experience
as a reader which created the "aha!" moment, where she saw what she did and why she did it. Her personal history, for example, revealed that as a young reader, she had no self-esteem and was always in the low reading group. This connected with her present emphasis on raising self-esteem and avoiding ability groups.

Her participation in the staff development process also generated a willingness to experiment with literature-based reading. By the end of the school year she was working with sets of novels and the students were responding well. Although Fc had not undergone a complete transformative change, she was in the process.

On the contrary, Fd had undergone a transformative change which began over the summer. She was moving from a skills to a whole language orientation. Although her participation in the staff development process did not instigate the change, it did facilitate the process. Over the summer she resolved that the practices she had adopted over her 17 years of experience were not working, and she wanted to try something different. She observed what process of reading helped her students read, and so she attended workshops and read books that would provide her with ideas. Her year, then, was one of trying strategies, reflecting on them, changing them, and seeing if they worked. She used the staff development sessions to think
aloud about what she was doing as well as develop her theories.

Fd was engaged in the transformation process despite the social context or because of it. She had little contact with colleagues. She just reflected and pushed herself forward in the process, while being encouraged by the curriculum specialist.

There were changes that occurred for School F, both individual and in their relationship as a group. The teachers individually were clearer about their beliefs and reflected more often about possibilities in the classroom. On the theoretical continuum presented in Chapter IV, each teacher shifted toward the transactive orientation. Table 13 presents their original position and then indicates their movement.

The teachers at least paid lip service to an increased interest in an interactive, literature-based approach to reading. Final classroom observations found four of the five teachers using novels. These teachers were using novels because they felt students were more interested in them. They also anchored that interest by establishing students' background knowledge before and throughout the reading. The fifth teacher, Fb, used plays she had found in an old reading series. Although she did not emphasize prior knowledge, it was significant that she had stepped
Table 13. *Theoretical Orientation Continuum for School F*  
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Beyond her resigned use of the basal. As a group, School F became more collegial and willing to explore ideas and questions with each other. They considered alternatives, experimented with activities, and consulted with each other during the school day.

**Across Schools**

Looking at the two schools, there were several similarities in the patterns that emerged from the data. Initially the research team felt that School A would provide an effective staff development situation. Its
principal that interested in research, had expertise in reading, and was dedicated to her teachers. The teachers appeared excited about teaching, energized by their students, interested in change, satisfied with their work environment, and satisfied with their principal. As the staff development process progressed, however, it became apparent that beneath the facade there were unsettled, dissatisfied, fearful, complacent teachers who, although they liked their students, felt constrained by their students' home environments, and felt as if some might never learn. Moreover, they appeared to feel constrained by the environment, isolating themselves at every opportunity. On the other hand, School F, the school predicted to fail in the staff development effort, blossomed during the staff development process. Initially they discussed the constraints they felt from the principal, from the students and the environment, yet as the staff development process unfolded, so did the teachers. They became curious about practices, strategies, and approaches to their classrooms. They asked questions and requested modeling of particular strategies. They struggled against the constraints, attempting to make sense for themselves.

This section explores the data gathered from the two schools in relationship to the literature discussed in
Chapter II. The topics will be examined in this order: staff development programs, practical arguments, reflection, and school culture. Teachers' language, empowerment, and the role of "they" will also be compared between the two schools.

**Staff Development**

In Chapter II, I described Howey and Vaughan's (1983) suggestions that staff developers must consider social context, relate to the teachers' work, discuss observed changes with teachers or students during the staff development program, represent a growth experience, and tie teachers' participation in the staff development to school factors and district policy. I also presented Little's (1986) research which suggested (a) concrete talk about practice builds a shared language; (b) staff development programs contributes to professional norms of collegiality; and (c) staff development programs are successful where teachers view improvements and changes as ongoing. She also emphasized the importance of collegiality and the breaking down of teachers' isolation of the classroom with shared language, particularly focused on practice and shared risk-taking. Furthermore, I suggested that historically staff development programs had two views--one that saw belief following behavior and another view, the
view ascribed to by these staff development programs, that predicted that behavior would follow belief.

The suggestions of Howey and Vaughan (1983) and Little (1986) were addressed in the preparation for the staff development program studied here, as well as during the process. The Staff Developers also assumed that the beliefs of the participating teachers were important components of the change process.

Significantly, the Staff Developers did not define the staff development process at either school, the teachers defined it for themselves. From the onset, the Staff Developers stated explicitly that they did not have an agenda and that they wanted to address the teachers' concerns. Each school, in turn, responded differently to those statements. School A did not believe them. Throughout the sessions they asked for the "right way to teach reading" and asked the Staff Developers to share "their favorite practices" rather than examine their own. The School F teachers were hesitant but they experimented with directing the staff development process until, by the last session, they had chosen the topic for discussion and led the discussion without much input from the research team.

For School A and School F the group meetings served different purposes. School A viewed the group meetings as
a social time to joke and tell stories, yet sometimes a burden because they felt they often had these types of conversations elsewhere during their day. There were few patterns to the staff development process at School A, except that tension seemed to escalate as time passed. Curiously, although the teachers claimed no real results or changes from the Project, there were observable changes in both language and practice.

One pattern observed during the progression of the staff development process was their stated concern with needing help. From the very first meeting they asked for a better way to teach, even though the staff developers did not offer one. This occurred often at School A and from time to time at School F. The teachers seemed to assume that they were supposed to need help, but complained when it was offered to them. When the Staff Developers repeated, often, that they were not there to provide one right way to teach reading, the School A teachers did not listen. When the Staff Developers from time to time offered suggestions for practice, the teachers shut down.

Another pattern that developed was hesitance to participate. Throughout the staff development process the School A teachers clearly did not want to and, in fact, rarely did discuss their practices. In their belief interviews, the teachers identified themselves as
different, maintaining that their philosophies were unlike
the others and that they did not visit their colleagues'
classrooms. Yet, they also viewed themselves as a cohesive
group that was good-natured, friendly, and willing to talk
with one another. Because of the teachers' initial
statements that they were collegial, the staff developers
expected them to be so. The expectation, however, went
unrealized. When the Staff Developers began asking
questions about practices, about why, hows, and wherefores,
the teachers of School A closed down. There was an almost
visible digging in of the heels. When at one point a SD1
challenged a teacher, Ag, to explain his thinking, another
teacher made it clear that that kind of challenge was not
acceptable, defending his right to hold whatever view he
had.

Further evidence of the hesitancy to participate
appeared in the stages of the staff development program.
School A engaged in the introductory stage far longer than
School F. School F's teachers jumped in, willing to push
through their hesitancy and accept the idea of leading
their own staff development process. School A, on the
contrary, wavered against that. As seen in Table 10, which
compares the stage involvement of the staff development
programs, School A seemed quite hesitant to participate.
At School A, although in the staff development process they talked about it as a baring process, they did not truly reveal themselves or their practices. It was possible that this lack of revelation was exacerbated by the conflicts in reading philosophies. Several teachers in individual conversations referred to "camp" lines surrounding reading. It is possible that that entrenchment, unknown to the Staff Developers at the onset of the staff development process and not overtly revealed in the sessions, affected the teachers' participation in the program.

In contrast, School F saw the meetings as an opportunity to meet and discuss ideas, something they ordinarily did not have an opportunity to do. They used the time well, bringing questions and materials to share as well as viewing videotapes that were taped in their classes. School F's participation was similar to the proverbial snowball moving downhill. As the sessions passed, the teachers gathered energy, information, and self-esteem so by sessions' end, they basically ran the program by themselves. Initially, the teachers were timid, both with the research team and with themselves. As they listened to their colleagues, learned new ideas and tested practices in their classrooms, they recognized possibilities for growth.
United against their common enemy, the principal, the School F teachers, who were quite isolated, looked to each other for support as colleagues. They listened to each other. They carefully observed the questioning techniques modelled by SD1 and SD2 and incorporated that into the ways they talked with each other. The final session saw them hunched over listening to each other asking whys and hows with the Staff Developers leaning back listening.

In the group meetings for both School A and School F the why questions of the Staff Developers generated an initial, if not continuous, defensive response. These questions, which probed philosophical backgrounds and private beliefs, demanded a certain level of trust. Sometimes the development of that trust took a long time. In the case of School F, the teachers eventually adopted the questioning strategy as their own.

**Practical Arguments**

One of the goals of this staff development program was to help teachers develop tools for reflection. In fact, teachers may not witness a rapid change in practice because teachers need time to incorporate ideas into their theories. The practical argument process and the group meetings encouraged the teachers to take ownership of new knowledge, as they worked it into their conceptions of why
and what they were doing, and to perhaps revise practices, as a result of the newly gained knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1986).

Fenstermacher's work, in itself, is a study of the theory/practice dichotomy. Fenstermacher (1986) in very logical, formal terms described his notion of practical argument including an example of dialogue between himself and a teacher. His theoretical presentation was flawless. In practice, however, work on the practical argument did not flow as easily or as logically, nor was there a formal presentation of premises. This does not mean, however, that the practical argument cannot be used. Rather, it points to the ways that practice is adapted by theory, the way that personal theory is adapted from formal theory.

Although the practical argument appeared to be a tool for aiding teachers in an examination of their beliefs, there were several potential problems with its articulation:

1. Can research evidence truly change teachers' premises, given their daily experiences in the classroom? It seemed that even pertinent research findings were complex and may not be able to change teachers' premises directly, when daily experiences may not reinforce those premises. Perhaps the best possibility for change was the value statement. Fenstermacher (1986) proposed that
addressing the value statement encouraged the teacher he worked with to adjust her practical argument. Perhaps in order to have truly testable, empirical premises and situational premises that are realistically attuned to specific instructional contexts, the value statement of the practical argument must be addressed first in the dialogue.

2. The practical argument analysis process is too long for daily use to be worthwhile (Morine-Dershimer, 1987c). To complete this process a teacher must be videotaped, review and respond to the videotape, consider the empirical premises drawn out by the interviewer, and choose a direction for self examination. This might, at the least, be a two or three hour time commitment. Given the demands of the teaching profession, this may be a hardship. Once, however, the teacher becomes acquainted with the methodology, it may not be as time-consuming.

3. The practical argument literature contradicts the staff development literature. Some staff development researchers (Fullan, 1985; Guskey, 1986) claim that you must change the behaviors of the teachers and the outcomes of the students before the teachers will change their beliefs. In fact, if the teachers do not see outcome changes, they will return to their old practices. Fenstermacher (1986) asserts that you must enlighten teachers, introduce them to research, and they, in turn,
will adjust their beliefs and behaviors accordingly. Perhaps it is here where the true experiment lies. Will the teachers accept what research says simply because it provides proof? Or will they politely oblige the researchers, waiting to see the effects upon their students?

Practical arguments have been misunderstood as attempting to foist theory onto practice which is just the thing Fenstermacher would argue against. Fenstermacher (1986), for example, does not suggest that teachers adopt researcher information as is into their philosophy using a practical argument form. In fact, they do assimilate the information and adapt it to mesh with their existing knowledge.

What is significant and valuable about the use of the practical argument process is its potential for revealing teachers' beliefs and their philosophies. Some teachers welcome this more than others. Interestingly though, there are elements of the theory/practice distinction revealed in the use of the practical argument process. As SD1 and SD2 undertook the individual practical argument sessions, they never used the terminology presented by Fenstermacher (1986). After the initial introduction of the three types of premises to each group, that language was abandoned. The term, empirical premises, might have
been stated once or twice, but was of no consequence in events. It was not the language of the teachers. Quickly, it became obvious that the formal language was not necessary.

The introduction of formal research information was also adapted. When SD1 and SD2 talked with the teachers, they did not use citations and adamantly avoided a "research says" conversation. Rather, they more often pressed the teachers with whys and hows to reveal her own philosophy. It was rare until the end of the practical argument session for the staff developers to mention research at all, even in a semi-formal fashion. Usually at the end of the session, they asked the teachers what they would like to pursue further. At that time a member of the research team would meet with them and establish a schedule. It was more normally the researcher assistant who provided concrete research examples.

The dialogue that the staff developers engaged in helped reveal the beliefs of the teachers. Beliefs that often they did not recognize as their own. The informal nature of the dialogue helped reveal the teachers' thinking. In practice the practical argument is more like a dialogue of practice, or a critical conversation, than an argument of formal logic.
Reflection

This was not a prescriptive staff development program where teachers were told what to do and how to do it. Rather, it was a staff development program where the teachers described what they wanted to explore and considered possibilities for that exploration. For Elliot (1976) "fundamental changes in classroom practice can only be brought about if teachers become conscious of the theories, which guide their practice, and are able to reflect critically about them" (p. 2). In fact, this staff development program was an attempt to introduce teachers to a form of self-monitoring similar to Elliot's work (1976), where the self-monitoring teacher engaged in a process of becoming aware of their situation and their role in that situation. To consider the potential of a situation, reflection was a necessary tool.

Schon (1983) suggested that practitioners' knowledge-in-action was found in the practitioners' actions and reflection on/in those actions as opposed to an engagement in "technical rationality," which was a very formal use of propositional knowledge. Schon (1983) believed the practitioners' knowledge has been undervalued and that "This form of knowledge, which he calls knowing-in-action, is the practical knowledge that professionals hold about their professional work and that cannot be formulated in
propositional terms" (Munby, 1989, p. 2). He distinguished between the knowledge of practice and science.

The practitioners' knowledge was created by practitioners through reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, which occurred in unspecified zones of action. Through these two types of reflection the practitioners attempted to create meaning. Here the practitioner reframed the problem situation, which helped the practitioner make use of their existing "repertoire of example, images, understanding, and action" (Schon, 1987, p. 66). The reflective process engages practitioners in a "conversation" about the situation. Past experiences were recalled, suggestions were made for possible consideration, and problem-solving ideas were generated.

In a reflective conversation, the focus is on practical knowledge and the solution to a problem of practice (Grimmett, Riecken, MacKinnon, and Erickson, 1987). The person, teacher in this case, must be "willing to suspend his disbelief," and attempt the staff developers', in this case, suggestion (Schon, 1987, p. 87). In fact, the person, hopefully, trusted the teacher without proof of success where they got involved in action without knowing, hoping to uncover what they need to learn.

Schon (1983) did not believe that practitioners had been introduced to different theories in their course work,
as if they were tabula rasa when they arrive. Schon (1983) suggested that there is a dichotomy between research and practice that I do not believe exists. Teachers do use research to affirm/disconfirm their own theories, using it to enhance their own theories rather than hinder them. Once the teacher has become conscious of their belief(s) aided by practical argument, for example, they can consider change. Applying theory to practice was not Schon's (1983) notion of reflection, because by giving teachers the sources of propositional knowledge they are not afforded the opportunity of experiential learning, which is necessary for problem setting and reframing.

Fenstermacher (1986) suggested that "the goal of anyone who sets out to teach teachers is to enable these teachers to become students of their teaching" (p. 48). The use of practical arguments and reflection in the staff development process became a critical undertaking. As the staff development process progressed, at least at School F, they examined critically their world and the constraints under which they taught with the goal, if only implicit, to free themselves. School F discussed the constraints with the hope of breaking free. School A teachers, on the other hand, only felt more burdened.
School Culture

While there was a shared culture of the school—codes of individuality, perceptions of students, Lortie (1975), Jackson (1968), Heckman (1987), Goodlad (1983) and others remained accurate in their assertion that there was not shared technical culture of the school or a shared technical language. At least in Schools A and F the teachers did not often share practices or even, necessarily, a technical language about schooling.

Few schools share a significant body of specialized knowledge and skill because each usually organizes teaching very differently (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Bird and Little, 1986). In many schools, there is no tangible body of shared ideas about teaching, the ways to generate it, or the means to share it with beginners. Although "isolation provides room for individual creativity and relieves teachers of some of the difficulties associated with shared work, it also deprives teachers of the stimulation of working with peers and the close support they need to improve throughout their careers" (Bird and Little, 1986, p. 495). Teachers do not often watch each other teach, lack shared professional language, and do not have many shared experiences. According to Bird and Little (1986), specific discussions about teaching are not a foremost part of teachers' talk at school. School
culture is socially constructed (Erickson and Shultz, 1981; Mehan, 1986).

In many schools, teachers are colleagues only in name. They are, in fact, quite isolated and attempt to solve/plan their own instructional, curricular, and management undertakings. Teachers shape their views of their daily routines and their career assessments when they work with others. Their enthusiasm for their work is also related to their colleagues.

The heterogeneity of teaching cultures makes the prospects for school change more hopeful. While academics tend to bemoan the powerful school culture which reduces the aspirations and energies of all teachers to mediocrity, school cultures are not uniform. Teaching cultures are embodied in the work-related beliefs and knowledge teachers share—beliefs about appropriate ways of acting on the job and rewarding aspects of teaching and knowledge that enables teachers to do their work.

According to Little (1987, p. 16), there is "A long-standing element of the culture of teaching is the maxim: 'You don't interfere with another teacher's teaching.'" Further norms of social collegiality must be tampered with before teachers can reflect upon and consider changing their instructional practices. At School A, for example, it would appear that there is a code of collegiality in the
school that (a) does not allow teachers to enter the rooms of colleagues; (b) does not permit questions about classroom practice; and also (c) does not allow anyone to speak harshly about colleagues. School F did not, on the other hand, appear to have such norms. The only real norm seemed to be an expectation to dislike the principal. Once they coalesced around that, they opened up.

Also in evidence was the code of individualism. In School A it was less apparent on the surface, because the teachers were friendly and gave the appearance of working together. Yet, when observed, it was clear that the contact between teachers was minimal. School F, on the other hand, had a blatant code where teachers almost avoid talking with each other.

The school culture did seem to greatly influence teachers' beliefs, actions, and participation in any school program. And in turn it seemed to reinforce old practices and discourage new ones.

Further, at School A there was isolation and little collaboration. There the teachers did not share their practices, little true cooperation among the teachers and a strong expectation of individualism. At School A, SD1 and SD2 tried very hard to have the group be a teacher-directed program. They attempted not to interfere and redirected any questions that requested their ideas on the
best way to teach reading. But the norms of the school were so strong, they could not break through the strong school culture.

School F, also, had isolation and little collaboration, did not share their practices, little true cooperation, and a strong expectation of individualism. Interestingly though, as the sessions progressed, the teacher opened to each other. In fact, at years' end in a self report they indicated they were talking more often to each other about practices.

One significant observation is that the staff development took place on School A's campus and took place off School F's campus. In fact School F teachers were quite adamant about having the staff development off-campus. By removing them from their traditional environment, it may have opened them up more. Whereas, keeping School A on campus, which they wanted, may have locked them into their traditional roles and confined them.

School culture had great influence on teachers' willingness to change at Schools A and F. First, the groups' shared perception of students held those students in position regarding performance or behavior. Their history was passed along with the students, locking them into place. Secondly, the code of individualism, the isolation, disallowed the teachers to share ideas many
times, which curtailed collaboration and sometimes affected their willingness to discuss practices. Finally, the mythology of "they" affects teachers' interest in change because the teachers' are fearful of using their creativity. This research suggests, thus far, that a model of teacher change must consider school culture to experience success.

Reflective teachers are teachers who ponder their teaching while it happens and after the fact, and are always seeking improvement (Schon, 1983). Sirotinik (1987) proposes that critical inquiry be required that would put teachers into the center of a "knowledge generating and using process." This requires building upon the reflective practice (Sirotinik, 1987) suggesting that as "centers for educational change, they must be centers of inquiry" (p. 6). Similarly, Heckman and Wilson (1988) suggest the use of a collegial dialogue. Critical inquiry becomes a part of a teacher's life, a demonstration of their strong beliefs, and a part of their world view, inspecting the world with a critical eye.

Language

Rather than impose a language on the teachers SD1 and SD2 talked in the teachers' language. They avoided, for the most part, laying on a new language to be used by
teachers. Sometimes new terms can help. Sometimes there needs to be natural or authentic labels, like premise. What they discovered, however, was that those terms like "empirical, value, and situational premise" did not work. Instead, SD1 and SD2 had some ideas about research, ideas about values, and ideas about situations, using a less formal language. A form of questioning began to emerge. It was coming together of people from very different backgrounds and experiences moving toward a common goal of becoming better teachers.

At School F that had begun to happen. The teachers had begun to question. At School A, in contrast, because the teachers appeared to communicate only on a surface level, a language seemed absent. They seemed to talk past each other rather than engage in issues. They discussed "they," but they offered no solutions. Instead, they just seemed victimized.

**Empowerment**

It would seem that for these two schools, a neutral site for the staff development program was needed to encourage open, honest consideration of philosophies. For teachers to be able to reflect and talk with each other, they may need to be away from their everyday environment. School F expected a neutral site as a part of their
participating in the program. At School A, having access to the school appeared detrimental to their participation.

At School F, eventually the talk shifted from what had not been done to what was being done and what could be done. In effect, they brushed away the "they" problem. To do that, a trust level had to be developed to deal with disagreement and the intimate nature of philosophical revelation. The recognition that "I have control over my classroom, I am what I am, this is what I am," on the other hand, was empowering. The questions for teachers became "Who am I? What am I doing? What is teaching?"

A turning point came, when teachers considered themselves as readers and reviewed their own learning-to-read experience. In fact, to some degree they had to face the flaws in their own education. As the level of intimacy increased, the teachers could begin to come to grips with their own subject matter incompetence.

The Role of "They"

"They make us do it" was a cry often heard during the staff development sessions. "We can't do that, they won't let us!" or "They might come into our classrooms" or "They check up . . . " were comments made in each of the schools. "They", often used, often feared, were apparently the foilers of all teachers' activities. Hanging over the
teachers' heads like an invisible threat was an ominous force that seemed to affect both their thinking and their actions.

Who were "they?" Who were those people that held such power over the teachers? "They" were in each school. Each school talked about "them" with similar intensity. Each teacher could carefully describe what "they" might do.

At School A, for example, the teachers said, "They come into our classes," they "monitor what we do," they "check our grade books." Interestingly, school F teachers concurred, stating, "We have to watch out for them," "they never cooperate," and "they watch us."

When pressed to expose precisely who "they" were, the teachers deferred. Often, there were looks exchanged, as if in disbelief that the research team could not identify the enemy. "Who are they?" the staff developers asked. "The district," a teacher said. "The parents," another teacher said. Eventually, it became clear that "they" was a force, not necessarily a particular person or persons. "They," apparently, could be other teachers, parents, school board members, the school district in general, or the school administrators (usually the principal).

What "they" did was interfere with teachers' creativity and inhibit their risk-taking, because teachers feared the consequences. Yet, the teachers only provided
general descriptions of "them." For example, at School A, Aa said he used the basal because the parents watched how he taught. Ad also expressed concern about the parents. Furthermore, the teachers of School F identified the parents, the district, and the principal as "them": the district had weak policies, although those policies were not clearly identified; the parents watched the teachers grading system; and the principal never backed them up.

At one point in the staff development process at School A, the staff developers became "they." During session 8, the Staff Developers pressed the teachers, as a group, to explore their beliefs and values about grading, students, and the teachers' role in the classroom. At one particular moment after a teacher had negatively evaluated his students, SD1 wanted to know his justifications. She encouraged him to reconsider his remarks, but he remained immovable. Another teacher then defended him, as speaking honestly about the students, and implied that the Staff Developer was being harsh.

The next day the research team discovered through an informal discussion with Principal A that the teachers were very upset. The School A teachers felt that they had been treated unfairly, yet when approached about the issue during the next staff development session, the teachers
were less than specific. They said little about what had occurred other than insinuating that the Staff Developers had been trying to force them to think a particular way about reading. They suggested that SD1 and SD2 were promoting one "best way to teach reading." In a careful review of the tape, that did not happen. It would appear that the staff developers represented "they" and were used as an excuse to inhibit participation in the Project.

Clearly, "they" was a force to confront. It robbed risk-taking potential and affected creativity. This was awesome considering that what "they" did could not be precisely described.

One Consideration

The practical argument staff development process appears to be similar to Friere's (1970) conscientizacao where, in his example, the peasants do not have certain issues present in their minds, and he introduces them using their own language. It is here where the peasant learns to read her world. The idea of the representation of cultural scenes is to bring them to consciousness. Freire describes the banking model of learning as the method of learning, where one takes in information without challenging it or without truly thinking about it, as a bank does with its money. He offered critical consciousness as an
alternative. The idea of critical consciousness for Friere has the peasants' attitudes or belief system engaged in a dialogue with a partner or partners where, when an issue is studied, it is then reconstructed/represented. The idea of practical argument fits here, because the creation of critical consciousness does not end in just talk or propositions. It ends in praxis, which is combination of theory and practice, an action of a reflective sort.

For Friere (1970) the action is never just an individual action, it is collective. It could be that the practical argument also ends with a collective flavor, as in the staff development, that is the creation of a community of colleagues, of teacher practitioners, a community of practice.

Culture, according to Geertz (1973) is "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which [people] communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (p. 89). It is the symbols that are so important to understand and interpret when attempting to facilitate change.

Freire (1970) recognizes that culture is not a neutral category, viewing it as providing a society with a symbolic language for interpreting the boundaries of
individual and social existence (Giroux, 1983). Furthermore, Freire (1973) believes that people should be able to generate their own meanings and frames of reference while developing their ability to critically perceive reality. Accordingly, knowledge is a social construct that also is the basis for social action (Freire, 1987). It is time to support teachers in the generation of their own meanings, and to help them reflect on the process of thinking itself (Freire, 1973).

Summary

Sedlak et al. (1986) claim that most of the educational reforms of the past 20 years have been initiated in the absence of any understanding of the manner in which the design for change will affect the lives of teachers and students in classrooms and school corridors, the places where learning occurs. (p. 20)

This indicated that the people most closely involved with education--teachers and students--are not consulted about the change (Henley, 1987; Wise, 1988). Cuban (1988) claims that, in fact, schools remain much the same as they have always been. Moreover, Tye (1987) claims that district and/or state mandates usually produce minimal success because the personality of each obstructs attempts by administrators to institutionalize school programs through the district or the state.
The change process experienced by the teachers of Schools A and F seemed quite dependent upon the social interactivity of the teachers, the teachers' beliefs, the school culture and the culture at large. It appears that teachers' beliefs about teaching affect the social context and vice versa. If this can be generalized, it becomes quite important when considering how to structure successful staff development programs.
CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The teachers in this study examined their beliefs, reflected upon them, considered the research-based practices presented to them, and productively engaged in the change process as a part of the practical argument staff development process. One crucial factor in this process is the social interaction of the teachers. Without the teachers' willingness to become involved in the staff development process, and because of these particular teachers' beliefs, the social interactions generated some shared meanings, perceptions, and empowerment. Thus far, Chapter IV described the teachers and the school culture; Chapter V summarized the staff development process; Chapter VI delineated the changes that the teachers did/did not experience; and Chapter VII offered an interpretation of the findings, including both schools and a comparison of their programs.

Although the research teams and the major focus, reading comprehension, were common across schools, the practical argument staff development processes within the schools differed. How the teachers participated, why they participated, and even where they participated were unique. The context differences were in the teachers,
their beliefs, their practices, their experiences, as well as their students, their schools, and their administrators. Even the teachers' responses to the staff developers' statements that the teachers could guide the direction of the staff development process, differed greatly. For example, School A's teachers doubted the possibility of prospective autonomy, while School F's teachers reached for the opportunity.

In summary, the general findings of this study were:

1. Teachers were not necessarily conscious of their beliefs and the practical argument staff development process brought them to the surface.

2. School culture played a major role in the processes of staff development.

3. The staff development process contributed to the participating teachers' changing or strengthening of perceptions, understandings and beliefs about teaching and reading, the quality of their discourse, their willingness to reflect, and their classroom practices.

This chapter draws together the ideas presented in the previous chapters and offers possible implications of this study. To do that, I will focus on four areas: change, teachers' beliefs, staff development, and school culture.

It is important to note that although this study offers suggestions in a number of areas, there are
limitations. Most importantly it was neither a longitudinal nor a large study which, consequently tempers an examination of the implications. If, however, these findings stand the test of time and other studies, these implications may hold true.

Change

The issue in this study was not whether teachers would change, because teachers change all of the time, but how they change and the magnitude of that change (Richardson, 1989). Both individually and as a group, the process of change for the participating teachers was sometimes tough, demanding, and uncomfortable. A change from one basal story to another, a first-order change, (Cuban, 1988; Watzlawick et al., 1974) may not administer any discomfort. Teachers often make changes like this and can just as often provide viable, substantial rationalizations for those changes. A change in beliefs, potentially leading to a second-order change (Cuban, 1988; Watzlawick et al, 1974), however, can be far more demanding. The process of changing beliefs involves extraordinary amounts of trust, flexibility, and time. As the teachers of School F considered the potential of literature-based reading programs, they reviewed the strategies among themselves as well as continuously interviewing Fd, who was engaged in
that type of reading program. The trust in this case was not only among themselves for support, but also in this type of program having the potential success. Because of their lack of experience, the teachers were concerned about how this might progress. When it came time for Fc to use novels in her classroom, something she had hesitantly planned herself, she was delighted when a member of the research team, myself, volunteered to work with her in her classroom during the reading period each day. After each lesson she would reflect aloud about the success, while seeming to disbelieve her experience.

When teacher change is discussed in research, it often refers to externally imposed change which can be mandated by the district, the state, and/or the federal government. This type of change is also usually of the first-order, which does not connect with or relate to teachers' ideas and/or theories about the issues of the classroom and learning. When this happens, teachers can appear disinterested or even recalcitrant. The change process as an internal process, on the other hand, can deeply involve teachers. Fd is an example of that type of involvement. During her participation in the staff development process, she was undergoing a shift in beliefs from a basal approach to a whole language approach to reading. It was a
personal change, an internal change, one which involved reflection and commitment.

Because of the Project's interest in research-based practices, numerous practices were presented to the teachers as they expressed certain topic/area interests. According to the teachers, these practices, in turn, might be attempted in their classrooms, but were only adopted into their repertoires, after success with students and adaptation by the teacher to fit with their personal beliefs. It would appear that successful teacher involvement in the change process depends upon the relevance of the practice to the teacher and to her students' outcomes.

Teachers' Beliefs

Teachers' beliefs were an integral part of the staff development change process. When a research-based practice was presented to the teachers, they began to ponder it and reflect upon its relationship to their own beliefs. The discussions in the group sessions were filled with conversation about what they did in the classroom and whether or not the newly introduced practice would fit in with that work. Practices, if relevant to their classrooms, were adapted to mesh more closely with the teacher's theories about reading and learning, as well as
the teacher's view of the classroom. Sometimes the alterations were considerable. This is a case in point. Although in her belief interview it became apparent that she was a teacher who valued her own interaction with students and her students' interaction with the text, she was also greatly committed to the basal text. She used the basal text not only because she wanted to use it, but because she felt it was mandated by the district. She seemed to fit the text into her beliefs by asking her students many questions and encouraging them through discussions. Yet, she always returned to the comprehension checks and vocabulary expectations in the basal text teacher's guide. As she progressed through the staff development process, the discussions challenged her thinking about the basal and her use of that text in her classroom. She actually found that the basal was no longer as successful in her classroom. Exploration of her own beliefs revealed that self-esteem, whole group work, and relevant reading were quite important to her. Furthermore, she found that literature-based instruction appeared to better meet her needs for the classroom as well as the needs of her students. Her shift was gradual as she considered the possibilities and weighed the consequences. By the end of the year she had her students working in novels with a loosely graded program.
Staff Development

The staff development process had both an individual and an organizational focus. According to the school effectiveness literature, the success of a school, and by implication, the success of a staff development program was dependent upon the structure of the school. Accordingly, that success can explain teachers' involvement, their commitment, and their willingness to participate in school programs. Little (1987) suggested that norms of collegiality and experimentation were more important to the success of the school program than the individual teachers' participation in that program. Rosenholtz (1986) also looked at the organizational features of schools, as related to teachers' willingness to learn, and suggested that teachers felt that their collegiality and instructional aptitude were related to their perceived success with the acquisition of skills. In other words, if teachers had a good relationship with colleagues and had a strong instructional background, they were more likely to feel efficacious. These are important issues, but unfortunately they neglect the individual's contribution to the process. Certainly the collegiality of the group is important, but as important is what an individual brings to the group. For example, Af's desires to please authority, demonstrated by her frequent requests
for the staff developers' favorite ways to teach reading, counterbalanced by her concern about how different she felt from her colleagues, greatly influenced the staff development process itself. Although group aspects are important, individual contributions are important as well. In fact, they created expectations among School A's teachers that drove the staff development process, and perhaps slowed their progress toward the empowerment stage.

An indication of the importance of group relations, however, was demonstrated in the types of teacher discourse. Between individual and group conversation, there was considerable variation in topic as well as willingness to reveal one's true thoughts. Teachers appeared more willing to discuss their issues and concerns individually.

Group work was also important in the development of shared meanings about teaching, learning, and, more specifically, about reading comprehension. As the sessions progressed, the teachers acquired a way of talking with each other about the topics of mutual interest. At School F, Fd used terminology associated with whole language to explain what happened in her classroom. Soon, the other teachers were using it. It was also terminology reinforced by the Staff Developers, because they used it to describe some of the practices they were presenting.
Important to the staff development process was the issue of empowerment. For whatever reason, the issue of "they" affected both schools. The teachers felt as if they could not break free and guide their own experiences because "they"--the principal, the central office, the parents--might stop them. In contrast, the teachers in this staff development process were asked to choose their direction and topics. The staff developers did not want to run the program, they wanted to learn, in a sense, from the teachers. Each school was willing to engage in the process, but there were varied degrees of involvement. In fact, this staff development process was not designed as a model or format for just this reason, instead it was to be a way of questioning and working with colleagues that could be learned and continued after the research team left.

During the staff development process the importance of identifying a teachers' theoretical orientation and/or beliefs became obvious. No teacher was perfectly aligned with any one scholarly theoretical orientation, rather, their orientations were enmeshed with personal experience. Teachers' theories appeared more robust, drew more upon experience, and better described teachers' experiences.

The reflection involved in the practical argument staff development process supported the teachers in examining their thinking about their beliefs and
practices. They also began to understand their personal theories generated by their beliefs. The practical argument process expanded understanding of their beliefs, provided a knowledge base for experiences in their classrooms, and helped them enhance their rationalizations for their actions.

Teachers, who lack an understanding of their personal theories and miss the opportunity to examine their beliefs may continue to blame the external "they" for the failures and acknowledge "them" for their successes. Empowerment suggests that teachers are in control of their language and their experience. To become empowered, teachers need to consciously examine their beliefs, reflect upon them, and express them, as they pursue a desire to be the best teacher possible.

School Culture

It appears that the school culture, the organization of the school, and the social interactivity of the teachers were crucial determinants in the success of a staff development and the successful involvement of the teachers in that process. Social context, and all that it entails, inhibits or enhances teachers' beliefs and experiences in the classroom and in any activities related to school. For example, the teachers of School F chose to
have their staff development program off-campus, whereas School A chose to have their staff development program on-campus. Significantly, the teachers of School F became more involved in the staff development process more quickly. Although there are many other factors that may have contributed to this difference, this does suggest the possible importance of the environment and the culture to teachers' successful participation in a staff development program.

The norms of collegiality were another important aspect of the school culture, particularly the implicit agreements that teachers appeared to have about how to act and how to communicate in both schools. At School A, however, these norms seemed to be obstacles. At this school the teachers appeared to have a code that encouraged them to be nice rather than question a colleague's practice. Consequently, when asked to discuss their beliefs and practices within the group setting, there was considerable resistance. These norms can impede teacher's participation in change.

It also appears that teachers' changes in practices can be influenced by school culture, the social interactions of their colleagues, and their own individual beliefs. As the teachers become aware of their beliefs and listen to the reflections of their colleagues, they
appear to reflect more upon their own practices. Much of the change in practice and discussion about personal theories seemed drawn from and strengthened by the discussions in the groups, even when teachers did not reveal their own personal practices, as in the case of School A.

Implications

The implications of this study suggest a reevaluation of research pursuits in teaching and teacher education rather than new avenues for research.

1. Teachers continue to need a language of practice. Prospective teachers and working teachers need to discover how to learn about the teachers' world and how to talk about that world. The work, in case studies addressing this, are and should be continued.

A language that allows teachers to share repertoires of practices would certainly help teachers begin to talk about their beliefs and practices.

2. Friere (1970) suggests the use of the language of the people. Teachers can discover their own language. They need to be able to authenticate their experience through their own words.

3. The examination of teachers' beliefs needs to focus on the deep structure level, not just the surface
structure. Teachers need to explore their experience, their beliefs, and the theories that are generated from them.

4. It is important not to keep theory separate from practice. Practice appears to be the authentic application of theory and the bringing together of these two perspectives will broaden the view of Teacher Education.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS
Teachers' Belief Interview Protocol

Background

Number of years teaching--grade levels--types of kids.

Preservice education. Where? Special program? Reading program?

Student Teaching. Where? When?

How did Cooperating Teacher teach reading? Text? Any innovative instruction in his/her class?

Probe: Quality of student teaching experience . . .

Reading and Learning to Read

When a student enters into Grade ___, what should that student be able to do in terms of reading?

Probe: Their conviction, not what the "program" expects.

What can a really good reader do? (difference between good and poor reader qualitative or quantitative?)

When that student leaves Grade ___, what can she do?

So when this good or poor reader enters your classroom, what do you think has made the difference in terms of the fact that one kid is a good reader and one a poor reader?

(Not looking for a description, but what has caused the differences.)

Is it possible for a teacher or other person to help a poor reader become a good reader?

How do you define reading comprehension? What is included in that?
Reading Instruction

Could you describe the way you teach reading comprehension?

Probe: Typical day
   Reading out loud
   Objective: Vocabulary? Remembering ideas?
   Memorizing fact?
   Questioning students: Why? what is a good response? What is a poor response? What is a creative response?

Where did you learn to teach it that way?
   Have you ever had inservice/graduate courses on how to teach it?

Have you ever tried something different? Why? What happened?

Have you ever wanted to do something different?

Grouping. On what basis? Why?
   Probe: Testing? What type? Do you change the groups? Why?

Have you ever tried to teach the whole group? Under what conditions would you do so?

Do you do different things in the different groups? Why?

What indicates to you that a lesson is going poorly?

How is teaching reading different from teaching math? from teaching science or social studies? Form teaching writing?
   Probe: More/less difficult? Less clarity about objectives?

Do you ever feel like you are getting behind in reading?
   Probe: Are the students getting behind in reading? Is what the school district defines as reading, really reading?
The Students

Describe the students in your class. Do they have a pretty good chance of making it through school?

Describe a student who is having great difficulty in reading.

Probe: Cause, what is teacher doing about it?

Describe a student who is just slightly behind--not terrific, but not a real problem.

Probe on same

Describe a student who is really doing well. Cause, etc.

The School

Do you feel that there is a characteristic way of teaching reading comprehension in this school?

Do you know what the other teachers are doing? I mean sort of?

How do you know?

Do you ever observe in other classrooms?

Do you exchange materials, ideas, methods?

Communication with other teachers? Specialists?

Other

What kind of reading do you now do in your spare time (Ha Ha)
Final Belief Interview Protocol

1. Well, how are you feeling about things--your teaching, your class--now that you are approaching the end of the year?

2. What seems to have worked well in reading for this set of kids?

3. Were you doing that last year? At the beginning of the year?
   --If "no": How did you decide to change? Where did the change come from?
   --If "yes": Did you try anything new? Where did it come from? How did it work?

4. What seemed not to work too well for this set of kids? Had you tried this before? Why did you think it didn't work?

5. Could you talk a little bit about reading comprehension? What is it? How is it learned? How best to teach it? (Give them plenty of time for this question.)

6. Is there a student who has really progressed beyond your expectations this year?
   
   Probe: Describe the kid. Progressed in what way?
   
   How can you tell? What helped? What did teacher expect of the student?

7. Is there a student who really did not get as far as predicted or at least hoped for? Same probes . . .
   
   How did you try to help this student? Do you think some other things might work?

8. A lot of our discussion at our group meetings revolved around assessment. Now that the state tests are over, how are you feeling about testing? what makes grading"objective?" Do you try to be objective? When do you find yourself being subjective? What helps you really figure out when you know how well a student is progressing? Do you use subjective information?
9. We also talked a lot about what prevented or encouraged you to do what you believe in the classroom. How do you feel about that now?

10. When you first looked at your videotape, how did you feel? Were you surprised with anything that you saw yourself doing? After seeing that, did you do anything differently?

11. How did you feel when you read your belief interview? Was there anything that you saw with which you disagreed? You know, "Did I really say that?" "I don't really mean that."

12. What really stands out in your mind as a strong belief about reading that you may or may not have stated in your belief interview?

13. How would you describe the staff development program?

14. Were there aspects that made you feel uncomfortable?

   Probe: "Yeah, a lot of people feel that, why do you suppose that is the case?"

15. Were there aspects that were more valuable or fun than others?

16. Do you think you are doing something differently because of it? Are you thinking differently about teaching? About reading? About kids? (If no, then, "Well, how are you thinking about teaching?" etc.

17. Let's say there were the opportunity to do the same kind of thing in whatever school you are in next year (for Kim) in Math or Social Studies? What would you think about that? What would you want to do differently?

18. As a teacher, how important are the other teachers in your school to you? How would you describe your relationships with them?

19. Anything more that you want to add?
Staff Developers' Belief Interview Protocol

Belief Interview: RIS

Background:
Prior to attaining your Doctorate, what kinds of work did you do?
  Probe, if needed:
    - Did you ever work in the public schools?
    - Number of years teaching--grade levels--subject areas--types of students.
    - Quality of teaching experience.

Who were the people/what were the events of major professional importance to you?

Since you began your work at the University level, what kinds of contact have you had with teachers?
  Probe: quality/types of contact.
  What types of courses have you taught?

In your work with teachers, have you engaged in staff development? At what level (district, school, etc.)?
  Probe: (only if mentioned) what were your pre-professorial experiences?

Describe a staff development project you were involved with--the areas covered, its focus, the grade level.
  Probe: types of inservices/staff development programs in which you have been involved.

What is your interest in participating in the staff development component of the RIS Project?

Reading
How do you define reading comprehension?
  Probe: What is included in that?

What is the role of skills in reading comprehension?
  (Questioning? Grouping?)

How do you think some students become better readers than others? (Looking for causes not descriptions of readers.)

Is teaching reading different from teaching other subjects?
  Probe: (if appropriate) Math? From teaching science or social studies? From teaching writing?
Teacher Change
When you are out in the field, what do you observe that teachers are doing now? In general? In reading?

Would you like to see something else happening? Describe.

What do you think are the forces that affect teachers' decisions in the classroom?

What are your ideas of the relationship between research and practice?
   Probe: How might this affect teacher change?

Staff Development
(From your own experience) Describe your "most successful" example of a staff development program. Why do you think it was such a failure?

Now, given your experiences how might you describe a successful staff development program. How would the program run? What would you look for in the program/in the participants?
   Probe: What does the Practical Argument process add to your previous perspective on staff development?
   What is the role of practical argument in a staff development program?
   (If they mention beliefs) How do you want to affect teachers' beliefs? If you want to affect change, how will you know when they have changed?

When you are working with the teachers in the staff development, how might you work with a teacher who, for example, expresses great commitment to doing things the way they always have?

How might you work with a teacher who takes a strong stand about an aspect of reading to which you have a negative reaction?
   Probe: Give an example.
   What if a teacher raises concerns outside of reading? How will you approach those concerns?

What do you hope to accomplish with the staff development component of the RIS Project?
   Probe: for details.
Participants
Describe the teachers that are participating in the RIS study.

Describe a teacher who is not very open to making changes in their classroom.
   Probe: cause, what is the teacher doing to indicate this?

Describe a teacher who is open and willing to consider changes in their classroom.
   Probe: cause, what is the teacher doing to indicate this?

Is there anything else that you would like to add?
Interview Protocol

Purpose: to gain insight into the teachers' perspectives about the RIS Project and to affirm any changes in their teaching. What have they noticed over the past four months?

Teachers

Over the past four of five months, when you have reflected upon your teaching and your preparations for your students, what have you reflected upon?

--Have you noticed any differences between say, last year's thinking about the classroom and this year's thinking about the classroom?

--In your teaching style?

--In your approaches?

--In your reading lessons?

--In your other subjects?

One of the teachers I interviewed suggested that if I really wanted to notice changes in practice brought about by project participation, I would need to return next year, because teachers come to school each year with an agenda that they are rarely willing to adapt. Do you think that's true?

When you have had the opportunity to talk with your colleagues, what do you talk about? Have you noticed any differences in what you've talked about recently?

How have your students' responded in the classroom?

Is there anything else you would like to add?
Principal

Have you noticed any differences in the communication within your school over the past four of five months?

--In your teachers?
--In your teachers planning?
--In their conversations with you about their teaching practices?

Have you noticed any differences in your relationship with your teachers?
--In the relationships among your teachers?

Are you anticipating any differences in your faculty's planning and/or practices over the next year, as a result of the project?
## APPENDIX B

### STUDY LOG FOR SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL F

**October 1988 - May 1989**

### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/6/88</td>
<td>Initial meeting of year 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Aa)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ad)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ae, Ag)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ac, Ab)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Aa, Af)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Aa)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Ab)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Ag)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Af, Ad)</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Ad)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Aa)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ad)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Af)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**School A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/9/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/89</td>
<td>Interviews (Ab, Af, Aa)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ag)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2-3/89</td>
<td>Interviews (Ad, Ae, Ac, Ag)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ad)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Aa, Ab)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ag)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ae)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ad)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Ac)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Af)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOTAL HOURS SPENT AT SCHOOL A
October 1988 - May 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Observation Hours</th>
<th>Interview Hours</th>
<th>Development Hours</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/88</td>
<td>Initial meeting of year 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fd)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fb)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fd)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc, Fe)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc, Fe)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Fc)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/88</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc,Fe,Fd)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Fa)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/88</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fe)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/88</td>
<td>Practical Argument (Fd)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fd)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/15/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/89</td>
<td>Interviews (Fa, Fc)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/89</td>
<td>Interview (Fb)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/89</td>
<td>Interview (Fd)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/89</td>
<td>Interview (Fe)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/89</td>
<td>Interview (Mb)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/11/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fd, Fe)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fc, Fa)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/89</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/89</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Fb)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/89</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOTAL HOURS SPENT AT SCHOOL F  
October 1988 - May 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Observation Hours</th>
<th>Interview Hours</th>
<th>Development Hours</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Hours at School A = 105.50
Total Hours at School F = 115.25
APPENDIX C
FULL DESCRIPTIONS OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

Case Study: Aa

After ten years of teaching first, third and fourth grades and serving as a district K-8 bilingual resource teacher, Aa had recently become a sixth grade bilingual teacher. His teacher training was dominated by the "phonetic sounded-out type of thing" with lots of workbooks of fill-in-the-blanks and drills with no emphasis on comprehension." When asked about the development of his teaching philosophy, however, he responded that it "was in my heart and soul even before I went to college." He stated that when he first heard the term "whole language", it was "the first time I ever had contact with a style or movement that bore a kind of similarity to what I was mulling over in my mind all along anyway." Although he would not necessarily describe himself as a whole language teacher, he "was excited to see that there is a lot of similarities and directions that we shared in trying to approach reading."

Aa strongly believed that the quantity of reading correlated with the quality of reading, yet learning to read took time and did not just happen over night. For him those "who read most read best" and he hoped that his students would "pick up a book with gusto and say 'I would like to know what this thing says.'" Because he felt he was "dependent on the quantity factor as an indication of how well they read", he directed his students' "attention to all these marvelous things that can happen as a result of them having successfully read something." Typically in his classroom he still used "the basal program to a significant extent mainly so that people can come into
[his] classroom and recognize a reading program that makes sense to them."

Although this did not occur every day, a typical day involved "some kind of introduction to a story in the basal reader and then time to read it silently. Then the following day, time to review the story and a comprehension exercise of some kind that would usually be written." For Aa "reading is just between you and the text" with no one coaching you through the experience.

Case Study: Ab

Ab had eight years of teaching experience, during which time he earned most of the credits toward a master's degree in special education. For his teaching certificate, his cooperating teachers trained him with basals and workbooks. He described his approach to reading as an incorporation of ideas he gathered from his college experience. He felt that these ideas were so "positively oriented" that he could use the methods associated with them "for the greatest benefit of the student." He also felt that self-esteem and a teacher's own ability to improve their reading would validate their experience as a teacher of reading. Moreover he said further that he "used the basal readers . . . I go beyond those though because of the training I had there . . . with kids looking for meaning in what they are getting at." Presently he was teaching a bilingual 4th grade.

When Ab first met his students at the beginning of the year, he found that his "hardest goal for kids in reading is for them to realize what really interests them and go for that." He liked to give them books to read that interested them. Instead of having the students work on "meaningless dittoes for time-fillers" when they finished reading he trained his students to take out books and read
them. He said "I model for them my idea of not wasting time" and expressed author and her/his style of writing."

As the school year progressed he identified the good readers as "the ones that read at whatever rate they can and just keep at it, the poor readers are the ones who just pick it up and don't see the need yet for how it's going to benefit them personally."

He defined reading comprehension as "so multifaceted I would think the most important thing is how they synthesize what they've read as it compares with what the world is like." In his lower reading group, reading comprehension did not center as much on what the words they were reading as it centered on what they had experienced that was similar.

In his classroom he did not "do the same thing everyday." Often he had a comprehension check, just allowed the students to read, and then got together to review the questions at the end of the story. For those in the top reading groups he gathered "them as a group before we read and say these are some of the words that you may have trouble with" and then he would "have some student who knows what the word is, use it in a sentence and then try to figure out from the context of what the person has said what it means." Unfortunately he did not always have time for that. Often for the sake of time he had them look up words in the dictionary. Although Ab often depended upon the basal and the text from which he and his students could draw meaning, he also considered the students' participation with the text to be important.

Case Study: Ac

This was Ac's second year as a teacher. She attended a local University and was influenced by her assertive discipline training and her observation that "too many
times teachers have to go by the book." Ac graphically outlined her philosophy, saying "You've got to let the kids know where you stand. She never "conned" kids which she felt was one of the outstanding features of her classroom management techniques. She found that "It's good to set your expectations high and to let them know that. But it's also good to be flexible. . . . Personality has a lot to do with reading." On the other hand, she was "afraid to teach reading" because she had always stressed reading in her own life and felt that that had a lot to do with her approaches to reading. For Ac, "If you feel strongly toward a subject you're going to have an inclination to teach that and be creative in teaching that." She also found that "things that can relate to their lives matter. . . . You've got to somehow integrate their personal lives with their curriculum in school . . . I didn't want it to be boring, I didn't want to give them a book and say go read these pages, do the comprehension check, I will check tomorrow and you'll take the test on Friday." She felt that "In order to be the teacher you've always got to be learning. . . . Every year you get a little more experience and a little better. So that's what it's been, it's been more of a trial and error." Ac recommended an "open mind about everything" because otherwise you "stop growing" and then how "are you going to ever teach these kids anything new except going over and over the same things." About reading Ac believed that it "is the key to everything. Your vocabulary expands when you read. . . . Reading is the key to the future." It had had a great deal of impact on her life.

While students were in her fifth grade class she expected them to have an "exposure to different kinds of reading." She believed that "if you approach the teaching of reading in a positive way and show them the things they
can learn" the students would enjoy reading. She also believed reading must be relevant to students' lives.

She defined reading comprehension as "being able to understand what you're reading, grasping the main point . . .," not leaving the little words or defining them perfectly. She felt that if a student could summarize a story in their own words, that was reading comprehension. According to Ac "You don't have to understand every single detail."

She described her approach to reading comprehension as brainstorming "about the title and what do you think the story's about. Get ideas, get feedback, go over questions if you have any questions. . . . That way you have an idea about what they will want in the end." She believed that "Reading takes time. After they've read, usually I go over vocabulary and what they didn't understand." She stressed to her students that you did not need to know each vocabulary word to understand what you are reading.

Case Study: Ad

Ad had been teaching for four years. During his student teaching experience, his cooperating teacher involved him immediately in the teaching process. He also learned how to work in the manual on a daily basis. He attributed his teaching repertoire to that teacher and to many other teachers. "Like picking a basketball team. I pick what I like and I dump what I don't. . . . You've only got so much time to spend and I've noticed even in the last two years there's more of a constraint on your time, so you try to do a little bit of everything." Time constraints affected his repertoire because "you have to teach so much of this and so much of that, and you've got six hours a day and of that some of it is lunch. We don't have a recess anymore." He used strategies in his classroom that he
liked and that seemed to make sense to him. He also used things "that work and things that keep order in the classroom too . . . I think they've got to read everyday. For success in reading, according to Ad, you must do it everyday. Learning to read was "like walking and breathing and sneezing. . . . It should come that naturally. If they're having trouble now, then just practice. . . . You've got to practice reading and do it all the time. . . . Just read everyday."

Ad had very clear expectations of his students. He found that as they entered sixth grade, they "should be able to follow directions . . . read orally fairly well." A teacher must find out where students are and take off from there. He expected his students to come along once he found their levels. During the first three weeks he just did "oral reading, do comprehension and skill checks." He asked them a lot of questions to "find out how they sound. I listen to what they sound like when they read because if they sound like they know what they're saying, then they'll have an easier time." He stayed close to the basal but he did "not live and die by the basal. . . . There's enough in there that I can pick and choose." For many of the things his students read, he asked the same questions but sometimes that "gets old about the basals," but he "wouldn't change the basal." He said, "Between the basal and the work book they teach the skills, the rest is up to the teacher and how you put them together. . . . I get at least two quality pieces of writing a week and everyday they are rewriting what they wrote the day before."

When defining reading comprehension, Ad emphasized reading rate, claiming that if students "go too quickly they have a tendency to gloss over some things and those who have read so slowly have forgotten what it was they were reading in the first place that they don't really
care." He noticed that readers "who are middle of the road are the ones that actually do the best."

When he described the teaching of reading comprehension, he said, "I just do the comprehension checks." He also considers skills a part of reading comprehension emphasizing work book and master sheets. He found that "it hurts sometimes because those students who aren't willing to read through the information...They don't know as much as the other kids who actually read through it and then gone back and answered the questions." He also went over the vocabulary ahead of time and had them read things silently the first time around. After that he paraphrased the second time as the students went through it. Interestingly he finds that "those people who can write have a tendency to read better...it seems to me that the better writers are the better readers." Ad believed "There are a lot more thinking skills involved in writing than there are in reading...Reading at times can be very mindless work. Effective writing is never mindless work." Further he never had "them look words up" and he encouraged oral reading because he had noticed that they "can listen at a much faster rate than they can read themselves."

Case Study: Ae

Ae taught fifth grade. She had had three years experience as an elementary school teacher and the one thing she learned from her student teaching experience was that flexibility was important.

As students entered her classroom she expected that ". . . they're able to read the material that I have here . . . without too much trouble. They have a pretty good-sized vocabulary, and if they don't know a word, they should either be able to figure it out by the context
clues." She wanted them to make sense, to read for meaning and read without stumbling. She felt they should be "able to read with more understanding, and I usually give them something to look for in the beginning of the story, and then, at the end, hopefully they have found those several things." She liked using the comprehension check questions to check for understanding. She wanted them to attack words that they don't know."

Her students "are able to read into things that are not necessarily written out there . . . they think about what has happened, and then they're able to go into it more." Her poor readers, just tried to grasp at material. She thought that the more "they experience written language . . . are dealing with books and written material, and see other people reading," the greater their success. She thought the root of the problem was "in the home, or whatever their environment, where they experience the written word. But, I don't know if that's the only thing." She recognized a low reader "when they're reading along, they don't know a word, they have no way to attack that word, they just look at it. They'll throw in any word." She also thought readers should "develop skills for attacking words."

She defined reading comprehension as the "ability to read and then be able to tell what you've read in your own words . . . because you've read it, you've internalized it, and now you're able to say it back." Reading comprehension also involved telling the main ideas in your own words. Teaching reading comprehension included reading "every day for fifteen minutes," using her own questions. She did not use only worksheets but what she did use she reviewed and then went over the workbook pages, and the assigned workbook pages. Before the nine week test, she took the worksheets and created a review packet.
When she looked for a good answer on worksheets, she looked for "a complete sentence" that repeated part of the question and was "rooted in reading, because we had to do character, setting and plot." She liked to "stay close to my basal, because, it's like a little security blanket. . . . I want to read novels this year, and I want to have them at the three different levels of a novel." She also wanted to stay with skills but not read every single story in the basal. When she thought of reading, she thought "of the skills that are in my basal, and that they're tested on every nine weeks." As much as she liked the basal, she also liked using novels because she wanted to do something a little different.

Case Study: Af

Af, with a Ph.D. in education, had been teaching for three years in her present school district with much more experience coming from elementary training at both public and private schools. Her preservice training included a cooperating teacher who taught from the basal, using workbooks and reading groups where students read out loud.

When students entered her classroom Af hoped that they would be able to read a passage from a book and be able to talk about it or write answers the questions. She wanted them to make sense out of it, sense for themselves, and sense to her as well "because often children make their own sense of things and I think that this is important . . . I think they should have enough experience with words that they should be able to look at a word and make some kind of analysis in terms of meaning." She would rather have them use common sense. She encouraged them to skip words and at the end of the page decide whether they needed to know it. She thought they should be able to get something from the context. "By the time they're done in here they should
have gotten used to reading about lots of different places, lots of different things, gotten turned on by some kinds of reading somehow. The effect that has is that their ability to use context is heightened." She also hoped they could read more expressively and recognized that a good reader did not mean that you could read faster than anybody else. She would "like to get the kid's curiosity and excitement to match that sophistication that comes with 5th grade."

She found that a poor reader was basically "afraid of words." When asked if a poor reader could become a good reader, she said, "... What I tend to do is try to get low reading children with more proficiently reading children and then give the low reading children a lot of support." She suggested that really "good readers don't read every word, if they come to a word they don't know, they let it go... [they] tend to explore before they finally come to the answer." Even mediocre readers, being around good readers, had something to model, they could watch how was done.

For Af, teaching reading comprehension included "... strategies for prereading types of materials... We do that when we start a new chapter, we look through it, we look at the pictures, we talk about what we already know." She liked to model comprehension, to talk about things and believed in "modeling a lot, trying to use the information." She did not see that the answers in comprehension questions were effective for comprehension. She used basals as a source for good ideas. She did not worry about the phonetics and did not do a lot of word attack skills. She did work on the workbook pages in the basal because the Scott Foresman's standardized tests they are required to take had a section on how to use a card catalog and the instructions on the test were difficult to understand. Although Af did not believe in standardized tests she
thought these tests might measure whether the student understood what she read, and it definitely measured if the student could figure out what the correct answer was, which she felt was an important skill.

Case Study: Ag

Ag had been teaching for nine years, working for his first two years as a resource teacher and then as the self-contained, intermediate Learning Disabilities teacher. He received his teacher training in a Masters' program where his student teaching experience extended over a year long period. He student-taught in both regular education, at the second grade level, and special education, as a second-sixth grade resource. His cooperating teacher emphasized the use of texts for reading, using "the teachers' edition... the dittos, we used whatever would tickle their fancy... It had to be somewhat sequential, and logical, some continuity."

He considered reading to be the learning disabled child's biggest problem. "They can't be mainstreamed", he said, because they're reading four or maybe five years below grade level." When asked about the level of students entering his program he offered an example, "I've got a new student this year, new to me, been in the program ever since forever, he's a sixth grader, and he did not know that the letter K was in the alphabet. This is the first year I've hit that low."

He distinguished between a "regular fourth grade reader" and a reader in his class stating "There are lots of differences... early experiences, early successful experiences in school. And the learning disabilities factor, the brain dysfunction plays a good degree in this." Ag felt "It would be much more helpful and they would be reading at a much higher rate had all this come together."
He did believe, though, that his students could become good readers. "They're not stuck where they're at. I have a thousand keys and there's only one key hole for each one." A good reader, according to Ag had "many more skills than when they first came in ... get the meaning out of the story and then possibly a little higher level of skills." He defined reading comprehension as "getting meaning out of written language that is close to or within the general framework of what the author intended it - in written information items. In recreational reading, though, students could just enjoy it.

He taught his class of ten students in a traditional fashion with five groups. These were ability groups assigned from information he had found in their school files. His lessons followed lessons out of a teacher's guide. He had a weekly pattern with words on Friday, skills during the week, sentences on Tuesday and Thursday, and questions on the details of their reading. His approach to comprehension checks depended upon "who's reading it and what it's about. I'd much rather have them find out that they understand the general idea of it and then go on to something exciting and some what if's."

Ag questioned his ability to teach reading. "I'll be the first one to admit that I have not had success with reading programs. Help me, give me suggestions." He felt the "more you run, the better the runner and the more they read, the better the reader. That's where I'm behind because I'm not really shoving this stuff at them." When asked if his students would make it through school, Ag looked worried and felt uncertain about their futures, saying "Those without severe behavior problems will survive and probably the ones ... a lot of them develop personalities to compensate. They'll do okay, they'll do better than surviving."
Case Study: Fa

Fa had been teaching for 17 years, serving as a regular classroom teacher, a supportive teacher/educational specialist and an learning disability/physical handicapped teacher for a large school district. Prior to receiving a teaching degree in Special Education, she received a bachelor's degree in nursing. Although during her student teaching experience, her cooperating teacher was very phonics-oriented and used basals, she felt she had been exposed to many eclectic methods of teaching reading that would work on her special education students. She was presently teaching "fourth, fifth and sixth grade physically handicapped, and these children have about average ability." She also taught a reading group of L.D. students.

She described her philosophy about reading as related to special education, suggesting that "the children's handicaps would lead themselves to a phonics approach and so we generated that type of approach and used the basal readers that followed the phonetic approach." She also used the TROT program (Therapeutic Riding of Tucson) because "Self-esteem is really important, we write about the experience. Sometimes they have to be looking for certain things while they're on the horse." She felt that "reading in this classroom takes place just about everywhere. . . . For some of my students, moving around is important, so we do running to the blackboard, read a sentence, run back and have relays and things like that get them active." She also enjoyed "the writing mode to reading approach because concrete works so well with sensory impaired children."

She defined reading comprehension as being able to "to pick up main idea, given a paragraph or a half a page." It was "being able to pick up and tell about" something. When
she taught reading comprehension she said that "I line them up ahead of time and I say now these are the main ideas I want you to look for . . ." and "I usually tell them to read those questions before they read the story so they know what points the author feels. . . . Very seldom do I make them sit and write the answer because the kids all really fumble with that."

Besides main ideas she usually had them "pick out the main vocabulary words . . . I use it through any subject we're reading." She liked to mainstream her students in reading "because it's one subject that has a little more discussion still in a regular class and they need that whether they're shy or outgoing or whatever." Discussions, she said, "do not show their weak spots, which is of course writing, putting pen on paper, pencil on paper. Most of my students I would say are pretty average . . . they're getting C's in reading from a regular teacher."

Case Study: Fb

Fb was a 22 year veteran teacher with a master's degree who has taught fourth grade for three years at her present school. When asked how she learned to teach the way she did, Fb replied "I do not know . . . I taught reading, basically, eighth grade vocabulary, trying to get their's up . . . I read the manual."

When they enter her classroom she expected her students to "be able to start at grade level in the books that we have to use . . . to be able to write a complete sentence for an answer if a question's given." She wanted them "to be able to read above grade level, especially, in the areas they like, because some of the kids can do that in science books, or whatever." Moreover, Fb felt that "you have to instill, I think, the love of doing it [reading], and the fact that they know they can do it."
She defined reading comprehension as "Being able to understand what you've read. And, express it, not necessarily in writing . . . I do listening with them . . . I read it to them, and they have to listen."

When she taught reading comprehension she did not "always use the basal book . . . With the Readers' Digest skill builders, I have them read a story . . . write the answers, (not in the book) and then, they check them themselves." These readings are "almost individually prescribed (Reader's Digest), it's the same thing with SRA." If she used the literature book she did it as a whole group, reading together and doing an activity that corresponded to it. She thought "that's the way we were supposed to teach reading--every day." Unfortunately, she only taught three days a week in the basal "using all its components, skills charts, the vocabulary charts, the workbooks, the masters, and of course, the book." For grouping she used the placement test that the students were given as well as looked at what they did last year. When reading a story she initially liked to "do the glossary words" and then the students looked up the pronunciation and the meaning. After that they read the story either independently, or they read it as a group around the table. She engaged in considerable work from the manual so she could generate a lot of grades.

Case Study: Fc

Fc had been teaching for nine years with experience in all the intermediate grades and was now teaching fifth grade. Her teaching had been heavily influenced by her college training where she took a one full year reading class in a language arts block. She was also influenced by her student teaching which was a full year experience where
her cooperating teachers were very structured and always followed the text.

When a student entered the fifth grade they "should have word attack skills . . . be able to read orally at their grade level without stumbling . . . be able to transfer that reading into other subjects, and understand what they read." She believed that students should know the meaning of many words . . . know how to write contractions . . . be able to work independently, somewhat, by the fifth grade, to be given directions, and be able to follow them through." By the fifth grade, students should have developed a "larger vocabulary, and be able to use that vocabulary in their oral and written work" as well as have developed more of an appreciation for reading, different types of literature--understanding what the author was trying to tell them." She also found that talking to students about their interests encouraged their reading ability. According to Fc, she "realized that if [she] could get them hooked into some situation in a book" she could interest them in reading. She observed the most important aspect for helping a student a "good reader is to find something that they're interested in reading. If you can find that one key, I spend a lot of time in the library and in the classroom, trying to find the one interesting book, that will hook the kids--hook that one person." For Fc "Once they're reading that, then they're off. They may struggle, but then, they're motivated. . . . I realized that if I could get them hooked into some situation . . ." they would read.

Fc defined reading comprehension as "understanding what is read. Also, it is being able to give that back . . . verbally . . . or in written form." When describing a typical day of reading she said her students began with a story that she talked with them about "so that it will be
interesting to read." She believed that would help students remember what they had read. "A lot of time, I'll set that up by a question. . . . If I know that at the end, I'm going to want to talk to them about what the plot was, or who the characters were, I will also mention that. It will help them to remember." Vocabulary was important to this process. She had "them do two things, like write down, look them up, and write down the pronunciation key, or the word and write down how many meanings there were for the word." She believed that "reading should come first. . . . I teach it first, in the morning . . . I think that probably brings a positive attitude."

For Fd, self-esteem was an important component of a reading program. She said that many of her students were "not connected to school . . . it's like, that's school, and this is home. They don't weave it together." And this caused problems.

Case Study: Fd

In her 17 years as a teacher Fd had worked through the elementary gamut from kindergarten to 5th grade and was now teaching fourth grade. Her training included an introduction to the basal manual by her cooperating teacher. That was the approach she used in her classroom at the time of the initial belief interview.

She expected the students entering her class to have a sense of reading and suggested that "Rather than just teaching the literal meaning of reading, or having them read a story, and having them find literal thoughts, I try to expand it to include the experiences they have had." She wanted to give them a way to relate to the story that they read and said she does that "purely because I've read the research that proves that's how children comprehend and will know the most in reading."
When they left her classroom she found that "during that period they gain a lot of skills." She saw a lot of improvement in their oral reading, and incorporated alot of reading of plays. She used journals and magazines like Instructor Magazine as a good source for creating good lesson plans.

She defined reading comprehension as coming up "with an answer about something that they read that's not the same as mine." She wanted her students to be creative with what they came up with and be "able to communicate it." She considered it her responsibility to share books with her students, but she did not teach reading comprehension every day. When she did it her students worked with one reading group, reading out loud and answering the comprehension check at the end of the chapter. As she chose stories she picked "out one that might be literal, one might be a personal experience of their own."

Case Study: Fe

Fe had taught for nine years. From her cooperating teacher she learned about reading groups, outlining and the use of basals. As a result between her teacher training and her teaching experiences, her teaching philosophy just evolved.

For reading lessons, she picked books that she enjoyed and used "book reports that you do when teaching basals, that the kids have liked reading, or that I've read that are interesting for them." She considered it important to read when her students do. "Using the basal, I felt most uncomfortable teaching reading because I came from a math teaching background. I felt most comfortable teaching math. Social studies also is something that I felt comfortable teaching."
She expected students in her class to "to be able to read social studies . . . with comprehension" and "to read literature." She emphasized reading literature, with the hope that it "becomes as pleasant to them as watching a movie." Technically she expected them to do research. Usually they cannot "when they come into sixth grade so that's a thing we have to work on." She expected them to interact with their reading so that it was not a "passive activity," and she expected them to look for styles of writing. She also expected them to be good listeners, believing that "good listeners are good readers".

For Fe reading comprehension was ". . . the ability to take the information and then use it for some purpose." She used the basal readers to check reading comprehension but she said "I'm kind of split between the basals. I have in the past used the basals. I still pretty much use them. But I don't like the reading material." She used the basal for the skill lessons and to read special stories, yet she also had her students read novels. She had questions for her students and they kept a reading journal to summarize and/or react to what they read. The students also kept track of "any vocabulary words that aren't in the back." When describing classroom activities she said, "We'll do the masters and the workbooks that go with the basal everyday." She did it "with the reading of the books. . . . I think I should be alot less active in the teaching of reading because I think most of their reading time they should spend reading." She viewed her role as that of the questioner. She felt she must make her students think. Furthermore, she saw content-area reading as the place where the "real ability to comprehend" took place. What she did was question the students and then they went over them using the pictures, etc. In her opinion, the students
often got really caught up in details and did not look for main ideas.
APPENDIX D
SUMMARIES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

School A

Session 1

The teachers straggled into the library. Several of them and the principal had to leave the meeting for a 20 minute child study. There was considerable concern and conversation focused on it. As the meeting began the teachers appeared interested but tired. From time to time the principal appeared in the room, sitting by herself.

SD1 provided an overview of the meeting, stating that the group would "figure out where we will go from here," discussing "interests you have, as you look at some of the reading instruction material, as you think about your own frustrations in class, and what you'd like to focus on." She encouraged them to think about what they would "like to focus on in the whole group and what they would like to focus on individually."

SD2 stressed that they did not "want a staff development to lay on people." Then SD1 and SD2 took turns discussing the focuses, observations, and other aspects of the project. When the teachers left for child study, the rest of the group took the opportunity to fill out University forms and ask questions.

When the group returned, SD1 asked for their sense of reading comprehension. Aa and Af dominated the ensuing conversation. Af stated that "pretty much we teach [reading comprehension] all day . . . when the video camera was there we chose practices that would look good for videotaping." She voiced concern about the videotaping and the possible misrepresentation of her understanding of reading comprehension. She asked, "Will you get at the teachers' definitions of reading comprehension?" Aa then
questioned whether anyone had ever considered studying the comparison of reading quantity to reading quality. In other words the study would examine "the theory that those who read more read better, and those who have read more at some point . . . to what extent is the quality of your reading a function of how much, quantity, you have read?" The others were actively listening but not engaging in the discussion. There were no resolutions, just more information to ponder.

Then the belief interviews, done last year, were returned for the teachers to review and correct if necessary. SD1 defined empirical premises and informed the teachers that their empirical premises were marked on the interviews. The empirical premises generated considerable conversation among the participants. As they reviewed their interviews, they recognized themselves in the transcript.

SD1 next introduced her model of teachers' theories of reading. This is a three-dimensional chart which placed the teachers on a continuum. The teachers appeared interested, but speechless. They were ardently trying to figure out who was which dot on the picture. Referring to the model and the interviews someone asked, "Were we smart enough?" This illustrated their apparent discomfort.

Finally SD2 gave the group an assignment. They were to look over the interviews and practice sheets and create the format of future sessions. "What do they want?" The teachers seemed to be concerned that the Staff Developers would be telling them how to do things better. And they seemed, at least several including AE seemed, to be interested in being told how to improve their work. When the meeting ended the teachers quickly dispersed to their rooms and their cars.
During this meeting the teachers were shy and reserved about participating. They listened attentively, but only Aa and Af asked questioned and discussed, with small contributions from Ab. As they stated at the end of the session, they were looking for the right answer and/or the right way to teach reading.

Session 2

Once the group settled down, planning for the individual sessions took place. Two teachers were missing (Ad and Af), so only one meeting was scheduled.

The next segment of the session focused on the belief interviews. SD1 asked for volunteers to discuss their interviews. This request implicitly asked the teachers to reveal themselves to the public. Ag said, "Most people would feel safe among their peers with this faculty." As he continued, he stated that his next interview would be different, more specific. SD1 and SD2 asked him questions as he spoke that revealed what he did in the classroom. He was, in a sense, developing an empirical premise.

The next person to discuss his belief interview was Aa. He remarked on the continuity of his approach. He felt that he could actually match his interview with the videotape. He was quite "happy to see the continuity ... for this grade level anyway." He observed that he has "pretty well established my philosophy of reading."

SD 1 then asked him to provide further details about his philosophy. He responded,

one thing, I eluded to it in here I think, but if I would do the interview again, I think I would make it more clear that I feel a lot of my role in teaching reading comprehension is as a reader myself. I stress to my students that the reason that I know the answers on the comprehension checks is not because I have looked them up in the teachers' guide, but
because I've read the story and I've interacted with the story, and I'm intimately involved with those stories, particularly because I know I'm going to be in class, so I don't just skim them over.

... I am continually asking them questions that are even beyond what are asked in the books. ... I'm trying to reveal to them that there is a lot going on even in a mediocre story, there is a tremendous amount of innuendo and implication. ... It is my being a reader that has put me in the position to model reading comprehension to them. ... It is the investment that I put into it in terms of time and energy . . . into reading. The other part of my philosophy ... I don't really feel there is much I can do in terms of intervention. I can set a good example, I can show kids what I do and think about, but there is no way for me to intervene in the middle of their act of reading and to redirect their attention . . . to do that would be to destroy their act of reading . . . to a large extent they've got to, they must be responsible for this while they are doing it. ... I really am not convinced that my intervention, breaking things down into individual skills, is really going to relate directly to their improving their reading comprehension. It was in there, but I never state it clearly.

Ae thought the interview "sounded like me . . . I realize my philosophy is very immature . . . learning by trial and error . . . I am at the foundation and going up." Ac discussed her "feelings of frustration . . . I have four groups and I am frustrated as to what to do." Ac said that her frustrations about how to deal with the diverse group of students were expressed well. She related some of it to the fact that she was a first year teacher and did not know how to meet the needs to the students. She also said that she did not feel comfortable teaching reading and felt she really needed help.

In response to Ac's frustration, SD2 and Ac's colleagues made suggestions. SD2 mentioned Vygotsky's work; the others talked about ability grouping. This had been an hour of sharing about classroom activities with the teachers offering suggestions to each other.
The third portion of the staff development focused on questioning. The Staff Developers chose questioning as a topic because in the first session the teachers had expressed an interest in it. SD1 said it was "not really about questioning strategies, but about the whole notion of questions, why use them?" The teachers concurred. Therefore SD1 and SD2 asked: "What do we use questions for? What are the themes for questioning?" With each question, lists were written. Because it was getting late, SD2 gave an assignment to "pay attention to the questions they asked in class, collect data ... reflect on the questions and their functions, and do a self-evaluation." She suggested that they actually tape record themselves.

During this session Aa began to elaborate in detail on his philosophy as did the other participants. Their concerns seemed to focus on doing it right. It was Ab in this session who seemed the most concerned about rightness. Their language about their practices and classroom activities seemed hesitant and uncertain at best, checking to see if they were doing it right.

The Staff Developers seemed more confident in their work. SD2 was over-prepared but did not often direct the conversation toward her materials. Instead she allowed the teachers to guide the staff development agenda themselves. In retrospect SD1 and SD2 said that in this session they worked better together and it ran more smoothly.

Session 3

This session began by inviting Ad and Af, absent from last week's meeting, to discuss their interviews. Ad acknowledged that he could not remember his interview very well. SD1 suggested, then, that he take one topic, like ability grouping, and discuss it.
Ad - I still do some of it. . . I started out this year, but as soon as this [the staff development] started, it was sort of hush-hush and not such a good idea. . . . I still do it."

SD1 - What gave you this impression? . . . So you changed?

Ad - Marginally, yes. I changed as far as that goes.

SD1 - How is it working out?

Ad - I don't like it. I like ability groups. I feel like I've got more on track...and may well go back.

SD1 - What was your alternative?

Ad - . . . You and you and you. . . . basically going by numbers. I found that if I do any group then I also have to do the exact same things with all the kids and I don't like doing that.

SD1 assured him that the staff development program was not aimed at forcing teachers to engage in something they did not want to do.

Describing her interview, Af said that she was "grossly embarrassed. I am doing things a little more consciously this year. . . I just now have words for them. I felt like what I said was what I meant." Af claimed (referring to last week's session topic) that she used questions to "ask kids to get connected with their own experiences." She seldom used "questions to get answers", in fact, the purpose was "to get kids into the reading."

The discussion then moved to questions. SD 1 asked the group about the functions list, drawn up last week, "Did they have anything to add to it?" SD2 wanted to know the purpose of questions in reading. Af said that "answers to questions [in the basal] were often wrong." Ab claimed that he did not feel comfortable unless he could have a child defend their response." Af retorted that
... that's when I think they come with their own purpose. They filter it through their own purposes and it comes out catawampus by our point of view, but I've had kids say how they read it, and it was real interesting questioning.

Aa said that he used questions to develop self confidence, "for the purpose of getting kids to stand up for their opinion on things." He said over the past week he discovered that he used the questions in the basal.

It was quite evident that I humbled myself to use the structure put up by the basal reader. I did use the questions that they had in there, and I'm not altogether dissatisfied with those because at least at the sixth grade level they do have a nice share of open-ended type questions. And I think they do have a lot of latitude to inject their own purposes. . . . I read it! I know! They can make their decisions on their own without having to have someone tell them what's right or wrong, and to me without that independence their reading in life is never going to progress beyond reading for somebody else's purposes. And a lot of kids, that's the kind of reading that they learn, and it's a very useful kind of reading to know because there's a lot of people in life who would like you to read for their purposes and not for your own purposes.

He said that he would like to put aside the basal, but there were, according to him, valid reasons for using that text. Specifically, he wanted parents and principals to be able to recognize his reading program.

SD2 probed. She wanted more information about his basal comments. Then Ab talked about his discussion with his students about questions. Misunderstanding the instructions, he looked at student questions. They came up with questions like: What is this word? What does the sentence mean? Am I right? SD2 asked, "What if it's an off-the-wall reason, what then?" and Ab responded that "Teachers must be flexible when kids challenge what's right." Several of the other teachers reported that they
use questioning as a form of developing and assessing student work.

Finally SD2 suggested that the teachers begin to write in journals to facilitate the reflective process. There was little positive response and considerable negative response.

As the sessions progressed, the philosophical notions of the teachers became more and more apparent. Every step of the way Aa presented his notions of both teaching and reading. His views were well-thought-out. This was true for Af as well. Although she had only attended two sessions, her philosophy was becoming apparent in her responses. Aa and Af appeared to be the more vocal of the participants, whereas Ab contributed somewhat and Ac, Ae, Ad and Ag contributed from time to time. It was important to remember as these sessions were examined to realize the momentum developed over time. It was also in this session that accountability was mentioned for the first time by Aa. It later became a major focus of discussions by all teachers.

Session 4

There was no formal beginning to this session. The greeting ran together into the beginning with a discussion of journals. Af, who last week adamantly refused to write, had written a considerable selection. SD2 discussed the importance of prior knowledge, pointing out that everyone had it and suggested that a purpose of journals was to make prior knowledge conscious for the writer. Ae stated that in her journal she wrote that reading comprehension was a picture in the mind.

SD1 commented that she did not write a journal, but did write random notes. She wrote about the role of the staff developer and how hard it was to give responses
sometimes. She said further that it was part of the staff developer's role to think with the group about what was occurring. She said,

This is a different process for us ... I tried to do a little bit of thinking, and then I talked with SD2 about what's going on here, and one of the things we both focused on is when one of you say, "I'm doing this, is it ok?" ... If you noticed, we are both real hesitant about that. ... I was trying to figure out why we are real hesitant when someone says, "I'm doing this and is it ok?" I think it's because we feel that it's real hard to just give feedback. ... Teaching, as you well know, is a really complex process and it's real difficult to "yeah, that's good" or "no, it isn't" without knowing the context and what the purposes are. ... I think part of the role is to think with you ... about what's going on in your classroom and to provide some input if it's necessary, but sometimes it isn't, because you say, "Well, you can come to some conclusion or you can try something different," and it isn't even necessary to come into the content and say here is some information on it. So, our role is evolving. ... We asked what is it about teaching reading that makes it very complex ... that makes it very difficult for anyone to walk in and say yes or no it's right or it's wrong. One of the things that we found is that there are so many different purposes that you talk about for what you're doing when you're teaching reading.

From SD1's commentary the direction turned to a discussion of the purposes and activities involved in reading comprehension and a continuation of the discussion about questioning. SD1 and SD2 had created a matrix (designed from the teachers' language) from which they initiated ideas for discussion. As commented that reading was "a wild and wonderful thing as are those people who do it."

At some point toward the end of the meeting the discussion shifted again to accountability and grading. Fortunately, Principal A was in the room and joined in the discussion.
Prin. A - I see it as fairly disempowering of kids to raise them up as students thinking that the only thing that counts is what someone else thinks about what you do . . . that external feedback is the only kind . . . that something doesn't matter unless there is feedback from the outside. I don't see that as very empowering in the long run. I don't see it . . . I think alot of us maybe are still suffering from that from looking always to some outside place.

Aa - . . . Can't get away from it . . .

Prin. A - They don't have to be given a grade on everything they do . . . we need occasions where they are graded and some that are not.

Af - . . . I think alot of this is fear . . . you were told when you went to school and in alot of your teacher training classes. Ellen Gagne in her cognitive psych articles . . . says children learn better . . . with immediate feedback.

SD1 - . . . Why does it have to be graded? Why can't there be non-graded feedback?

Aa - My fear isn't that they won't learn but that I will lose track of my accountability measures . . . and not remember whose been doing what . . . . I have to justify grades . . .

Ae - . . . I want to be an objective grader . . . I want to be able to justify . . .

Clearly grades and accountability were a major worry for the teachers of School A. What was initially introduced in the last session, just briefly, now appeared as a major concern for the teachers. It almost seemed to be a greater concern than reading or learning. They all wanted to know how best to grade their students. The interesting point here was that they were talking to and with the person to whom they were accountable, and she was giving them carte blanche to do what they wanted with grading. In fact, she did not believe in grading every activity, and they did not seem to believe her. Instead,
they continued to talk about their concerns of grade justification.

Session 5

This session began with a discussion about the repression of the system as the teachers saw it. They all claimed that for 50% of their reading time they must use the basal, although Principal A denied that. Aa brought up an article he was reading about the basal in the Reading Teacher and related it to the grading discussion.

SD1 and SD2 returned the focus of the session to last week's topic, bringing out the matrix. SD2 asked, "Do any of you use webbing in the classroom?" Af responded that they may suggest it in the research, but "I think it's dumb. There is not just one way to teach reading." The discussion flowed along, discussing ways to have students participate in class, and silent reading. Ae used silent reading to encourage her students to "become friends" with the characters. Ad read to his students because things "move along more quickly." Ab said that his "students read a lot faster silently."

The next topic was the assessment of grades. The teachers said that grades were needed to justify what was going on in the classroom. They related a story of one of the assistant superintendents coming into their classrooms without warning and reviewing their planning books. Ad said, "The purpose [for grades] is management and accountability. The kids who work hard will get better grades." The group agreed that grades were given on the basis of effort, quality of product, personality, learning as a process, and mood.

Aa said that "My gut level says reading is an extremely subjective activity . . . with a multitude of responses." He talked despairingly about the constraints
on reading. The experience of reading was subjective "but you need to fit into an objective mold in order" to succeed. Ac stated that "society has made the system the way it is ... what do we do?" In response Af discussed grades, whole language and how grades might be detrimental to reading comprehension. She said that she graded on the basis of what made "my heart sing," yet she felt forced to grade. Aa responded saying that the "grading system hinders reading comprehension," locking students "into a vicious cycle."

It was in this session that a certain level of hostility and resistance became overt. Through quick jokes, "Try to repress your hostility a little more, please!", and innuendo, "Maybe this class was giving him a headache," the participation in the program and the teachers' willingness to engage in the thinking process required here came into question. There were also non-verbal activities such as note-writing and face-making that pointed toward dissatisfaction. The question became, what was the resistance and why was it there.

The overriding concern for grades and the constraints felt by the teachers also became explicit. They felt powerless and driven by the system to do things they say they do not want to do. Aa, for example, felt that students were hindered by the use of grades yet felt compelled to use them creating a contradiction for himself.

Session 6

This meeting was actually cancelled after our arrival because several school programs were scheduled for the next day, and the teachers had extremely tight schedules. Several of the teachers, however, stayed around to chat. SD1 directed the group with a question of "how was your week?" Aa immediately launched into a discussion of the
mixed messages from the district and the feelings of powerlessness. SD1 then asked questions about grades and other incentives for students and SD2 suggested that they design their own report card. Nothing veered them from their feelings of powerlessness. MB suggested that the constraints of one's own personal stamina were more important than the constraints projected by the system.

SD1 and SD2 attempted to change the topic by suggesting that the teachers choose a focus from the research focus sheet to address. They asked, "What do you want to work on?" with the hope that someone would talk with another and as a group would decide what to emphasize. AA immediately attempted to have SD1 and SD2 tell them what should be done. In response SD2 pointed out that they (SD1 and SD2) were not interested in presenting the teachers with anything except topics of interest to the teachers.

Interestingly, the teachers spoke strongly about their feelings of powerlessness, yet wanted the staff developers to tell them what to do. This created serious problems for them as they progressed along in this staff development process. It was important to note that at this point the staff developers had their own feelings of powerlessness and apprehensions about their abilities to reach these teachers, as well as concerns for the interests of the teachers. Prior to this meeting they were considering the cancellation of the Project at this school. Of course, they persevered. They felt that the teachers, in this display of interest, demonstrated that they wanted to continue participating in the program.

Session 7

This was the first session of the new year. SD2 suggested that the teachers "catch us up" on what had been
happening. Ab began by talking about, complete with overhead, how he had employed ideas gathered from the Project. He specifically talked about his own and his students' use of questioning. Then Af described retrospective miscue analysis, which was something she had pursued after her practical argument interview. Af also expressed uncertainty about the use of the focuses, asking "What are the issues? . . . What are the sterling practices that people see . . . with respect to the issue of assessment . . . so I know what to be looking for? . . . Or how I might teach that? . . . What do people consider important?"

Aa discussed his silent reading. He said that with silent reading "don't dwell on each word, you see groups of words." It reminded him of an "accordion process . . . expanding and contracting and narrowing in on things . . . don't have to read each word separately."

The next segment of the session focused on a videotape of a teacher discussing a book with a group from her fifth grade classroom. As they watched the tape, Aa suggested that "... a key to successful reading teaching was related directly to how much the teacher him or herself has been involved with the text on their level." He felt that his "best reading lessons were stories" where he had a very detailed recall of what happened.

The final portion of the session came around again to the focuses and a discussion of what they would do about them. Af suggested that the staff developers tell them about the things they thought "were interesting and exciting." She felt it was "a lot more interesting to hear about something that somebody cares about." Aa said that "it would be good for us to talk about it as a group, because I just went around one by one" without developing consensus. He suggested that each person bring in their
own "pet concern," and he volunteered to discuss his quantity versus quality approach to reading.

The theme of powerlessness continued to prevail. Even when they did not talk about it directly, the teachers asked the staff developers for their ideas about practices. They wanted to be told what to do.

Session 8

The teachers had been given an article on assessment to read, but no one had taken the opportunity to read it. SD1, therefore, provided an introduction and suggested they table any discussion of the article until a future meeting.

Ab began talking about his students and the questions they were compiling from their reading. Although he was dissatisfied with them, SD1 and SD2 were encouraging and were very impressed with the caliber of questions his students had generated. Quickly the discussion moved to a discussion of students and their abilities. This topic had not been discussed in depth before during a session. Ac described the lives of School A's students as geared toward survival. She believed the students were coming from a point of view where anything they did learn wouldn't be able to be shared with anyone in the family because a lot of times the families are just not there to listen . . . with these kids it's more difficult to grasp concepts.

It became apparent that home environment was very important to the teachers, as well as a scapegoat for school problems. Ag identified his students as "below average or lower than that. . . ." In a long description of the poor quality of his students, Ag listed their many faults. At some point SD2 responded to Ag, cutting him off and pointing out the derogatory nature of his comments. Although she almost immediately apologized for the intensity of her feelings, which appeared to surprise even
her, at least one person rose to defend Ag. Curiously, it was Ac, who last year in her belief interview seemed so concerned with her students' well-being. Now she too viewed the students as low quality. She pointed out that Ag was not demeaning the students, he was just speaking the truth.

In the next segment of the meeting SD2 expressed frustration because she had been unable to convey the importance of various strategies. She wanted to see the teachers experiment with these activities with the hope that they would be successful in their classrooms. Bringing up a subject from the last session, she continued with a discussion about silent versus oral reading. SD1 asked "if 4th - 6th grade is the time to develop strategies for reading differently?" The teachers pursued this question which evolved into a discussion about the distinctions between narrative and expository writing. Once again Aa brought up the issue of quantity versus quality of reading. Interestingly, SD2 brought the discussion back to home environment. She asked, "How could school have made a difference with these students? . . . making them aware that independent reading is a viable activity?" Aa responded that "it is an option in life to pick up a book and read . . . and this is a fairly good school for parental support . . . [reading provides] a healthy dose of reality."

During the next portion of the session, Aa launched into a long, careful description of his quality/quantity issue. He characterized the way that he kept track of the amount of students' reading which was generated from his chagrin with teaching reading. Again the issue of home environment appeared. Aa graphically explored the differences for students, the successes and failures. SD2 discussed the social expectations of reading and home and
how some students could not read at home because of what was occurring or did not read at home as they were taught at school. She pointed out that "At this school, in the belief interviews, the teachers rarely mentioned home as a factor in reading. Yet when they talk, they clearly think it is an important issue." Aa suggested that it was because the teachers just knew how "important it is and just didn't say anything." Finally Aa returned to his notion that reading was a lonely activity, done by a student by her/himself for her/himself.

Although teachers had discussed home environment from time to time in informal interviews and a few teachers had mentioned home environment in their initial belief interviews, it was not a topic often vocalized. It was, however, an issue of strong belief in the group session. All of the teachers seemed to agree that the student's home environment affected, usually adversely, their school experience. This, of course, reflected upon the issue of teachers' powerlessness, because teachers had nothing to do with students' home environment.

Session 9

Report cards were due into the principal's office on the next day. Appropriately the session's topic was assessment. What was objective? What was subjective? were the questions that they began to explore. Ad said, "I tell them exactly what subjective things I'm going to look for, and then when I'm done, I give it an objective grade." Af suggested that "if someone would [evaluate] score it, and we came up with the same score, that's objective!" She wanted to use others' measures so that she did not have to develop it herself. SD1 pressed the teachers to elaborate upon their positions about grading. "Are you getting a true measure of each student" with their grading system?
"What do grades reflect?" Aa questioned the ITBS and whether that test was objective. Af pleaded with the group to define "A." A great discussion of grades, reliability, and objectivity ensued. Eventually they began to discuss comprehension questions and how they might be used for grading. Finally, Aa said they "needed the skills of diplomats," and Ac suggested a "workshop in district politics."

During this session both SD1 and SD2 tried very hard to extract the teachers' thinking about grades from them. They attempted to have the teachers justify why they do what they do. It was, in a sense, hard on the teachers because clearly they had not thought about a lot of this before. These teachers wanted to come up with 44 grades for each student so that they could have objective grades in their grade books.

Session 10

Prior to this meeting we had heard that several teachers were dissatisfied with last week's session. Their dissatisfaction seemed to have been provoked by the intensity with which SD1 and SD2 engaged, when they asked questions about grades. The teachers did not like it. The session began with SD1 asking what the group would like to talk about. Aa, Ad, and Af immediately said "not me" when asked if they had anything to discuss. Finally, Ac jumped in, after a long silence, stating that the group had met at lunch and realized that they were unclear about the direction of the project. Ag said that the Project seemed to "present a best way of doing reading," unfortunately he was unclear which way they were presenting. He wanted "definite boundaries" and "more structure." Ac suggested that we "choose three practices and tell how they worked"
out in the classroom . . . that would be more effective."

Further, she said that

... if we have a certain way of doing something, and
it's not necessarily agreed upon by you two or the
whole group, ... then we are made to feel ... that
it may not necessarily be the best way. ... It's
kind of like not said, but it's an undertone of,
"Well, couldn't you do it this way." ... I'm not
sure now of the purpose, in the beginning I was, of
why we're here . . . what are we getting at? . . . How
is this helping my program. . . . A lot of times I
feel like it's a rap session to talk about what
happened in class. Maybe that's what it is, and you
are getting input from that, but I'm not understanding
how it's helping us. I can see how we may be helping
you with the research, but in turn, it was supposed to
be a give and take and for some reason I'm not
understanding the other side. What it is we are
taking with us?"

She also was confused about whether or not to approach the
researchers.

Af continued,

I think what we are putting out is, "This is what I
do, how can I do it better?", not "This is what I do,
what's wrong with it?", and that's a real fine
distinction. ... I kind of thought, when we started,
that somehow the idea was to help be the best kind of
Af kind of reading teacher and for Ag to be the best
Ag kind of reading teachers . . . to help each of us
be the best kind of reading teacher that we are, . . .
and I got a little confused. . . . I started feeling
like there was somehow a best way, but I'm not real
clear what the best way is. . . ."

Ag equated the experience of the staff development to
removing "the shell" and being revealed, "laying it on the
line." He felt very vulnerable because there was "more
emotion in this one." The other staff developments had
been just cut and dried.

The teachers continued to offer a critique of the
staff development and their declared lack of clarity about
it. Af asserted that much of her practices had "been
changed by my peers' practices. . . . There are several
things Aa has said and several thing Ag has said" about which she had thought long and hard. Ab affirmed this, saying that his "awareness has been awakened. . . . I'm not as comfortable with them [basals], as I have been in the past."

SD1, at this point, began to talk about her own feelings of deep involvement in the project. She said, 

. . . my sense is that teaching is a highly complex, extraordinarily difficult task. There is every reason in the world for people to feel like this is almost overwhelming. . . . More and more is being laid on teaching from the state level, from school district level, from the federal level and this sense of lack of power, this sense of I can't do what I want to do in the classroom because X, Y and Z out there. There's this, there's that, there's the school board. There's very, very real concerns, . . . and as I try to think through what that does to teachers to have continually that feeling of less and less power over what I can do in the classroom, I see it as divorcing actions from beliefs and understandings . . . . What reflection does, is allow you to then bring these two together--here's what I'm doing and here's why I'm doing it. From this theoretical sense that I've got in my head about this is a good practice, maybe it's not such a good practice, but I am able to think about that and assess it without all this other stuff out there that tells me I ought to be doing other things, . . . and divorce teachers from the ability to look at actions and assess them with their own personal theory . . . . my sense is the only way to get back that power . . . is to continue to reflect and understand what you are doing in relationship to subject matter and what the kids are learning . . . . to develop those ways of thinking that are more than just a view of teaching being an extension of yourself. . . . Teaching is more than just an extension of ourselves. . . . One of the things I hoped to see from the staff development was not other things done in the classroom, but ways of thinking about what is going on in the classroom that would truly empower you as teachers, so you would no longer have to justify things that you do in the classroom as something from out there that's pushing you to do it, but this is my personal theory.

SD1 suggested that she wanted to help the teachers "get back their power" and suggested that a way to "get the
power back" was to "continue to reflect and understand" their practices and be able to separate themselves from their practices to examine them.

Ac suggested that what she would like was a "bag of tricks," a list to add to her repertoire that she could pick from when needed. She would rather have had that than discussions. Aa agreed. Aa pointed out that there was one thing that was truly threatening to teachers and any one else, that was, discussing the thinking about/not thinking about of what was being done/not being done.

The short second segment, of this session focused on the focuses with SD2 talking about different reading practices. One of the frustrations for SD2 was that she rarely had the opportunity to discuss the various accumulated practices in depth. This portion of the staff development came toward the end of any session, usually right before it was time to leave.

This was an interesting session. Rather than waiting again for the staff developers to tell them what to do, the teachers spoke out about their feelings regarding the group and how they want/wanted the group to be. This appeared to be something that had built up over time. The fact that this staff development program was very different from other staff developments they had attended caused some consternation. They did not know what to expect and they were now dissatisfied. The important point, however, was not to focus on the dissatisfaction. It was possible that no matter what type of session they might have attended, they would have felt dissatisfied. The important focus was the powerful move the teachers took when they expressed themselves. During this session the teachers asserted themselves.
Session 11
SD2 began this session asking what the teachers "would like to say about this week?" There was little response. SD1 then asked, "What is the role of the teacher?" They began to discuss what it meant to be an authentic teacher in an authentic classroom. In response, Ac expressed her concern about the degrees of control in the classroom. She was unsure about maintaining any control.

The discussion of authenticity became an exchange about authenticity in reading. Aa asked, "To what extent is reading a subordination to an author? . . . Who is the author? . . . Is the meaning in the text?" For Aa the author had control of the reading experience. That is, whatever the author said was the only way to interpret that text. His world was a world of right or wrong. There were no alternative possibilities. SD2 drew a picture of reading where the author was a funnel through which the story flows. The story then met up with the reader, who was also a funnel through which the story flowed. In this manner the author constructed the story, and the reader reconstructed the story, adding her/his own experience.

The final discussion of the session revolved around the impact of the study. School A had decided that they had gone far enough, and that there would be no more group meetings, although they would continue to meet individually with the research assistant assigned to the school. Aa was pleased with his participation in the program. He stated that he considered the discussions to be the "most viable thing I've gotten out of the whole deal, . . . that's the kind of food that I personally need in order to keep my own teaching progressive and vibrant. I need less of the specific skill inservice." Af suggested that the teachers form a teacher support group that could meet periodically to discuss practices. She said it was "just sharing that
has been so supportive." The others concurred in varying degrees.

School F

Session 1

Although the teachers appeared tired as they walked into the house, they were nonetheless interested and, to some degree, excited about the staff development. SD1 began the meeting with an introduction of the project, guaranteeing that the teachers would understand the purpose of the staff development. Initially, SD1 stated that "What we want to figure out is, is there an area or several areas of interest that you'd like to cover," and that there were two aspects to the staff development. There was the individual aspect where the teachers would talk with the staff developers "about what you'll see on the videotapes," and the group aspect where, as a group, the teachers would discuss issues of their choosing. She wanted to discern (a) how the staff development will be organized, and (b) what the areas are that the teachers want to cover. She explained that the Staff Developers were "not coming in with a package" and telling the teachers the way to do it. Instead, the program had many alternatives and "depending on what you all are interested in and your particular styles of teaching, we can help you enhance that," but "we don't have a package." At this point questions from the group were addressed.

Fd expressed concern about the evaluation of students. She was concerned because one of the teachers was having a difficult time with the way she was working with the slower students. She also wanted to know how you fit a student into the classroom without taking a lot of time. She felt that everything she did, while being videotaped, was based on what the "research says works. I did motivational
activities, skills, all from the basal reader and cooperative learning." She was not sure, though, what the teacher said about "... what they got out of the story. How do I find out? ... I could have them do the comprehension questions at the end of the story," except she did not want to teach like that anymore. She questioned how she could evaluate her students. Fb shared that concern and stated her concerns about grade justification. For her, the "whole thing boils down to where you 'have to.' You have to come up with some kind of grade that you can give." She thought it would be great if you "didn't have to give them grades," but "in everything you do you have to give a grade ... you are locked in." What's more, at School F, the principal checked the grades.

Fc wanted to know how to meet the needs of students amidst so much diversity. Fc could not do this year what she did last year. This year her students were out of control. (Last year her students worked with novels and stories. This year she only used basals and demanded a lot of discipline.) Fc also expressed boredom with the basal reader, but questioned what she can do. She said she had evaluated with novels, yet was concerned with using novels with this class. Fd was glad to hear that, however, she wanted to know more about how to evaluate that when using novels. She said it was good "to know someone else deviates from the basal."

The teachers began discovering who had similar beliefs, as if they had not listened to each other or talked with each other before this meeting. There appeared to be little cohesiveness, yet there was something that kept them hanging together. There were shared perceptions of students, the students in Fe's class, for example, were bad, unruly, and simply had too many boys.
SD2 when discussing practices, described this project staff development as aiming toward the teachers, and discussed the research base reviewing the entire list of practices. Fd asked about the research base of the Illinois test. She questioned its value for her students.

SD1 discussed the observations from which the list of practices was taken. She explained the observations and reviewed the handouts. As they explained the project, she stated that the motivation for writing the proposal was that the funding agency claimed that teachers were not using research-based practices. In fact, they were. SD2 at this point once again talked about the teachers' roles and how the researchers had misunderstood what teachers did.

The interviews were then distributed and SD1 explained them. She described the empirical premises as what people had in mind about the way the world worked. They immediately attempted to recognize themselves and others in them.

SD1 followed up this discussion with an explanation of her model of teachers' theories of reading, explaining each quadrant. The teachers tried to find their dots.

At the end of the meeting the teachers negotiated for meeting dates and times. SD2 reminded the group that "the design is to respond to your special needs--to do what you all want to do."

Overall, the questions focused on practices and evaluation, especially how to evaluate students without an emphasis on the "right and wrong" of it. They wanted to investigate alternatives. They were also concerned with the different ability levels of the students.
Session 2

SD 1 began the meeting with a discussion of assessing reading comprehension, which was a major focus of the last session. She felt that the first question had to do with what reading comprehension was. She asked, "What activities are kids doing, when they are learning reading comprehension?" The teachers' responses included silent reading and questioning, written direction, writing their own stories, discussion--sharing their reading experiences, focusing attention prior to the lesson, and comprehension check (not just a teacher assessment). SD1 probed asking, "When the students are doing these things, how would you talk about them?" The teachers defined what comprehension meant to them. SD1 probed more strongly, asking, "How do these skills related to reading comprehension?" Fa said that skills were ". . . the foundation . . . you need to know them. You need these tools." SD1 said, "To comprehend text, do you need to know skills?" Fa pointed out that "you don't need to recognize a word as a compound word, for example, but you need to be able to read it." Fd suggested that "I know in my heart that my students are reading ten times more than probably other students. . . . I don't know what's working, but I'm not emphasizing skills at all . . . everything is done in a cooperative fashion." Reading skills and word attack definitions were, according to some, dependent upon the teacher. SD2 suggested that teachers seemed to be saying that there was an emphasis on reading skills and, perhaps, it should be on comprehension. At this point the conversation turned to accountability/assessment and why it was a problem.

From year to year according to the teachers, there were cards kept on students. "What is comprehension?" pressed SD1, what was the concern of what happens from one
year to the next? SD2 stated that it was "real hard to figure out if a student is reading in silent reading. How do you codify it?" She pressed the teachers about the whys and wherefores. She questioned what information was passed on. They responded "... mostly skills information." Fd was more concerned with accountability. SD1 identified the issue as accountability not just assessment. Fd agreed.

The basal reader became the next topic of discussion. Fa said that "we buy into a package deal ... at least district does." Fc said she wanted "to be able to spend a day on reading." Fd claimed she "never made reading a main focal point." She sets a theme for the month, and each year she built on those themes. Fd also hated teaching reading the traditional way, because to her teaching reading is teaching skills. Fe said she did not like to teach reading, unless the focus was on the content. Fd said her goal for her children was for them to learn to love reading. Fe suggested that of the fluency of language brought a real understanding. Fd said that the basal skills ". . . don't relate to fourth graders. They are not relevant to them . . . the tests aren't good tests" and the worksheets are "stupid." I "did it for 17 years" and she claimed expertise. Fc used "some workbook assignments because it builds self-concept."

"What was the basal?" was the question discussed by the teachers. "What was the barrier to not using the basal?", SD1 asked. Fb asked, "How do you assess your students?" Their concern for grades appeared to emanate from the principal's policy of checking grades in the grade book.

From their conversations it sounded as if these teachers were just getting to know what each other was doing. They began distinguishing between skills and reading, discussing principal F and complaining that he
did not treat them equitably. Fc said that in the 1960s the basal worked, but now it no longer worked. Fd also expressed excitement because "they" were coming over to her side. Mb said that "we never talked before and probably talked too much." SD2 reassured her and stated that teachers had their own words, own ways, own language.

Furthermore, SD2 stated that there were the fundamental issues of the staff development process, because when these issues were understood and worked out, the teachers could work from there. But if there were barriers, these things had to be dealt with initially and developed into a shared understanding.

Mb, the school curriculum specialist, attended every meeting. Although she attempted to dominate the language, the direction, and the tenor of the meetings, those attempts were stopped cold at this meeting. This occurred when SD1 and SD2 modeled the polite challenge of her direction, as Mb stressed the importance of parents and how they complained when there was not appropriate assessment. SD1 pressed about why parents complained, to whom they complained, the number of complaints, and whose parents complained. SD2 cited Brice-Heath and her study of home and school to propose a different way of thinking. That challenge seemed to open the doors for the teachers to challenge her thinking as well. Once this occurred in this session, Mb no longer tended to dominate or drive the discussions. She became just another participant.

Session 3

Before the meeting began, SD2 cleared the air and apologized for the miscommunication about what had occurred at School F prior to the staff development. SD2 assumed there was a certain agenda, the teachers thought there was another. She then described the plan as she saw it, which
involved a presentation of practices about literature groups by a research associate and the videotaping of modelling. Plus the teachers were to have worked with the focuses, choosing a focus, then modelling a practice within it, or the research associate would model it. It would be videotaped, and then it would be discussed in the group. The teachers were not adverse to it, they just did not recognize it as their own. SD2 then presented her alternative plan. She would review the focuses, because she felt they were misunderstood, and would present a videotape of a teacher’s lesson that modelled what would have been done at School F.

The initial discussion focused on a conflict management program that took the students out of the classroom during reading time. In this case approximately half the students were gone from each classroom. This was not the only program that removed students from the class or the only days when it occurred. The teachers identified this as a major problem. The discussion expanded to include reading and the basal in the context of the focuses. SD2 clarified focuses and explained that the teachers would then be better able to choose with which to work. She emphasized the research on prior knowledge and provided information about reading research, prereading/reading, and paying attention to prior knowledge.

Fa discussed the prior knowledge of teachers explaining that teachers background experience helped build their knowledge for the classroom. SD1 suggested the importance of developing a shared knowledge of the teachers and students. This moved into a discussion of students use of books in the classroom. Fb claimed that students did not reread books. SD2 disputed that, citing her son and his friends as evidence. Fb then pointed to the difference between classroom reading and "other" reading.
Fd suggested that home and what was important there had a lot to do with whether students read and how they read. SD1 asked whether kids knew why they selected certain books. Changing the subject, Fd asked about the use of journals in the classroom. SD2 extended the question to include a question about the handling of a teacher's responses to all those journals. Fc said that she had used journals for the development of writing skills and punctuation, but they took considerable time to grade. Fa used them one day a week with students writing in an open-ended way. A research associate discussed her positive experiences with journals, and how she enjoyed reading her students' work. Fd brought the focus back to journals and their use with reading. SD1 said that meanings changed as they were discussed. She stated that "as we write our meanings change. . . . It is important to read, write and hear about things for a "rich construction of meaning." They did change as they considered different points for the journal, from reading and other students. Fe asked about book reports. Fe said she used book reports to hear about the books that her students read. But Fd wondered if teachers could "figure out if kids read the book from reading a book report?" The journal idea especially appealed to her. SD1 warned that the teacher should not "give formula questions, if you don't want formula answers."

Mb brought up the issue of accountability to parents and Fa claimed that parents wanted to know the criteria for grades. They were concerned with testing and grading to please the parents. SD2 suggested that someone needed to tell the parents what the testing meant and why it was done. Fe questioned what teachers did when kids wanted certain grades. How did her colleagues handle that? Fa asked specifically how Fd would handle that. Fd said that
she had had a horrible insight last night. "I judged ... kids on their reading ... using a test in one of the scholastic magazines." She said she had the opportunity to look at what a test made her do. "When kids scored a certain way," for a moment she thought it indicated where they needed help. This pointed to the "power of the test-makers," because it indicated that the test-makers knew more about the kids than the teachers knew about testing. Mb pointed out that kids were conditioned for grades, too, and that parents were connected to school through worksheets. SD2 asserted then that "It's our job to show them it doesn't have to be that way."

The group watched the videotape of KS which was followed by a group discussion. Fb discussed "being stuck in the old traditional ways of teaching." The teachers really engaged in a serious discussion about teaching.

Session 4

SD2 began the meeting asking, "What's happening?" and provided an agenda, which included a discussion of what's happening, a follow-up on background knowledge, and a discussion of the tape of the research associate in Fd's classroom. Fb said she wanted to view modelling and wanted someone to model use of the basal, but the research associate assigned to the school refused. SD2 assured the teachers that the research associate might be opposed to that type of modelling, but the Project was not and that the Project staff would find someone to model practices for her.

The teachers then discussed the differences between the basal reader and the literature books. Fd agreed to lend her practical argument videotape to Fb. She felt it would be a good example of the use of literature and the basal. Fb also wanted evaluation information. Fa said, "I
don't think I ever thought so much about reading in my entire life. I'm also doing a lot of pleasure reading." In her classroom they read at least 15 minutes a day and read silently as well. She also worked with her students on a biography and a timeline of a person's life.

Fd announced that a speaker, Dr. Jim Flood, would be in Tucson to celebrate the "Love of Reading Week." She also announced that she had started using novels "I really love it. At first I was terrified, . . . but now I love it. There are three different books. I give them vocabulary every day, and I give them questions every day. They don't have to do drill stuff."

From there, SD2 raised the issue of the vocabulary controversy. Some believed a "good vocabulary leads to good reading comprehension." There were also people who opposed that. Fe talked about the use of vocabulary and how she did not necessarily like looking up words, but sometimes she did that. Quickly, SD2 demonstrated one way of working with students and prior knowledge.

Then Fd talked about the videotape that was done in her classroom. She felt that writing was really the focus of the research assistant's presentation. The presentation revolved around Roald Dahl's work and the current of his writing as it flowed from his childhood experiences. The group watched the videotape.

Fe asked how the research associate would have evaluated the students. SD2 was impressed with how much the students had read on his work. There were many questions for Fd. Fe talked about her preoccupation with wanting students to demonstrate civilized human behavior.

SD2 talked about ways to open the students up. She was really pressing the teachers to think about different ways to reach the students. What teacher actions would bring the students to talk a lot in a group?
Fa said the study helped her listen to the students in a different way and build more on what the students said. SD2 said that knowing the history of the classroom can propel ideas further.

**Session 5**

SD1 began with a review of what happened during the last session. Each teacher helped fill in the picture. Fa said that she had tried concept analysis and described how it worked in her classroom. She felt it had been very successful. SD1 asked logistical questions like "Did it work?" and "Did it take an excessive amount of time?" Then SD1 began to reveal her practical argument about the concept analysis with why she had used this practice and where she had used it, and when she had used it, and the value of the practice.

SD2 then proceeded to discuss concept analysis as a pre-reading practice in detail. As the teachers listened and learned, they discussed how they might adapt the process for their classrooms. Fa worried about how this activity worked with building the self-concept of her students.

The comments evolved into a discussion of the district gifted program and why certain activities, where there were no right or wrong answers, were not used in the regular classrooms. In the gifted programs the students were assessed on processes rather than outcomes. SD1 challenged, "How would it be if you got that [type of teaching] in the regular classroom?" The teachers see the dilemma of assessment, when contrasting the regular student programs and the gifted student programs, but continued to fall back upon the regular right/wrong programs. Even when Mb talked about the shift her own son experienced, when the emphasis was taken off the "right" way of doing things, she
still maintained that the gifted program strategies were not for everyone. The poorer students could not do it, she said.

S21 then related the experience she had with a student teacher who ran a gifted program with regular students. He worked them at their own pace and was quite successful. She talked about encouraging students to take risks versus wanting them to "get it right" the first time. She asked, "How can these expectations be broken?"

The discussion shifted to grading. Fa suggested that grading was something that teachers needed to focus on philosophically. Teachers needed to recognize that students came to school with knowledge. The "old way was that only we had knowledge, it was rote learning." The new way involved the recognition of the students' knowledge. We needed to "acknowledge that they are neat kids. . . . We want to know what's inside and draw on that . . . it is the teacher's job to draw that out." Fa talked about the reward system at School F for grades. She said that acknowledging only a few students for their grades created a "bad self-esteem issue" and was done because teachers "have to cover our tails." She pointed out that it was also true at School F that the Principal required a certain number of grades. Several teachers expressed fear, because the Principal said he would not support them if the parents challenged their grades. Fa said that she gave grades because someone in special education said that "I needed to do it." A research associate suggested a narrative rather than a letter grade. Fa said, "It would take too long."

The next portion of the session was devoted to the viewing of the videotape and a discussion of the work done by a research associate in Fb's class. It eventually became a discussion of certain students in the room and how
the research associate might work with those students and why.

After the session ended Mb said that the Principal was feeling left out of the meetings, and she thought he should be invited. SD2 said, "Well, should he come? This is your program, what do you want?" Fb responded that if he came, "I'll stay home that day." SD2 warned against that and stressed that this was a decision to be made by the teachers. There was no resolve.

Session 6

There was no formal beginning to this session. Everyone seemed to enter talking and that conversation seemed to lead into the staff development itself. Initially Mb and Fd discussed a conference they attended. Mb listed the books she ordered, and Fd talked about the sessions she had attended. Mb proposed buying books and having the teachers that used them create concepts sheets and vocabulary sheets that would be kept in the resource room. She wanted to encourage the teachers to try different ideas but viewed the students as "still in the worksheet mode."

At this point a discussion began about the literature versus basal approach to reading. SD2 suggested that literature used "authentic stories," whereas the basal readers used stories that were excerpted from other texts and were then abridged and/or changed around. The issue then centered around the activities following reading. Fd said that the questions in the comprehension check "always focused on right or wrong answers," and she had a problem with always looking for right/wrong answers. Fc said that if a student's answer differed from the book answer she said, "I really think you could see it both ways," with the hope of building the student's self-esteem. Fc said
that "What makes the basal less than satisfactory is that they want to short circuit learning." In other words, they had prescribed answers that suffocated creativity. SD2 asked, "How can you change that?" Fe suggested that the students do the questions together. This brought up the issue of student feedback. Fe wondered how she could provide feedback while the student was working on the project. When she graded papers, she wanted the students with her so that she could provide on-the-spot feedback rather than responding after it was turned in and completed. Several other teachers encouraged doing more writing, particularly writing drafts and sharing them with each other.

The next portion of the staff development focused on the videotape of a research associate modelling brainstorming in Fb's classroom. The research associate described her experience, and Fb talked about her experience as an observer.

Finally in this session Mb expressed concern that when her students were reading novels, they did not often see it as reading. As an assignment the teachers decided they would ask their students about what they thought reading was, so that the teachers could begin to elaborate on those ideas.

Session 7

The session began with a "what's new" question. Fd said that she had "started with three new novels." Fe asked how her students determined if the novel was hard. Fd discussed her criteria for helping the students choose a book. Fe said that she liked using novels, and she liked to have all of the students read all of the novels. Mb brought the adoption of the basal into the discussion about
literature and began promoting the new basal literature series.

Fd then turned the discussion toward authenticity, comparing the abridged basal with an authentic piece. Fa identified a book as an art form. Fe offered suggestions of practices that might be used to work with students and novels. Fa said, "What do you do with skills and spelling?" The teachers pondered this at length.

The topic of outlining was raised in relation to students talking about what they have read. They wanted to know how to teach outlining. SD2 wondered if it was a worthwhile practice. Fc said that she taught outlining by having the students outline their lives. Fd wanted to know "What do you do in the writer's workshop?" SD2 suggested that the students should write a story and then attempt to outline that story. In the process of outlining the story, they would learn outlining. Fd really liked that idea. A research associate suggested that they do character sketches in twosomes, where they attempted to understand each others' characters from the writing. Fd said that she used map drawing to help the students learn outlining. Mb described her classroom experience, where her students had to write several pages and then read it to a partner who, in turn, had to title the piece. If the title matched, the writing was clear. Fd said that she was "not about to worry about outlining . . . I'm just glad they write." Fc complained about the students concern for page length. Fa wondered about grammar and spelling. "My kids get worried . . . I don't care . . . but they do." Fe suggested that Fa should have her students dictate to a friend. SD2 stated that "errors help make sense . . . use a real story . . . the only reason for grammar and spelling is to help make sense . . . use their real stories." She suggested having a partner read the story out loud for sensemaking.
At the break the teachers designed the next staff development. They wanted to meet as a literature group. They wanted to meet and discuss a book, or books, that they chose and work from there. On the return from a break SD2 asked, "What makes a good practice?" She mentioned briefly several ideas she had gathered about background knowledge from her consulting trip. The teachers took copious notes.

The next segment looked at the students' responses to what they thought reading was. Mb related a story of a student who said he did not care about length or whether he could read every word, he just wanted to read about battles. Fe mentioned the good aspects of the basal, that it provided structure to the students who needed it. Fe then revealed her own story. "I never learned to read in elementary school... In my senior year I said I can't go to college. I can't read. They gave me a test and I scored at the fourth grade level." She went to junior college. She underscored the fact that the basal did not help her, and the teacher's strategies more than undermined her self-esteem. She taught herself to read. "You become a reader when you find something that grabs you." She said she "learned phonics in junior college" and basically built up her self-confidence, but now she must consciously drop "the old way" to read sometimes. For Fe the "hardest thing for me is to put kids into groups."

The session ended with an elaborate discussion of different students and their needs.

Session 8

This final session came just three weeks before the end of school. Consequently, much of the initial conversation focused on the school, the renovation process it will undergo this summer, the fall schedule, and the job location shifts of certain teachers. Plus, several
teachers were looking at the novels SD2 had placed around the room for them to investigate.

SD1 asked, "What's been going on?" And the teachers unfolded and described the past few weeks. Four of the five teachers were working with books. Three were working with novels and one of the teachers was using biographers. The other teacher was working with an old reading series of plays. Her students were acting out stories and having a great time. The teachers were all quite pleased with what they had undertaken.

From here the discussion turned to a discussion of the novel they had chosen to read, Arthur, for the Very First Time by Patricia MacLainhan. Each reader discussed their interpretation of the title and the text. They also identified the aspects about which they felt the strongest. Several teachers were reading the story to their students. It became apparent that each reader had his/her own and quite individual interpretations.

As the topic shifted to using novels with students, Fc asked what her colleagues did when introducing a novel, "Do you read the back of the book to your students?" Her colleagues responded with suggestions about what to do and descriptions of what they had done. Some read a line or two, others did not read anything as an introduction.

SD2 pointed out the importance of prior knowledge, stating that students "need something to motivate them" and prior knowledge can be that something. She used, as an example, the various interpretations presented by the teacher about the novel they read, and said "meanings will never be the same." This was followed by a discussion of the authenticity of text and whether that authenticity existed in the basal. Most teachers decided it did not.

Mb pointed out that she really felt that the project had been quite successful, once she realized that
strategies were not going to be offered unless the teachers specifically asked for them. She realized the importance of knowing your beliefs.

As she thought about using literature, Fb pondered assessment. She asked, "How do you assess their work?" Fd said she just walked around and "I tell them I am walking around," and evaluated them on what they see. Fb tried to figure this out "Ok, so it's about participation?" "No," the teachers said. Fb pointed out that the teachers were professionals and that people should accept what they said as that. Fb said, "Then how do you grade . . . how do you know you are judging them fairly?" Fa said "after all, we are professionals" and people should accept whatever the teachers said about grades.

In the final moments the teachers expressed ambiguity. Ambiguity about wanting the year to end, but not wanting the staff development itself to discontinue. They were all very grateful.
Prior to working at the University level, Staff Developer 1 (SD1) taught at the secondary level in public school, for four years, primarily in English and Math. Her experience ranged from a cream of the student population in Malawi, East Africa, to "non-college bound" students in an Eastern inner-city. Her second experience, in the United States, was frustrating because she felt less empowered than in Africa where she felt she made a difference. In the United States, the system was a stumbling block.

From that experience she entered the University system, serving as a graduate assistant. After graduation, with a Ph.D, she held various research jobs, culminating in a Federal research agency. There she ran a research division that funded "a lot of the research on teaching and effective schools and teacher education" for twelve years. Between that job and her tenure at her present Institution she taught at a large Eastern University. Her contacts with teachers came "both in my research, going out observing, and doing supervision of student teachers and contacts with cooperating teachers. Most of the students in courses that I teach at the graduate level are teachers."

Her experience in staff development had been quite broad. She had done workshops and consulting as well as individual work. Most of it had been as she defined it "blow in and blow off and blow out." These experiences lead to her definitions of staff development as "a process in which someone works with a group of teachers, and it could be one of the teachers actually in the group, to
eventually lead to changes in beliefs, understandings, and, possibly, practices."

When asked to define reading comprehension, SD1 said "I feel that reading comprehension is extracting meaning from text." She did not, though, know exactly where to fit skills work into that definition. Although she recognized the need, sometimes, for skills work as a developmental boost, in everyday reading she was not sure where it fit. When considering that some students became better readers than others, she said "I think a lot of it has to be with being developmentally ready. . . . I think that kids who grow up in a heavy print environment . . . are socialized into a print environment. But even still some of those kids have trouble reading."

Teachers impressed her as "doing activities, they are doing things with the kids. What those things are, one can observe, but very often can't understand, can't place into any kind of a framework and neither can the teacher". They used isolated activities, "first you do this then you do that" because "that's the way it is in the book. So, for a lot of things . . . teachers are doing they haven't thought very much about the rationale for doing it." Their rationale, she said, "is that it's in the basal. So, it's not really random, they don't pick it. But maybe the basal people did." She realized that she "can no longer just observe in a classroom" because "You really have to talk to the teachers about what's going on - try to get a history and the teachers' own sense of understanding of kids and what the kids are doing." For SD1, reflection would provide the opportunity "to justify what they're doing and I think with that alone, they would significantly improve because then they would have to say why they are doing an activity." She suggested that it would also encourage them
to think about what the task was, why use it, and what the
students were learning from it.

When discussing change SD1 said "You can't just walk
in with a research-based practice and say try it or do it." She
thought that "research has been poorly used within the
last ten years in a kind of reform environment at the state
and federal level and turned into mandates that are quite
inappropriate." One purpose for the RIS Staff Development
Program at this point was to "get more of a sense of the
inappropriateness of some research findings." Furthermore,
she thought this kind of staff development provided "ways
of thinking." When teachers asked to reflect, according
to SD1, alternative frameworks from which to reflect
provided those "different kinds of constructs and so in a
way they're thinking differently about what's going on in
the classroom." She cautioned, though, that "the notion of
research providing effective practices" was not viable any
more. Additionally she suggested that "It's important to
focus on ways of thinking rather than on practices. . . .
It's really the way of thinking that is important there,
not the practice." She also thought that there needed to be "active participation on the part of the people who are
being developed."

When discussing the practical aspect of the staff
development she found that it added "a clearer notion about
what reflection is and how content can feed into
reflection . . . a major difference between a practical
argument staff development and clinical supervision." She
also pointed to a vast difference between beginning and
experienced teachers. She found the differences rest with
the empirical premises because "the experienced teachers
are the ones with the empirical premises and the beginning
teachers don't have many." She also said the staff
development was "very much focused on the beliefs of the
practitioners and on our own beliefs, which are changing.

A staff developer needed to learn something to create good staff development program. She also believed that beliefs were a critical feature "and in a sense everything revolves around that. The practical arguments are categories of beliefs, value premises and empirical premises, so I see them as really critical." SD1 felt that a critical issue was bringing the teachers' beliefs to the surface. Many times teachers act automatically, according to SD1, and she would like to see them "examine those practices in terms of their own beliefs." When asked how she would know when the teachers had changed, SD1 said "To me I think we can talk about change on the basis of how people have changed the way they talk about something and that that kind of thing is change." She hoped to reverse the trend of staff developers to "put down teachers" and not "give them much power in the process." She believed that this staff development process gave teachers power and brought them into contact with different ways of thinking and research. Moreover she hoped that this staff development process would bring practice and research together in a way that "teachers can live with, understand, and appreciate."

SD1 brought considerable expertise about teachers and teaching, and experience with teachers and teaching, to the RIS Project as well as goals. From her experience she recognized the importance of encouraging teachers to develop their reflective skills and their ability not only identify their own beliefs but their practices as well. Furthermore she expressed a commitment to empower through the staff development process in a way that had not happened often before.
**Staff Developer 2**

SD2 had experience in education working with elementary school through college, teaching in public schools for six years with all kinds of students. She had also done considerable community work, including staff development, throughout her career, which thus far focused on literacy and school improvement.

At the University level SD2 had had considerable contact with public school teachers. She had taught courses on reading in the content areas and Masters' practicums. Her staff development experience included programs in various districts and at various levels.

Her interest in the RIS Project was her concern for the "merging of the research theory and practice . . . and whether or not a staff development program can make research theory and practice come closer together." Her most recent interest extended to "the seemingly limited language that our teachers have for talking about what they do and what they know and how unempowering it is to have such limited language." She maintained that they have a limited vocabulary for talking "about what they do and know that when they're asked to explain that or analyze that or are asked to tell somebody else about it, they can't or they don't do it very well." Furthermore, she asserted that it may be "the very crux of why teachers have very little power, why teachers trust themselves so little and why things like testing and technology in materials can drive curriculum."

She defined reading comprehension as "an interactive dialogue between a reader and an author" which transformed the readers' knowledge and the author's intention. In this process the reader go beyond the text to find meaning. Moreover, SD2 believed that reading comprehension was "a social thing as well."
During her observations she had become concerned that "teachers are at the moment pretty dependent on their materials and on the tests for their curriculum. It seems like they're teaching more narrowly than what they probably will be doing in the future." Her fear was that "the ditto machine has been replaced by the xerox and we have lots and lots of worksheets." Her sense of the way a classroom should be included in the integrated curriculum. She felt the thematic approaches, especially for intermediate level students, "like environment or weather, or whatever and do the map and the literature and the writing and the social studies and science all around that theme." Further, she suggested that teachers felt constrained by several forces including parents. When she observed that "In both of our schools we've been hearing that the parents are demanding these grades and the parents are demanding these worksheets," she did think that much of this is teacher interpretation. She contended that the influence of standardized tests had diminishing "but a lot of our instructional decisions have been made on the basis of what's going to be on the test. What will help kids succeed and do well on the test." She believed that "practice should be disciplined and inquiry oriented . . . I think that our practices would improve if we were to have a research component." She also believed that "it's important for us to understand the limitations of research in testing practices. The traditional research study is so well controlled that the ecological validity is not particular high," consequently using a researcher-based practice in a classroom was not as feasible. Instead, the research-based practice was transformed by the teacher when it was presented and used in the classroom. She felt that the relationship between research and practice affected teacher change, claiming that "as teachers are engaged in
that curriculum and dialogue, they'll change." She hoped they would not be passive recipients of "ivory tower information" but engaged in the creation of knowledge. She asserted that "you can't stay the same when you're doing that."

For SD2 a successful staff development program "can't be a short-term, one-shot deal" and must have a "commitment from all involved, teachers, administrators, and staff development leaders." According to her, the practical argument contributed enormously to a successful staff development. The

. . . whole way of conceptualizing what somebody says they do and what they actually do and why they say what they do is very, very powerful. You can watch during the practical argument interviews, the teacher will say something and then you ask why and then they talk some more and then you reflect. And they say that's not the same as what I said before.' You can just watch . . . so what it's done for me is it's given me a new framework to hang ideas on so I can compare and contrast them and understand them better. I wish I'd known about it a long time ago.

Further she claimed that the practical argument session informed our content. According the SD2 the Staff Developers chose the information to be shared in the group information sessions after they had attended the practical argument sessions. And how will she know that the teachers have changed? She asserted that there was "a different sparkle in their eye. There's much less talking on my part and much more talking on their part." She found that after change occurred the teacher established the agendas "whereas in the beginning they are deferring to authority and they're listening or doing what they're told." When the staff development process succeeded the teachers "don't do what they're told at all and they ask lots of questions and they're very creative and powerful."
Her hope for the RIS staff development program was the creation of "a community of teachers" who became "articulate about what they do and who are empowered to ask questions that are important to ask and for improving the quality of education that they provide in their schools." She also hoped to generalize this experience to generate a model for others to use or an "even more sophisticated analysis of staff development" than this Project has created.

To the RIS Project SD2 brought extensive staff development experience and knowledge of the learning to read process. While one of her goals for the Project was to bring theory and practice closer through this work, she was often not willing to compromise her commitment to empower teachers. A way to achieve both empowerment and a positive discussion of theory and practice was through the use of practical argument which she wished she had heard about years ago.
APPENDIX F
DESCRIPTIONS OF THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS FOR THE HIGHLIGHTED TEACHERS

Teacher Aa

Aa requested the videotaping of his lesson that involved a basal selection excerpted from the Wind in the Willows. During that lesson there were small and large groups lead by Aa. The large group discussion included the entire class. The small group discussions involved students form selected groups.

In the large group discussion Aa addressed the language of the story and the language usage which was not standard English. The students recognized this addressed its peculiar sound. SD2, while observing the tape, questioned Aa about his story choice. He indicated that he knew the students might have problems with the vocabulary but that he wanted them to read the story in spite of that. SD2 pressed in with why questions, attempting to reveal Aa's reasons for choosing this story and teaching the lesson in this particular way. She asked specifically if he had warned his students about the language. He responded that in "some of our previous lessons we had compared using the context as opposed to the dictionary for getting meaning," and he reminded them to do that.

Typically in the session they watched the tape for several minutes and then stopped it to elaborate upon certain points. Aa considered himself to be very reflective and was quite willing to expound upon his thinking. An example of an exchange was:

SD1: Let's stop here and just talk about that a little bit in terms of your thinking about helping kids figure out things that they might not understand. I mean,
it's clear that you're trying to use context and so forth, but do you want to elaborate on that a little?

Aa: I'm also trying to convince them that it's no earth-shaking experience if you do run into a stumbling block, and then as long as you have the basic train of thought that the book is leading you through, then the particulars are not something to be overly concerned about. I don't think they were overly concerned. I think they probably did precisely what I was expected them to do. There weren't a whole lot of kids that even brought things up to me that were things that they had stumbled on. I think they probably had just skipped right over those things.

SD1: And used context.

Aa: Hopefully.

SD1: Did "nosebags" ever come clear through the story--by the end of the story?

Aa: No, it was never mentioned again in a actual usage. This was just one chapter out of the whole book, and that's, in fact, one of the dangers of that method, of taking a chapter out of a book and putting it as a selection. But after somebody mentioned something about a thing to feed the horse, I thought that's what it was."

SD2 then began to probe for Aa's development of prior knowledge. Evidently, Aa had spent little time developing prior knowledge and SD2 was establishing why it was not included. Aa, on the other hand, did not necessarily see the importance of prior knowledge, suggesting that students should understand the story from the context. He said the point that he wanted to make with his students was "sometimes it's just not worth the trouble to belabor a point like that when you're reading. If you can't get it from context and you can't get it from the dictionary, then blow it off." As SD2 continued to pursue the issue citing the importance of one's own experiences, Aa became clearer and more adamant about his beliefs stating "I think I would rather not have my students stop at that word and
come to a screeching halt and engage in a lengthy process of reflection there." He found that he would rather "have them, if they have that ability, just kind of put it on file. . . . I'd rather have them just keep reading." The real question centers on the importance of needing to know every word.

The sessions continued with discussions about activities, the use of comprehension checks for grading, and how the use of grades on students' work. Then SD1 pursued the issue of context.

Aa: I could see a real benefit, in fact. Wind in the Willows, we selected the second chapter of the book. I think it might have been a real good idea to read the first chapter of the book orally to them and that idea hadn't occurred to me, but I can see there's a real possibility there.

SD1: That would have helped their motivation. They would have had a story to hook into. Some sense of characters already and stuff like that.

Aa: I kind of caught onto that idea a little too late, but on the following day I got the book and I said 'Now, here's the third chapter of the book, and it has something about 'badger' in it. What do you suppose badger might be like?' And I reminded them that the book really began with a series of character sketches, this particular character sketch really being dedicated to toad. And I did mention it to them, though, that frequently books will spend quite a bit of time dealing with character development before you get into the main plot, and I encouraged them, if you're reading a book and it seems boring at first and nothing is really happening, that you need to hang in there because you need to know these things or else the story wouldn't be too rich later on. If you can just hang in there long enough to get to know the setting and the characters, you're in story for a real treat.

Aa began, during this session, to elaborate on points introduced during his belief interview. For example, he viewed reading as a private act performed only for one
person by one person and did not want to treat students delicately. He claimed "ultimately,
reading is something you do by yourself, and I'm trying to remind them that the act of reading is between you and the book . . . it happens alot in school. I think school, particularly junior high and high school, seems to be dominated by very lonely reading . . . when they read the book, they're not reading it with somebody else. They don't have the pages open and they're not sharing it. There's gotta come that time when you have the competence, there's the book, here I am. It's a lonely adventure to be reading a book. You can read concurrently with somebody, but that's still not reading with them."

Further he drew a distinction between real literature and popular literature. His students were reading "about events that are centered around school life, that kind of thing. I think my kids are reading that kind of stuff" but there "are certain whole categories of literatures that my students seem unwilling to approach." For A reading comprehension occurred when a student arrived at the point "where they can be wound up in something they're reading that they get emotional about it, that a connection has been made there." In his mind, he believed "that that's the goal, when that occurs I am confident there has been abundant reading comprehension taking place." He felt, however, that that did not happen with Judy Blume and other popular literature. Blume kept "things very light, and the kids kind of go through the story, just kind of responding to events and just kind of shrugging it off." He supposed "they could get emotionally involved in that, but there's some kind of a big leap that's necessary to be willing to track with a totally unfamiliar setting, a setting that a student could never have experienced personally."

He mentioned concern with assessment, both the assessment of students and the assessment of teachers. He also discussed his independent reading program and his
concern for parents' evaluations of his program. He said
I would only consider this half of my reading program.
The other half is in-depth reading, and I keep a page
tally. . . . I'm keenly aware of how much time I have
to spend justifying my classroom methods to parents.
And that's never a fun thing to do.

He was uncomfortable about parents coming into his
classroom and saying "What's this that you're doing
d here". You're kind of on the defensive already, and I
don't like to be in that kind of position. So a lot of
what I do--not all of what I do, . . . is a concern with
the way things are done." He felt compelled to teach the
way he did because there was a "whole idea of 'reading to
answer the questions' kind of mentality." He observed that
"that mentality is so firmly entrenched in our whole
academic process that I don't think it's going to be
productive for me to ignore that for a year in their
lives." In Aa's opinion there was a process which involved
other people establishing the agenda and asking questions
"and you are going to have read to answer other people's
questions if you expect to be an academic success. I just
don't believe it's possible to excel in school unless
you're reading for somebody else's purposes." This
justified, for him, the use of comprehension checks. He
believed that for those students having genuinely a
difficult time "engaging themselves the story, to
degenerate to the secondary purpose of just getting through
these questions. For kids that do know how to read the way
we all desire them to read, that poses no problem."

The session concluded with Aa delineating areas he
wanted to investigate further. His first area of concern
was "launching kids" into reading with prereading
activities. He wanted to learn more about the activation
of background knowledge, for example. He also wanted to
know more about the assessment of activities. He hoped to
discover ways to be more reflective in the assessment process.

**Teacher Af**

The lesson videotaped in Af's classroom involved "Benny's Flag" from *Sea Treasures*, where she worked with her students in a whole group setting. The story was chosen because it coordinated well with their social studies unit on the Pacific States. Before reading the chapter, Af and her students previewed it. They discussed issues of fiction/non-fiction, the value of previewing and made predictions. For example, she asked "If I hadn't told you it was a story about Alaska, could you figure it out?" and "How could you figure it out?"

For Af it was more important to have student involvement and have them relate to their reading than "almost anything else." She wanted the students to develop a "different direction of thought" and she tried to help them redirect their thinking along the lines of the reading. Moreover she wanted her students to make connections among their ideas, to form intellectual constructs, to relate the past reading experiences, and to speak freely in class. She said,

> it's like they get into a corner and I just want to pull them back and ask a question that will get them off this way out of the corner. We may or may not get to the correct answer, but they will get into a more fruitful way of looking. . . . I am really interested in getting the kids to make connections among ideas, intellectual constructs that they have, their personal experiences, their feelings...and getting them to feel free about talking . . . it's also, how do you read when you don't know how to read? . . . I do previewing to get them to make connections, to get them involved, to get them talking to me.

Her discussion of her ideas was heavily laced with her personal experiences linking each part of her teaching
theory with her own classroom experiences as a student. For example, after telling a personal story of a teacher that related to right/wrong answers, Af said,

if you've seen this [the video] you can see that I'm not so concerned with right answers when I am questioning, I am just concerned with getting an answer. And then maybe see if I can get a different direction of thought and sometimes I just accept whatever I get. I am trying to get children to participate and get more involved in what they are doing when I am asking questions.

She then talked about why she used discussion so often with her students stating that she had a teacher who would have her students talk about what we were doing and what we were thinking and that sort of stuff." And that teacher had been Af's model.

When asked about the use of prediction she observed that she recognized test-taking skills as very important. She believed it was important "to be able to guess the purposes of the person who's written the test or comprehension questions in the basal." She also felt it was important generally and made a better student if a student could guess what the teacher's purposes are then you can adjust your behavior." She did not like standardized tests but did feel they determined a good portion of peoples' life choices. She said, "There is a purpose for everything I do."

Af was concerned with student's personal achievement. She claimed that she did not "like to focus on what they can't do, I like to focus on teaching them ways to do. . . . I am sure that if everybody taught the way that I do I would take a basic skills approach because I think you need a balance." She viewed fourth grade, "as a bridge." This, in her opinion, was a time for the students to find out about themselves. "I don't like to label them. Well, we have our terrific readers in training. That's the kids
who have a tough time in reading and terrific scholars in training. But I have worked with them on strategies." First she taught the students good reader strategies "whatever strategies I am going to be teaching first so that they have it down."

Next SD1 and SD2 began discussing questions and whether or not questions should be read before the story. Af declared it was imperative to read the questions and the summary before you read the passage, but affirmed that this opinion was not everyone's opinion. Further she said "my feeling is let's get everyone alive, alert and active . . . to reinforce with praise, good skills and good performance, what ever this is."

Interestingly Af talked alot about good and poor readers which seemed to contrast with her stance about the importance of students' self-esteem. She said that she talked candidly with her students, "We talk a lot about some of us are good in PE," she said, "some of us are good in reading and some of us aren't and some of us are good in math and some of us aren't."

In addition she said,

As near as I can tell, my hypothesis is that if they say they can't read, it means they have done poorly in school in reading. It may or may not that they read signs at home, that they read other places, and I've found that kids and grown-ups alike tend to identify reading as what you do in school. And the other kinds of reading aren't really reading.

As the session ended Af decided to pursue certain issues during the staff development program. First she wanted to continue developing her work on questioning, particularly about predictions. Secondly, she wanted to continue to analyze ability grouping. She felt these were areas on which she would focus during the year.
Teacher Fc

A lesson, in a whole group setting, centered on a basal selection that had a beekeeper as a main character, was videotaped in Fc's classroom. The students, as well as Fc, were engaged, enthusiastic and appear to enjoy the lesson. As the lesson began Fc did several pre-reading activities that built upon her students' background knowledge. As the students settled down and readied themselves for reading, Fc asked the students if they had ever had honey before. Some had and some had not. To better set the stage for reading she offered crackers and honey for the students to taste as they talked about bees and honey.

Fc walked into the practical argument session expressing her discomfort with talking about her teaching philosophy. She confessed that she had "never been analyzed by anyone. ... I don't think any teacher, principal or colleague has ever asked me about my philosophy in reading. . . . I feel nervous and anxious because I haven't really talked about it with anyone. . . . I'm on edge." SD1 and SD2 immediately complemented Fc about her work. SD1 said "I just wondered where you got your good ideas." "I don't know," said Fc, "it's just natural, I guess."

When SD1 asked why she had brought the honey to class she pointed out that "motivation is important." Although she did not do this all the time, she said "I try to do that, probably every third story I can come up with something." In response this exchange took place:

SD1 Do you think it worked pretty well? What does it do?

Fc Yes, I think it caused the kids to look forward to it in the story. It helps them relax, to enjoy reading it, so that they get more out of
it, it makes them have the comraderie feeling that the whole class is involved and it is something different.

SD2 There is another really important thing that it does. I don't know how many tapes, but this is the first example of providing background knowledge . . . giving a common prior experience that the kids can then talk about, remember and share . . .

Fc I guess I should say here that I like to draw from the kids everything that they know and have them share . . . I try to start off with what they know first before I introduce new information.

A student's self-esteem and personal feelings were very important to Fc. They seem to take precedence over even the reading process. SD1 and SD2 pressed for Fc to elaborate upon her notions. SD1 asked if she wanted reading to be a personal experience. Fc responded "I try not to have them sit and open a book and start reading a story. That's not very motivational . . . to put on a personal level . . . even though as a group it was still like I was teaching to one person." Furthermore she said, "In the real world of teaching you don't have an awful lot of time to really sit down and consider all the aspects of reading that you wish you could. Because I try to put so many things on a personal level." Fc went by her "gut feeling, whatever comes to mind, that I can think of I do that and as I teach more at one lesson" to create motivating lessons for her students.

In a like manner self-esteem and motivation were important in the development of a good reader. For example, she did not do group work because students felt very insecure about it. For Fc a student needed to feel good about themselves to become good readers. When asked how she recognized their insecurity Fc replied that the
students "will just work as fast as they can to get caught up so there is no division."

When the students participated in the brainstorming/semantic mapping activity about bees, SD1 asked "What if they give you a piece of information that you consider to be incorrect at this stage?" Fc responded "Well, sometimes I'll write it down . . . and I just accept what they are telling me." Another concern she had is about involving all of her students. SD2 wondered about the other plans that you use to get everybody's participation. Do you ever wonder about the kids who don't get called on?" Fc said "That's always been a problem with me. I always try to call on everyone and I do take time to call on kids who do not raise their hand. And sometimes I pick one child and then I let them pick the next." She had found that "children know alot more than we give them credit for . . . and I try in almost all my lessons to bring out what they know first."

The focus of the session shifted at this point to the questions asked during the lesson's introduction. The exchange included:

SD2 Are these your questions right now or are they...

Fc Right now they're mine . . .


Fc What do you like best? What was your favorite things? What do you remember the most and why do you remember it? Putting them in the place of the beekeeper . . . in the place of the character. . . .

They inquired about her use of comprehension check questions, and whether she used them all, or just some of them. She responded "No, I just pick them. Sometimes it depends on the time left and sometimes . . . it depends on
whether they are writing them or giving them orally. Oralily alot of times I just ask all of them. When they write them I don't always have them just write each one because I am looking for a specific skill or . . . ." She again addressed the issue of personal experience stating "the first thing you have to do . . . is try to make them comfortable with any answer because quite often it is not the answer that the person sitting next to them has." She always reassured her students that "whatever they are thinking is ok." She also emphasized that they had insecurities about "doing it right" particularly with inferencing. In fact, she considered inferencing as her own insecure area.

Next SD1 explored what Fc liked to work on in reading.

SD1 What kinds of things would you like to work on in reading? Are there some things that really bother you, that you have questions about?

Fc I think teaching inference is one thing that bother me.

SD1 So the kind of higher order questions . . .

Fc Trying to understand what process they go through to develop an answer . . . that has always been on my mind.

SD1 Do you have questions about what kind of response . . .

Fc . . . answering of the why . . . I consider that the inference and that is just the biggest concern I have in how they come up with answering it.

She emphasized the importance of skills and fit that in whenever possibly. Further she felt she could not skip anything in the basal because she gave them the unit tests.

At the end of the session SD1 and SD2 compared her session with other practical argument interviews they had done. They found hers to be quite different. Fc looked
curiously at them and asked why. They observed that her use of pre-reading activities, and her interest in fun—her students and her own, made her lesson extraordinary. She seemed puzzled and acknowledged that she had not often received compliments about her work.

In this session Fc began a conversation about assessment and accountability that continued throughout the staff development sessions. She mentioned that she had asked permission to teach science 40 minutes for one quarter and then health for 40 minutes for one quarter. SD1 and SD2 asked why she asked permission for grading. Because she would not be giving a science grade every quarter, she had to ask permission. Fc said, "You have to be accountable in the grade book and for the grades."

Also at the conclusion of the lesson Fc addressed the areas she wanted to pursue further. She wanted to work on inferencing and questions because this was a major problem for her. And she also wanted to examine whether the use of more literature in her lessons would be valuable for her students.

**Teacher Fd**

In a room with ghosts hanging from the ceiling, Fd decided to do a lesson combining a picture book and a basal reader. First she read *Ghosts Hour, Spook's Hour* by Eve Bunting with the students gathered around her making the appropriate spook noises. She chose this lesson for videotaping because she wanted to work with the basal reading story and some of the variety of ways she could extend the use of the reader. She said, "... I share a lot of picture books with them. ... I don't always have a novel going. ... I share picture books with them and we decide whether they have the characteristics of ... whether they are award-winning books or not." In contrast
to other teachers she was not concerned by evaluation because when she held parent conferences she explained that she did not use basal readers, "I'm teaching reading differently than perhaps it's been done with their child last year. 'And my goal is that your children learn to love literature or love reading.'"

When teaching reading Fc wanted to generate a love of reading. In literature class she used literature that "grabs" the students, even if it was not "good" literature. In any reading activity she liked to use a motivational activity to connect the students with the story they were going to read. She had also been working on predictions and believed that all of her students were predicting now. Regarding motivational activities one exchange revealed:

SD1 So, when you say that an activity like this is motivational, what do you mean? Do you mean that it motivates them to read or . . .

Fd This particular picture book that I am doing here . . . the purpose, the reason I did this was it tied in with the story that they were going to be reading and I wanted to get them excited about going to get that story and read that story and it was a time around Halloween where they had had a writing project and they had chosen to do ghosts . . . trying to tie it to an overall picture . . . things that they had been exposed to already . . . what I've noticed about them is that they are always predicting all of the time now.

One thing Fd liked to do during her lessons was mention the author's names. She felt that, in turn, the students would come to recognize the authors and their style of writing. Apparently in her class there were favorite authors and she wanted to promote that type of recognition.

Prediction was the next topic of discussion:
SD2  I know you did prediction, but I wonder why you think it's important for the kids to predict? Why would that be an important thing to be highlighting in the classes?

Fd  It's just a higher level of thinking . . . than the norm.

Fd also said that "when I see kids predict . . . they anticipate what they will get to when they next open to book." Moreover, Fd connected their predictions with their writing. She used a writers' workshop format with her students where they wrote often. When asked how that work was graded she indicated that she "just responded to it." In fact, she often did her grading with her students rather than the traditional way.

At one point in the lesson she was quite embroiled in a figures of speech chart. Later she appeared to lose interest in it. She said she thought that "part of the lesson was really dragging. When I was doing it I was feeling like that . . . I was probably trying to do too much at one time . . . I have never really mentioned figure of speech again." As she adopted her new approach to reading, Fd's lessons appeared to change. Fd appeared to struggle with how best to teach reading to her students. Was it skills or simply reading?

Her lesson then moved to small group work with students reading quietly to each other. SD2 asked about the validity of reading out loud and how it served the students. Fd observed that she used reading out loud to insure that slower readers were understanding the assignment. However, she did not have any proof that reading, so I've made this observation that probably is erroneous, probably the premise is that I'm thinking that reading it out loud they understand it better than reading it silently." She felt she had "operated out of that
premise" and she could see that that premise had "no validity whatsoever in the conversation that they were having."

Fd was excited about the project and had quickly adopted its language, as evidenced by the conversation just discussed. She also had many interests she wanted to explore. At the end of the practical argument interview she decided to continue experimenting with the whole language approach to reading. She also wanted to continue exploring the use of skills in her reading approach.
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