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ABSTRACT

This study set out to develop a grounded theory of staff development for teachers. The aims of the study were:

• to evaluate the impact that a staff development program, called *Frameworks*, had on teachers beliefs and practices in literacy education

• to evaluate a personally developed staff development theory which underpinned the design and delivery of that program

• as a consequence of the above, to develop a staff development theory which had been formally grounded in the real world of classrooms and schools.

The study employed a naturalistic mode of inquiry, and in particular was framed by the parameters of a responsive constructivist evaluation paradigm. The methods of naturalistic inquiry were employed. In particular there was a strong emphasis on a hermeneutic/dialectic process which takes full advantage, and account, of the observer/observed interaction in order to create a constructed reality that is as informed and sophisticated as it can be made at a particular point in time.

The study comprised four case studies of four class teachers which analyse and describe their experiences as a result of their participation in the eight week program. These four case studies were further analysed into a construction of *Frameworks* as it was run in the Gorham Middlesex School District (more commonly known as Marcus Whitman Central School District).

A theory of staff development grounded in the data emerged which has been depicted in schematic form and described in detail. Recommendations for the future of staff development, based on the principles emerging from this theory are made. Finally it is argued that effective staff development in the future is contingent upon the adoption of a new paradigm of teacher learning, namely, one that views learning cultures of teachers as social semiotic systems.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

THE PURPOSE AND AIMS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to develop a grounded theory of staff development. To fulfil the purpose of this study the following aims are proposed:

- to evaluate the impact of a staff development program called *Frameworks* on teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education
- to evaluate a personally developed staff development theory, and
- as a consequence of the above, develop a staff development theory which has been formally grounded in the real world of classrooms and schools.

In order to achieve these aims, and thus fulfil the purpose of the study, the following questions are used to guide and frame the study.

- What effect does a particular staff development theory have on teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education?
- How does the staff development theory 'work'?
- What is the nature of the change process?
- How do teachers cope with change?
- What processes do teachers go through as learners as they are exposed to a paradigm shift?
- What processes and structures need to be in place to support teachers as they experience such a paradigm shift?
- What role does language play in this change process, i.e in the learning process?
- What factors, both perceived and actual, enable/inhibit teacher change (teacher learning)?
RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

There is much written on effective staff development and how effective staff development programs should be designed and implemented (Fullan, 1991). However, Fullan and McMiles (1992), amongst others, claim that educators have not been very successful in these endeavours. Moreover, they argue strongly that there is still much that staff developers need to consider so that implementation of such programs results in lasting change. If the time, the money, and the energy spent in the name of staff development over the last ten to fifteen years appear to have been largely a waste, then what is done in all future staff development, given the current economic climate, will need to be carefully thought through and even more carefully researched. This study is motivated by these needs.

Over the years, I had begun to develop a personal theory of staff development (see page 9) which became the basis for the design and delivery of a staff development program in literacy education called Frameworks. It is a theory which, I believe, 'works' as it is a theory which has been grounded in personal experience in the field over many years. A major focus of the theory is on developing what I call 'personally empowered learners' or what Fullan (1991, 1992) calls 'perpetual learners'.

Frameworks (Turbill, Butler and Cambourne, 1991) is both collaborative and interactive in its nature and aims to introduce teachers to the paradigm of 'whole language' or 'holistic learning' philosophy as it pertains particularly to the teaching of literacy. It aims also to support teachers as they attempt to make the paradigm shift from a traditional view of literacy learning and teaching to a more holistic view. This shift, it is recognised, requires significant change in thinking for some teachers whereas for others the change may be minimal. The program therefore has to accommodate teachers at various stages of their learning in whole language philosophy whilst
constantly asking teachers to consider the implications for such a philosophy for their classroom curriculum and practice.

It is thus deemed necessary to not only examine the effectiveness of this program by evaluating the impact of Frameworks as an agent of change on teachers' beliefs and practices but also to illuminate the processes teachers go through as learners during their participation in the program.

There is a strong need, I believe, to study teacher learning and the role that language plays in that learning. Fullan (1991:37) reminds us that effective educational change is ‘multidimensional’ in that it involves a variety of factors, it takes time and it is a ‘process not an event’ (Hall et al, 1983; Hall and Hord, 1987:8). There is much written on teacher change and the change process, but it seems that a focus on teacher learning as it pertains to change has been relatively ignored or left mostly at the implicit level in the research. Effective teacher change, it would seem, needs effective teacher learning. And although Fullan cites much research which purports that effective change must occur at many levels of a system, he argues strongly that it ultimately starts and ends with the teacher; the person who is ‘at the chalkface’ with students each day. If this is the case then there is a need for research not only in teacher change and the change process, but also in teacher learning and the learning process and the relationships between the two. As Fullan (1991:117) says,

Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple
and as complex as that.

And so, this study focuses on that person, the teacher, and on the conditions which need to be in place for effective teacher learning and any subsequent change to occur. There has been substantial research on the conditions for student learning (Holdaway, 1979; Cambourne, 1988; Gardner, 1991) but as Sarason (1990:13) points out we need to provide our teachers with similar opportunities.
For our schools to do better than they do we have to give up the belief that it is possible to create the conditions for productive learning (for students) when those conditions do not exist for education personnel.

An evaluation of Frameworks can begin to examine the issue of teachers' learning.

Fullan (1990:18) suggests that the research into teachers' learning has fallen into four main categories - technical, reflective, inquiry, and collaborative. He notes that, traditionally, these four aspects of teacher-as-learner have been examined separately when they need to be seen in combination. There is little work, he comments, on how all four can be integrated in the learning process of teachers.

Although many approaches address aspects of all four features (teacher as inquirer, collaboration, technical skills, reflective practice) of teacher-as-learner in one way or another, all models to this point have a central tendency to stress only one or two of the four. Rarely (and we would say never in a fundamental sense) have all four received intensive attention in the same setting. It is easier said than done. The question is, how can the strengths of each of these four traditions be integrated and established in the teacher as learner.

The staff development theory upon which Frameworks is designed attempts to integrate and establish all four traditions in the teacher-as-learner through the many structures and processes inherent within the program. One focus of the program is on the role that language plays in learning (Halliday, 1978; Butler and Turbill, 1984; Turbill, 1989; Turbill, 1993). Indeed, I have argued elsewhere that language is the integrating force in the curriculum. Thus language could be seen as the integrating force among the four traditions of 'teacher as inquirer, collaboration, technical skills, and reflective practice'.

It is necessary to evaluate the staff development theory from the focus of the teacher as learner in an attempt to respond to questions such as Fullan's. In doing so, this study will examine the relationship among these traditions within the teacher-as-learner and
examine the role that language plays in this interactive and integrated learning; this will be done with a view to informing the future design and implementation of staff development programs.

Another critical feature which needs further investigation, Fullan (1990:20) suggests, is the question of generic and specific levels of development of teachers-as-learners.

By specific we mean how particular improvements are experienced and designed. For example, one can start with a technical instructional innovation, such as cooperative learning, and find that it has consequences for all aspects of the teacher as learner. Similarly, one could begin with ... an action research project and proceed to incorporate the development of technical instructional skills, reflective methods and so forth. We do not know enough yet about the very difficult conceptual and strategic questions of whether it is better to start with a single teacher-learner dimension (and if so, which one), or to work on all four equally.

If teachers can ‘develop the generic capacity to function on all four cylinders’, Fullan believes, they will reach a point where it becomes second nature to be perpetual learners in a constant state of change; they become personally empowered as learners and are in a position to make decisions for themselves about their learning needs and how they relate to both classroom and school needs.

Therefore this study is timely as it attempts to respond to these issues; it not only adds to the body of literature on staff development and teacher learning but also adds to the field of staff development design and implementation. It aims to generate a grounded theory of staff development and teacher learning by ‘testing’ a personal theory which evolved from my personal experiences and tacit knowledge.

The study can also be justified in terms of its potential contribution to the field of growing research on teachers’ learning particularly from the perspective of empowering teachers through their own professional development.
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The background to the study comprises two sections. The first focuses on the current socio-political context of literacy education; the second on a more personal background. The first discusses the issues raised in current literature. The second is an historical recount of my particular interests and thinking in the area of literacy education in relation to the staff development of the teachers who teach literacy.

CURRENT SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT OF LITERACY EDUCATION

The concept of literacy and how it is best learned and taught has become a political issue and one that has been debated more frequently in recent years. As Frameworks is a staff development program which focuses on literacy development, it is necessary to discuss the current socio-political context of literacy education and what this means for staff development.

What is Literacy?

People were once considered literate if they could sign their names. But times change and with the advent of mass education there came an expectation that all children would be literate by the end of schooling. Thus the focus on literacy and literacy education has increased dramatically over the last twenty years (Brown, 1991:xii). This focus has encompassed a range of issues and raised many questions; questions which we in the educational arena are still trying to come to grips with and which still cause a great deal of debate at educational, political and social levels. These questions include:

- what is literacy
- what does it mean to be literate
- what philosophy or paradigm in learning should we use to guide our literacy curriculums
• what staff development courses should be available to support teachers in this focus area
• and how effective have programs and teachers been in literacy education?

Reports on Australian and US education released over the past two decades seem to indicate that the educational profession as a whole has not been very successful in achieving high degrees of literacy for all school students (for example, *A Nation at Risk*, Washington, 1983; Karmel Report, Canberra, 1973; Quality of Education, Canberra, 1988).

*A Nation at Risk* (1983) - commissioned by the (US) National Commission on Excellence in Education - called for ‘major improvements in education as a matter of national survival in an increasingly competitive global economy’ (Brown, 1991:xii). This call resulted in broader and deeper understanding of literacy education through the emergence of a plethora of research in reading and writing research; the publication of many new reading and writing programs with detailed teachers’ manuals; a multitude of professional books written by academics and teachers and an increase in staff development programs for teachers which competed for teachers’ professional development time and school districts' diminishing budgets.

The eighties decade in the United States ended with a summit meeting of the nation's governors and the President of the United States. The resulting report from this unprecedented meeting called for radical reform and restructuring of American schools. Brown (1991: xii) sums up the present situation thus:

The new literacy that requires such massive change goes beyond mere reading and writing ability, beyond the so-called basics, and beyond the current requirements for a high school diploma. It now includes capacities once demanded only of a privileged college bound elite: to think critically and creatively, solve problems, exercise judgement, and learn new skills and knowledge throughout a lifetime. What at the beginning of the twentieth
century was a high standard for a few has apparently become, in the minds of a good many powerful people, a desideratum for all.

Brown refers to such literacy as ‘new literacy’ or the ‘literacy of thoughtfulness’. This literacy requires students to be able ‘to think critically, to problem solve, to exercise judgements and learn new skills and knowledge throughout a lifetime’.

It was during this period that a ‘grass roots movement’ in literacy education began to emerge as a strong contender against the more traditional theory and practices in literacy education. It is my belief that the ‘grass roots movement’ known as ‘whole language’ in the United States and ‘holistic natural learning’ in New Zealand and Australia can be likened to Brown’s view of ‘literacy of thoughtfulness’. It is a view of literacy which is a culmination of the research in literacy and learning emanating from New Zealand, Australia, Great Britain and the United States throughout the eighties.

A New Paradigm in Literacy Education

Whole language or holistic learning is a view of learning and language development which is quite different from traditionally accepted views of learning and language development. As such it can be likened to a paradigm in that it represents ‘the thoughts, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, a vision that is the basis of the way a society organises itself’ (Capra, 1988:11).

The movement to whole language paradigm can be viewed as a ‘paradigm shift’ (Kuhn, 1970) in learning and the teaching of language and literacy which is as significant to the educational world as the Einsteinian relativity paradigm was to the scientific world (Covey, 1989:29). Capra (1982:22) defines ‘a paradigm shift’ as ‘a profound change in the thoughts, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, a vision that is the basis of the way a society organises itself’.
While whole language has been perceived to be the ‘answer to our literacy problems’ by some and a ‘laissez-faire move to mediocrity’ by others, it represents a profound change in the thinking, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, of what literacy is and the role that literacy plays in learning.

It can be argued that the whole language paradigm, if adopted as the paradigm which underpins the literacy curriculum in our schools, will provide learning cultures which are highly conducive to producing literate students; students who think critically, problem solve, exercise judgements and learn new skills and knowledge which will be durable throughout a lifetime. These are learning cultures in which empowered teachers are creating empowered learners (Turbill, 1991; Cambourne, 1991).

The Challenge of Staff Development

The challenge to those involved in the staff development of teachers is to create learning programs and learning cultures which not only set out to teach the concepts inherent in this paradigm called whole language, but also to support teachers as learners as they move through such a paradigm shift.

In what follows I have outlined the development of a personal theory of staff development which has attempted to do this. It is a theory which formed the basis of the staff development program Frameworks, the evaluand in this study. Inherent in this personal story are the many presuppositions which I hold about learning, about language and about teacher learning and about the role that language plays in learning.

A PERSONAL THEORY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHERS’ LEARNING

Background Information

My interest in the professional development of teachers began some sixteen years ago during my employment in the New South Wales Department of Education, a very large
monolithic centralised bureaucracy which employed some 45,000 teachers across the range of Kindergarten - Grade 12. The Department of Education was sub-divided into ten regions across the state of New South Wales, each with approximately 220 schools.

In 1976, I was invited by the central administration of the St George Region, in which I taught, to leave the classroom and, drawing on my skills as a successful teacher of 12 years, to work with other teachers to ‘support them in their attempts to put into practice the new centrally written curriculum guide on Language Education’. This document, commonly known as ‘1974 Primary Language Document’, was the first of a series of documents written by teachers seconded from their classrooms into the central office. Their brief was to review the current research and writings in language and literacy education, to analyse and synthesise this thinking and write it into a curriculum statement for teachers. The philosophy underpinning the 1974 Language Document was holistic in its intent, child centred and experientially based. It drew greatly on the work of the British Bullock Report (1975).

Other documents followed. In 1978 the Reading K-12 Policy Statement was released based on the research of psycholinguists such as Ken and Yetta Goodman, Carolyn Burke, Virginia Woodward, Frank Smith, Peter Rousch and Brian Cambourne. In 1985 Writing K-12 was released. This document drew on the work of Donald Graves, Brian Cambourne, R.D. Walshe, James Britton and the St George Writing Project (Turbill, 1982).

During these years my role and responsibility was mainly to help teachers, and school staffs as a whole, to implement the philosophy of these documents into school based curriculum and classroom practice which reflected the needs of the students in their particular schools.
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Another responsibility which increased in importance over the years was to represent the teachers and schools in my region in the ‘interactive development’ of the curriculums in Reading and Writing. This meant regular workshops where staff developers from all the ten regions met with the central office curriculum developers to consider the needs of the students and teachers in the regions and the current research and thinking in the field. The outcomes of these workshops were to be documents which reflected ‘the best of current theory and classroom practice and the particular needs of students in New South Wales schools’, namely, Reading K-12 and Writing K-12 mentioned above. Because of the interaction between central office and regions in the development of these documents, Reading K-12 and Writing K-12 each took approximately five years to develop and publish.

Thus my role over this period was not only to be a staff developer but also a curriculum developer. My perception of my role was to act as ‘translator of theory into practice’; to act as a ‘clearing house’ for new ideas and resources and to respond to the needs of the schools in light of the current curriculum documents. I saw myself more as a specialist in the Language education field rather than an expert, however, I realised that many teachers in the schools perceived me to be ‘the expert’.

**My Role in Schools as a Staff Developer**

Much of my time during those nine years I was employed as a staff developer I spent in schools, mostly in classrooms working alongside teachers. These teachers invited me into their classrooms to work with students, to demonstrate new activities, to observe them in action and to generally help them reflect on their classroom practice and how they might change this practice. My personal theory of staff development which emerged over those nine years went through several interesting changes or phases culminating in a staff development model which was used as the basic model for the design of *Frameworks*.
Phase One: Practice

During the first years my focus, as a staff developer, was on 'practice'. I brought along ideas and the latest resources to show teachers. I demonstrated new practices for them to emulate. The expectation was that the teacher would take these 'new practices' and adopt them into his or her classroom. My role was to 'transmit the knowledge'.

My staff development model could be summarised thus:

![Practice Model](image)

By 1977 I began to realise that just giving teachers a 'shopping bag of new tricks' may satisfy them for the short term but it did not seem to result in any long term change in their teaching practice.

Phase Two: Theory into Practice

With the release of Reading K-12 in 1978, those of us in staff development began to consider ways of helping teachers make the links between the theory or philosophy espoused in the document and how this theory could be implemented in the classroom. And so I entered the 'theory into practice' phase.

As the perceived specialist and authority in the field, I conducted many workshops which engaged teachers in considering how they themselves went about reading and in linking the principles which came together from these workshops with the theory which the document was espousing. These workshops were mostly held during one day

---

2 As this section takes the form of a personal recount, it was decided not to label the models drawn throughout as 'figures', except in the one instance where I reference a model published elsewhere.
in-service courses with little or no follow-up for the teachers. How teachers incorporated the ‘theory into practice’ workshops into their classroom practice was left to them.

My staff development model now could be summarised thus:

![Diagram of Theory into Practice]

It was a one-sided model. I saw my responsibility as helping teachers understand how the current theory in literacy education, and reading in particular, should be reflected in their teaching practice. It was my belief that having given teachers the information on the ‘theory into practice’, they were responsible for implementing this into their classrooms.

**Phase Three: Theory's Impact on Teachers' Beliefs and Practice**

The period of the late seventies and early eighties was a time of change. As funds in Department of Education staff development budgets were cut, staff developers across the ten regions began to question their effectiveness over the years and how they could be more effective with less finances. It was during this period that ‘action research’ surfaced as a valuable professional and staff development model. I had also begun to realise that working with teachers in their own classrooms and within the school itself over a period of time seemed to bring about more effective change.

And so I moved into the third phase of my development as a staff developer. I began to design school and class activities with teachers where, together, we examined their classroom practice, examined their personal beliefs and examined the theory which was presented in the curriculum documents which were still mandated as guides for what
was to occur in classrooms. This model meant I would work with teachers as a group and also within their classrooms.

This model depicts my belief that I needed to help teachers examine their beliefs and practices in light of the current theory espoused in the curriculum. They did this through workshop activities in which they were asked to reflect on their own beliefs and processes. My personal theory, at this point, assumed that changes in teachers' beliefs and practices would occur as a result of this involvement, interaction and reflection. All this had to be guided by the curriculum policy (the theory) mandated by the Department of Education which was still seen to be the main source of change.

There continued a strong focus on 'theory into practice'. However, my role was beginning to change. I began to operate more as a 'process consultant'; someone who set up the processes for the learning of the mandated theory.

An evident result at the school level, was the significant interaction among the teachers during these meetings; this interaction continued long after I had left the context. I could see that change was occurring at the classroom level because teachers were changing their beliefs and thinking about how children learned and they were articulating these changing beliefs. Teachers were growing more confident about the teaching practice they chose to implement. The congruence between their beliefs and their practice appeared to be greater than was evident in previous years.
However there were still too many teachers with whom I worked who appeared to know what they were supposed to think and do but did not do it; that is, they seemed to be able to articulate the theory and principles espoused in the current curriculum documents in discussion with their peers and in the rationale which prefaced their classroom programs but this ‘apparent knowledge’ did not show itself in their classroom practice. Change here seemed very superficial, occurring mainly in the adoption of some ‘new’ teaching approaches and organisational procedures. Scratch the surface of these teachers and their classroom practice and there was little evidence of change. Innovations seemed to have had a very short life and disappeared once the key mover in the school (myself or a key member of staff) left, or time passed.

**Phase Four: An Interactive Model**

In 1981 it was my responsibility as a curriculum consultant to initiate, maintain and monitor a curriculum innovation in three schools in the K-3 grades (Turbill, 1982). The foci of this project were ‘how do young children learn to write’ and ‘how can teachers support this learning’. The methodology used in the project was based on action research as outlined by Kemmis and McTaggert (1982).

I now had the opportunity of not only observing young children learning to write in natural settings but also observing teachers as they struggled with learning the ‘new theory’ about young children learning to write (Graves, 1981; Goodman Y., 1984). They were also learning from the observations of what their young children were doing as a result of their changed teaching practice. It was an exciting period for all of us - teachers, children and myself - we were very much a ‘community of learners’ to quote Roland Barth (1990). Together we formulated theory and curriculum about young children’s literacy development. This work found its way into the Writing K-12 Document (1988) and two books (Turbill, 1982; Turbill, 1983).
During this same year I went through the process of being a 'learner writer'. I attended a week's Writing Workshop where I, and the others in the group, went through the process of writing 'a piece with which I was personally satisfied.' Each morning we wrote, shared with peers and learned about 'leads' and 'editing' and gained other insights into the writing process. In the afternoon we reflected on the processes which we were experiencing and considered the implications for the teaching of writing.

This experience gave me insights into how I learned and how I went about the process of writing. From these insights I began to gain new insights into teacher learning and staff development, namely that teachers need to experience the processes of learning that they expect their students to go through. Although we had begun to carry out workshops in the reading area which required teachers to examine their own reading process, we had not spent time taking the next step of considering the implications for the classroom.

What we, 'the community of learners', began to realise was that we were all in a position to influence and teach other. We were in a position of each of us creating our own personal theory, which in turn could influence others' theories.

Collaboration, reflection and peer teaching were powerful staff development tools for us. Such collaboration saw us trying to solve our own problems, having been forced to reflect on what we were doing in the classroom and why we did it. It meant we needed to read and reflect on what others were doing in the area. It was indeed an empowering process for us.

And so, from all of these experiences, a new theory about staff development was beginning to emerge for me. It could be summarised thus:
I now began to believe that teachers needed to understand their own language and learning processes and thus be aware of their own beliefs about language and learning. They also needed to be aware of, and understand, the theory that others (including their peers) espoused about language and learning. Finally they needed to be aware of the many classroom practices which they could use in their classrooms, but also understand how these practices reflect their own beliefs about language and learning. I was becoming increasingly more aware of how these three areas supported and fed off each other. I still felt the most powerful influence was the 'theory of others'; that is, the theory that was espoused in the curriculum documents which the teachers were required to implement.

**Phase Five: The Role of Language in Teacher Learning: Facilitating Staff Development**

A critical factor in my emerging theory was the realisation of the role that language played in teachers' learning. It became evident to me that I made decisions about how I could best facilitate the learning of teachers by listening to the language they used in their daily teaching.

In order for me to support teachers it was necessary for me to evaluate their needs. Therefore I had to make various judgements about the teachers' beliefs and practices, about the teachers' areas of strengths and where I could step in and make suggestions for classroom practice. In order to make these decisions, I found I had to listen carefully
to what the teacher said to me; that is, the language the teacher used. This included what assistance the teacher asked for (the teacher’s perceived needs) and what the teacher ‘chatted’ to me about (the teacher’s implicit beliefs about language and learning).

I only became fully aware of how I operated when I was put into the position of supporting new staff developers and was forced to make my 'processes' explicit for others.

The region in which I worked decided to adopt a ‘buddy system’ to support newly appointed staff developers. My ‘buddy’, a young male Mathematics consultant accompanied me for the first three weeks of his employment. One hot day in February, as we were driving back to the office after spending a morning in a school in several classrooms, he asked me, 'How do you make the decision about what is the best thing to suggest to a particular teacher? How do you do that?' That simple question initiated my reflection and research into this area and has culminated in this thesis.

My colleague’s question forced me to reflect and to make explicit what I had been doing implicitly since my involvement in the St George Writing Project. I was forced to make explicit the tacit knowledge that I was constantly gathering and yet constantly drawing on to make evaluative judgements about teachers’ degrees of implementation of the philosophy which underpinned the curriculum documents which guided language and learning education in the NSW Department of Education.

My reflection highlighted that I drew very strongly on the language each teacher used in dealing with the students in his/her care. This language may be used in the classroom, in the playground and often in discussion with me about the students. This language - what the teacher said, and how the teacher said it - seemed to tell me more
about the needs of the teacher in the process of implementing ‘holistic child-centred philosophy’ in his/her language and literacy curriculum.

Another source of information I identified through my reflections was the language the students used in talking with me and with their teacher. I found I made judgements about ‘where the teacher was at’ through interviewing students and asking questions such as, why are you doing this activity? what do you do in reading in your classroom? what do you do in spelling? and so on. And then when I worked with the students I considered their responses, i.e. how they responded to the discourse I used with them. This included how they coped with responding to my questioning techniques; how confident they were to respond to my questions; to take risks with their responses and to have a go at the activities I was introducing to them. And finally, I drew on the language that was displayed around the room and the language the students were asked to read and write; how this displayed language was used by the teacher and how the language produced by the students was used by the teacher.

‘But what does this language tell you?’ my buddy probed further. It was then I realised that I had developed a ‘working hypothesis’ which had emerged from the classroom data I had tacitly gathered and which was constantly being grounded in the classroom data. A grounded theory had emerged for me. It went something like this: ‘a teacher’s beliefs about language and literacy learning were reflected in the language that he or she used in the practice of the classroom’.

For me, the implications of this theory were that if I were to help teachers change their practice, which is what they asked me for, I needed to also help them change their beliefs. In changing their beliefs they would begin to change the language they used in their teaching, particularly the language used to establish the ‘ethos’ of the classroom. Teachers would begin to ask different types of questions and thus provide different responses to children. The indicators of this change process for me were embedded in
the language the teachers used. But what exactly these indicators were and how they operated I could not clearly identify. I did, however, realise that I knew it was important and that I needed to research the area, both in the classroom and through the literature.

It was at this time that I changed my context - I became a lecturer in Language Education at a University. Within this context I was expected to carry out research. I also continued to work in the field of staff development in various ways - all of which had impact on my thinking about teacher learning. And so my personal theory began to change again.

I became involved in two major research projects. One was an evaluation of a curriculum staff development program and the other was a classroom ethnography.

The University received a large grant to evaluate the impact that a staff development course, the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC), had as an agent of teacher change. Headed by Dr Brian Cambourne, a group of five of us carried out a 'responsive evaluation' (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) over a two year period to evaluate the impact of ELIC.

I also set up a research project using micro-ethnography as the methodology to examine the 'language teachers use to teach literacy'. Using a small radio microphone I collected the language of 'literacy episodes' used by teachers who espoused whole language philosophy. Data were also collected from the classrooms of six of the teachers in the ELIC study. These teachers were at various stages of development in their thinking about implementing whole language philosophy in their classrooms. Several could be considered 'traditional' in their teaching approaches, following a fragmentationist sub-skill methodology.
The majority of data, however, were collected on a weekly basis from a Kindergarten classroom in which two teachers were team teaching 54 children. This research followed certain procedures over a school year. I would arrive at the school each Wednesday morning. I would talk to the teachers about the week gone by, about the plan of the day to come, about individual children and about literacy, learning theory and practice. One of the teachers was 'wired up' before the children entered the room and the language used from that point until the morning break two hours later was audiotaped. I took field notes of what was going on, noting the behaviours of the students as well as the teachers' practices. I focused on specific students each week. These students changed from week to week although sometimes I stayed with the same child for several weeks. Each week I also took copies of the teachers' day plan and curriculum, students' work samples and other artifacts emanating from the morning's teaching. I returned the following week with the transcript of the previous week's lesson and my field notes. These were left with the teachers to be discussed in the following week. And so the cycle continued.

Over the year the data revealed that:

- the language which teachers use in their classroom practice is a reflection of the beliefs/the paradigm they hold about learning and language development
- the differences in the language are clearly reflected in the tenor of the language, the type of questions asked and the responses teachers make
- there is a greater use of inclusive language rather than exclusive language in classrooms where teachers hold holistic beliefs about language and learning
- questions are used to help students make connections rather than to test their knowledge
- questions are also used to force students to reflect, to think, to problem solve
- teachers use meta-cognitive language to reflect and to make explicit the purposes of the learning as well as the strategies used in learning.
Three major categories of language use emerged. These categories were evident in the classrooms of traditional class teachers (TTs) and of those who espoused whole language philosophy (WLTs). What differed was the way the language was structured (Turbill, 1987).

The first category can be described as the language of teaching, demonstration and intervention. All teachers use language to teach. It was the type of language used by the two groups which differed. WLTs used language to demonstrate and explain literacy knowledge to the children. For example, they explained the surface features of the language:

'This letter is a "c" and this one an "h". When they are together, like they are in this word, they create the sound "ch".'

They also explained the processes of learning to the children.

'When I come to a word like this one (points to "cow") I can try and work it out by looking at the first letter, "c", looking at the picture, remember what the story is about and then guess it, "cow". If I still can't work it out, it doesn't matter - I can read ahead and see if that will help me work it out.'

WLTs also tended to explain the purpose of what was about to be discussed, and explained why it was important for the children to learn it. This type of language use was rarely used by TTs.

Both groups of teachers asked many questions of the children. However, the types of questions and the purpose for the questioning differed. WLTs tended to ask questions to help children make connections in their literacy learning whereas TTs' questions were more in the domain of recitation (Cazden, 1988; Brown, 1991) and testing.

WLTs did ask questions which fitted within the recitation format.
‘Who can remember the next one? Shaun?’

Yes, two big crayfish.’

The function of the question in this context (shared book experience with a big book) was not as much to ‘test’ the child but to check his understanding, to focus all children’s attention, to encourage Shaun to predict using his background knowledge and to use the picture as a clue. More importantly, WLTs asked other types of question which forced the children to reflect on their own learning and the strategies they used to learn. Questions such as these encouraged students to think, to reflect, to problem solve:

‘How did you work out how to spell that word?’

‘Where did you get that idea to write about?’

‘Why do you think that?’

‘What does that word say? Tell the children how you worked that out?’

Most of the TTs’ questions tended to follow the recitation format:

‘Who knows what that word says?

Robert?

No. Gary?

No. Look, everyone, it starts with --?

Yes, Sarah. A “e”. So the word, Sarah is?

Yes, good.’

The second category of language use to emerge was language of control and organisation. Both groups of teachers used language of control and organisation, particularly at the beginning of a school year. However, what was clearly evident was that WLTs began to use less language of control and organisation as the year
progressed and the children were aware of the rules of operation (the structures and processes) and what was expected of them. Because WLTs spent more time explaining to their children what the purpose of the lesson events were and what the expectations of them were, there was less ambiguity for the children and thus, it seemed, less need to control and organise them. There was a high degree of predictability in the day’s lesson episodes.

TTs’ use of language of control continued throughout the year and in fact often increased in lessons in which the teacher was ‘transmitting new information’.

The third major category of language use to emerge was language of response. Because teachers used questioning for different purposes the language they used to respond to the students also differed. Both groups used language to respond to students in an evaluative sense, however, TTs’ responses tended to evaluate the child’s response as right or wrong then move on to another child.

‘No, Steve, that’s not quite right. Sarah ...?

Yes, good girl.’

WLTs also evaluated the children’s responses but tended to follow them up if they were not on course. WLTs’ responses tended to follow a format thus:

**evaluate**

‘No, that’s not “cow”; that’s a good thought, but you are not quite right...’

**demonstrate again**

‘Have another look. The word begins with a “c” and this is a picture of a “cow”.’
extend the demonstration

'Yes, this word says “cow”. But look, this word here also starts with a “c” but the picture is of a “cat”. So what must this word be?'

try a new demonstration

'We saw that word in another book yesterday. Let me show you. Look, here it is. “Cow”. Now look at the word here. They look the same. So this word must also be “cow”.'

celebrate

'Aren’t you clever, Shaun, for using the picture to help you work out that word.'

What did all this mean for staff development?

I was beginning to understand that there was a high degree of congruence between the beliefs which teachers held about language development and learning and their classroom practices (Cho, 1990; Cambourne, 1991). Furthermore, it seemed that these beliefs were realised into classroom practice through the language the teachers used as they related to their students, as they interacted with them, and as they demonstrated that which was to be learned. Not only was this language a major source of content information for the young learners but it was also the shaper of the classroom ethos and culture; a culture in which certain conditions could be clearly identified. These were conditions which enhance ‘natural learning’ (Cambourne, 1988; Holdaway, 1979); conditions which encourage young learners to think, reflect, problem solve, and be active learners (Cambourne, 1991; Brown, 1991). It was a climate which actively encouraged social interaction (Turbill, 1987).

Some questions now began to emerge. If the classroom discourse which the teacher uses is so powerful in creating the classroom ethos and curriculum, if this language is a reflection of the teachers’ beliefs, and if teaching practice is a realisation of teachers'
beliefs through their language, what can we learn from this for teachers’ learning and staff development? Do we try to change teachers’ beliefs and will this lead to a change in language? Should we try to change teachers’ practice and hope that this will, in turn, change the language they use which, in turn, will impact on the beliefs they hold?

The Evaluation of the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC) (Cambourne et al. 1988) shed some light here. ELIC was a staff development course run by a highly trained tutor over a ten week period. The underlying philosophy was based on ‘developmental learning’ (Holdaway, 1978) and holistic language learning. Teachers were asked through various workshops and activities to focus on their students as learners. These reflections, plus what they were given to read about children’s learning, formed the basis of the content of the Course. A range of new teaching strategies were introduced through the Course and the teachers were asked to try these and reflect on how these ‘worked’ in their classrooms. The ELIC tutor worked in classrooms with the teachers, sharing their concerns and often demonstrating new teaching strategies for them. Overall, ELIC was a highly successful agent of change of teachers’ beliefs about language and learning.

Two years after their involvement in the Course, the evaluation found that those teachers who had little understanding of holistic philosophy when they began the Course, focused on using the new strategies in their classrooms. Having to reflect on these strategies with their colleagues in sharing sessions in the Course and in informal situations after the course seemed to help these teachers begin to articulate their beliefs about language and learning. As time went on, they developed a more coherent and cohesive belief system which was more clearly reflected in their teaching practice.

Those teachers who had already begun to embrace the principles of whole language philosophy found that ELIC helped them to consolidate and enhance their emerging belief systems. These people moved well beyond the content within the course seeking
further input from other courses, from professional articles and conferences. They became very confident about what they were doing and could justify clearly why they were doing it.

The study found that there were many factors involved in initiating and supporting this change process. These included:

- the course was conducted over time
- the support given by a tutor during the period of implementation
- the support and guidance given by the leaders in the school
- the opportunity to reflect and share with peers
- the opportunity to collaborate with the tutor and other teachers over time
- the establishment of a network for continued sharing.

Fullan (1991) clearly demonstrates that teacher change is not an isolated process. It is certainly not a linear cause-effect process. There are many interacting variables which need to be considered and these variables are highly integrated. Thus it seemed that a successful staff development program aimed at helping teachers make the paradigm shift to holistic learning and thinking needed to challenge teachers’ thinking and practice at many levels. And the way for teachers to get control of a certain classroom discourse is to be immersed in it and to have opportunities to use it. As M.A.K. Halliday (1980:1) has so often stated in his lectures and writings, ‘We learn language, we learn through language and we learn about language simultaneously as we use language.’

It seemed to me, therefore, that teachers need to hear the language of a holistic view of learning; they need to experience this view of learning in practice; they need to examine their own beliefs and theories about learning and language development; they need to be made aware of the theories that others in the field have put forward, including their peers; they need to see how this theory lends itself to classroom practice; and they need
to have opportunities to try things in their classrooms and reflect on them and what it means. All this needs to occur in a non-threatening and supportive learning environment; an environment in which a 'community of learners' can grow (Barth, 1990).

Processes which Fullan (1990:20) alludes to, such as collaboration, reflection, action research and trying new techniques, need to play equally major roles.

By 1988 my personal theory of staff development had emerged into the following model.

![Diagram of the model](image)

This model formed the basis for the design of a staff development program developed by Brian Cambourne and myself called the Secondary Literacy Inservice Course (1988). SLIC was a spaced learning program conducted over six weeks by a coordinator who needed no specific training.

SLIC emphasised that the focus of teacher learning was the teachers' own beliefs and understandings of how learning 'worked', how writing 'worked', how reading 'worked', what language was and the role it played in learning. In order for teachers to
learn new things they needed to become aware of the 'theory of others' and how this theory of others was implemented in the classroom. They needed opportunities to share this information, try things in their classroom, but ultimately it was how this new information impacted on their own personal beliefs and understandings that created 'teacher change' or 'teacher learning'. Processes such as collaboration with peers, reflective thinking, support over the time that implementation was occurring and a supportive learning environment were all necessary variables in creating a 'community of learners'; a community in which learners felt comfortable to take risks and share their newly forming beliefs. The dynamo that powered these processes and the learning which occurred was language. This model placed the focus on the inside circle, the core. It is an inside-out process.

Figure 1 is an overview of how these processes operated in SLIC and indicates the role which language played in these processes.

**Overview of SLIC Process**

We learn through language

Language is a social process

- Listening to input, reflecting, and talking about it with others
- Whole group discussion
- Spontaneous, informal exchange of ideas
- Sharing information, thoughts and experiences with others
- Viewing/observing then discussing observations/reflections with others
- Reading, then discussing the content with others
- Small group activity and discussion
- Practising and reflecting on the experience with others

Figure 1: Overview of SLIC Process (SLIC Manual, 1989:6)
During this same period Cambourne and I were developing a research methodology, which we referred to as Teacher as Co-Researcher (TACOR), into an approach for staff development (Cambourne and Turbill, 1991).

Whilst carrying out our research work with class teachers and their students we began to realise that both parties (whether it be academic and teacher or academic and child) had expertise to offer and share with each other. There were times, for example, when I looked to my co-researcher teacher for the ‘expert knowledge’ and there were times when she looked to me for expertise. There were more times, however, when we both struggled over a problem trying to make sense of our data. This understanding that the role of expert/novice oscillated between us, and in fact, eventually did not exist at all, forced us to make explicit this relationship which we called co-researching. Together, the teacher and I researched questions and problems from our different perspectives in the setting; together, we solved the research questions; together we learned. It was this type of relationship that I had established with the 27 teachers involved in the St George Writing Project in 1982. However, it was not until Dr Brian Cambourne and I undertook this joint project that we began to formalise the process as a valuable methodology in qualitative research projects. What also became blatantly clear was that this process served as a powerful form of professional development for all those involved; academic, teachers, students (Cambourne and Turbill, 1991; Barton, 1992).

We argued that traditional staff development programs, be they be the one or two day inservice inputs, summer workshops, make-and-take workshops, long term, spaced-learning lecture/workshops, on-site, on-going, peer coaching, mentoring by a more experienced peer or the clinical-supervision-by-a-senior-peer model, all have at least one thing in common.

There is an acknowledged and accepted difference in status between those who teach in these programs and those who are supposed to learn in them. Those who teach are automatically accorded the status of expert, while those
who learn are automatically accorded the status of novice. (Cambourne and Turbill, 1991:1)

We further argued that once a staff development enterprise establishes the 'expert-novice' dichotomy, it becomes locked into a certain model of learning based on the premise that learning is essentially a process of transmitting information and/or skills from an expert to a novice. The expert therefore has the responsibility for ensuring that learning will occur.

The concept of co-researching as a methodology for staff development is a form of collaborative educational inquiry. As such it involves both parties (or all parties) working together in ways which encourage a merging of roles and responsibilities. This merging of roles and responsibilities requires equal status between the parties. All involved are acknowledged as having different kinds of expertise, all of which are valued and necessary.

The challenge I now began to wrestle with was how the TACOR model could be incorporated into my staff development model.

In addition, there was a problem which was causing me concern. 'Whole language' was becoming a set of orthodoxies due to some dreadful misunderstandings and lack of information. Whole language was beginning to sweep through schools in both the United States and Australia. It was a strong 'grass roots movement' in the United States and teachers were seeking support. From my work with teachers in America and Australia it was also obvious that 'orthodoxies' were beginning to appear. Teachers were taking on board the 'theory of others' in the sense that they could articulate these theories. However, they did not seem to be making these theories their own.
They were adopting classroom practices which they either saw other teachers trying or read about in the many books and articles written by teachers for teachers. But many of them were not taking such practice and going beyond the adopting phase. They were not adapting these activities to suit their situations and the needs of their children. Teachers did not seem to have enough confidence in what they believed to take risks and create new strategies in order to best teach what it was they wanted to teach. Although they seemed to be able to articulate their beliefs about whole language philosophy, they were not allowing these beliefs to orchestrate their practice. They were not operating from the ‘inside-out’. Teachers it seemed, were wanting to turn whole language into a set of ‘do’s and don’t’s.

How could teachers empower their young learners to think critically, to be analytical, to problem solve and to make decisions which were appropriate for the situation when they themselves did not appear to be empowered; they themselves were not able to think critically, to be analytical, to problem solve and to make decisions which were appropriate for the situation. Staff development about whole language not only needed to teach a content which was about the empowering of young learners, it also needed to empower its learners in the process.

It seemed that the ‘three circle model’ needed another layer and a slightly different focus. And so a fourth layer, ‘implications for MY classroom’, was added. The focus of the model shifted from the professional development of teachers, generally, to the professional development of individual teachers, incorporating the notion of empowering teachers so they could empower their student learners.

Thus I found I was beginning to talk about teacher learning using the ‘four circles’ as a model, as well as the design of a staff development program for groups of teachers. These four circles represented four domains of knowledge which were both interactive and integrative.
It was this model that was used as a basis for the design of *Frameworks*.

In general terms the model operates this way. The inner core represents the basic beliefs and knowledge a learner (any learner) already holds about that which is to be learned. The next layer represents the knowledge and beliefs held by others about that which is to be learned. The third layer is the application of these beliefs and knowledge of that which is to be learned by those who have learned it. And the last layer represents the learner's attempts to apply that which is to be learned, is being learned in his or her own context. It is a model which operates from the inside-out and then moves from the outside-in. It is both interactive and integrative.

The model helped me to begin to understand the difference between a disempowered learner and an empowered learner whether the learner be a child or teacher.
The Disempowered Learner

The disempowered learner has an inner core of clearly understood beliefs and knowledge about that which is to be learned. These beliefs and knowledge are 'messy', unclear, lacking in cohesion and certainly more subconscious than conscious. The learner may refer to this inner core as 'gut feelings' and 'intuitions'; whatever the name given to such knowledge and beliefs, they are not valued by the learner as being important, and certainly not valued by those people in the learner's learning environment. They are usually dismissed, in the case of the teacher, as being too subjective when making important decisions about learning experiences for students.

The disempowered learner relies strongly on 'the theory of others' and how that theory is implemented into practice by others. Thus the how-to manuals that come with various curriculum programs in reading, writing, science etc. become the basis for their teaching. They tend to follow these manuals to the letter not believing they have the knowledge or the power to challenge the authors' instructions and to adapt them to suit the needs of individual students.

Thus the disempowered learner does not operate in the fourth layer. He or she takes on board the practice of others and tries to implement this practice as either shown or
written. If things do not work well, the learner blames himself or herself or, in the case of the teacher, often blames the student for not understanding. There is no room for problem solving, analytical thinking and decision making as the disempowered learner does not value his or her beliefs and knowledge in such a way that any type of critical reflection about what others say and do, can occur. Because these teachers think that what others, i.e. the experts, say and do is 'the truth' and there is a right and a wrong way to go about teaching, orthodoxies occur. A disempowered teacher/learner, therefore, is in no position to begin the process of empowering student learners.

Basal reading programs have supported, if not created, thousands of disempowered teachers in classrooms. The testing procedures built into these programs operate only to reinforce the need for the disempowered teacher to adhere to the strict, linear, lock-step teaching procedures set out in many of these programs. The programs may have been written with the intention to support teachers and their students' learning but, in fact, the opposite is seen to occur (Shannon, 1989; Goodman et al., 1988). The first step in moving these teachers to become empowered learners and teachers is to help them begin to value their beliefs, their 'gut feelings' and intuitions, and to value their inner core.

The Empowered Learner

Chapter 1 - Introduction
The empowered learner is aware of the beliefs and understandings he or she has in a particular field of knowledge, in this case, literacy learning. Empowered learners can clearly articulate these beliefs and value them highly to the point of almost appearing arrogant. This inner core of beliefs and knowledge is constantly being drawn on and used to think critically about, to analyse and to make judgements about the ‘theory of others’ being presented to them. The new theories and new knowledge often create ‘intellectual unrest’ (Cambourne, 1988). This unrest is often uncomfortable for the learner because the new knowledge is challenging the very core of the learner; the learner’s existing beliefs and knowledge. The learner moves to lessen the degree of unrest by considering the information in light of his or her existing beliefs and knowledge and the application of such knowledge in his or her own context.

This interaction does not only operate between the inner core and the second layer. The learner also considers how this new knowledge is applied in practice. What do others do with the new knowledge and beliefs? What can I do with it? How can I use this new knowledge in my context? These are important considerations which the learner puts into play.

The process of interaction which comes into play across the four circles can be likened to what happens in cells in an organism. The movement of ionic particles in solutions across cells through the semi-permeable membranes is a constant dynamic process. When the pressure (turgor pressure) builds up in one cell it becomes ‘uncomfortable’ for the cell. Movement of the solution needs to occur to decrease the turgor pressure in the cell wall. The fluid moves in a direction where there is less pressure, thus moving towards a greater degree of congruence. In this movement to and fro, the cell moves the ions which need to be moved from one cell to another through the semi-permeable membrane to other cells (Gruelach, 1973).
This analogy helps to describe how the learner takes what he or she needs from the ‘theory of others’ and the ‘implications for practice’, tries these in his or her contexts, analyses what goes on in light of the knowledge and beliefs already held in the inner core and makes judgements about what to use from what is seen and heard to become part of the inner core of beliefs and the outer layer of practices. In this sense, the learner is constantly moving towards a high degree of congruence between the beliefs that she or he holds about language and learning and the practices which occur in his or her classroom.

The empowered teacher will critically examine programs such as basal reading programs and after analysing (testing) the apparent philosophy of the basal program against his/her beliefs about language and literacy learning and considering the needs of the learners in his or her care, will make decisions about the appropriateness of such materials for the learners in his or her classroom. This problem solving process occurs because the empowered teacher not only is aware of his or her beliefs and knowledge and can clearly articulate them but also values them highly (Cho, 1990).

The empowered teacher is thus in a position to empower student learners.

*Frameworks* was designed with this model clearly in mind by its three authors, Turbill, Butler and Cambourne (1991). The model is set out in the beginning session accompanied by a clear explanation of how the design and the delivery of the program underpins it. The model has since been used by teachers when planning learning experiences in their classrooms. Cambourne and I also use the model to design our Masters classes.

It is this model, and the theory it represents, that is the major focus of this study.
LOCUS OF THE STUDY

THE SITE
The study is located within a school district which was involved in a larger study involving some 30 school districts. The district is one of 30 districts across New York state in the United States of America which had formed a consortium for the purposes of trialling the Frameworks Program. (See Chapters 3 and 4 for more details.)

Gorham Middlesex School District (more commonly known and henceforth called Marcus Whitman Central School District) is a small rural district in the northern part of New York. It has two elementary schools, one junior high and one secondary high school. There are approximately 114 teachers in the District and 1700 students. This study focused on the facilitator and teachers from the two elementary schools who participated in the trialling of the Frameworks program. Twelve teachers from Grades 4, 5 and 6 from both Gorham and Rushville elementary schools met weekly in the library of Gorham school over an eight week period to participate in the sessions led by a trained Frameworks facilitator.

THE PARTICIPANTS
Four teachers, two from each of the schools, volunteered to be case study teachers and therefore willing to be interviewed regularly and have classroom visits. The facilitator is also a key person in the study. This group became the primary data source whereas the other teachers who participated in the program, the principals and the Superintendent, became the secondary data source.

The facilitator, Jackie, has been teaching for 20 years - the past 13 years she has been the Reading specialist teacher for both elementary schools. She was trained in 1988 as a trainer for the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC) and during the period of this
study is a part-time Reading teacher and part-time staff developer in the District. These roles and responsibilities take her to both elementary schools.

The Case Study Teachers
Lonnie is a Grade 5 teacher. He has been teaching 15 years having taught Grades 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9. His most recent academic award was a Masters degree granted in 1982.

Denny is a Grade 6 teacher. She has been teaching 18 years, having taught all Grades 1-6. She received her Masters degree in 1991. Denny had attended many staff development courses and conferences in the past ten years, many in the literacy field.

Ginny is a Grade 4 teacher. She has been teaching 21 years; thirteen years as a Physical Education teacher for Grades K-6. In the years prior to the study she taught mainstream Grades 4 and 5. Ginny has a Masters Physical Education and in 1988 was awarded her Elementary Education Certification.

Gail is a Grade 4 teacher. She has been teaching 16 years, having taught Kindergarten, Grades 4 and 5. She received her Masters in Education in 1976. Since then, Gail has participated in many staff development workshops and conferences, particularly in whole language education.

THE EVALUAND - FRAMEWORKS

WHAT IS FRAMEWORKS?

Frameworks is a long term staff development program for teachers of Grades 3-8. It espouses the philosophy of holistic learning in language education which is the basis of the whole language approach. Whilst it focuses on theory into practice there is an equally strong focus on helping teachers explore their own philosophy and practice and how that relates to current theory and practice. Frameworks draws on the current
research into language and learning and the relationship between language and learning and the current research in staff development. It is a flexible program and can be customised to fit the needs of a school district. The program is run by a trained facilitator.

AIMS OF FRAMEWORKS

The aims of the program as stated in the Facilitator’s Manual are:

- to sensitisise participants to the processes they use as learners, as readers, as writers; to the role that language plays in their learning and everyday lives
- to introduce key concepts, beliefs and understandings about language, language learning and the role that language plays in learning
- to consider the implications for these understandings for classroom practice
- to introduce instructional strategies which participants can use in their classrooms
- to assist teachers in planning and organising a whole language curriculum which best suits the needs of their particular students
- to support teachers as learners as they come to understand new theories about language and learning and try new classroom practices.

(Frameworks, Facilitator’s Manual, 1991:1)

The Program claims that it aims to produce teachers who:

- understand the nature of learning
- understand the nature of language
- understand the theory of how children learn and in particular how they learn language
- understand how learners acquire the skills and strategies in order to become effective readers, writers and spellers
are aware of the role that language plays in learning in all areas of the curriculum

can set up classroom conditions which support learning and language learning

have a range of instructional strategies which support the acquisition of learning to read, to write and to spell

can continually evaluate their learners' progress as well as their own performance

can plan a language program based on the observed needs of the learners.

(Frameworks, Facilitator's Manual, 1991:1)

The program consists of eight two and one half hour sessions entitled:

1 The Nature of Learning
2 Learning Language
3 The Nature of Language
4 Language Processes 1 - Focus on Writing
5 Language Processes 2 - Focus on Spelling
6 Language Processes 3 - Focus on Reading
7 Assessment and Evaluation of Language
8 Pulling It Altogether - Classroom Practice

The materials include the 'Facilitator's Manual', a VHS videotape with video presentations, an audio tape. The video clippings serve as input for Sessions 1, 2 and 8 whereas the audio tape can be used to direct Session 6 which focuses on reading and the reading process.

There is a set of materials for each participant to use during the program. These include a 'Course Notebook' which teachers use in each session; a book of instructional

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FACILITATOR**

The roles and responsibility of the facilitator are to support and guide participants as they work through the program together. Although facilitators will have been involved in a five day training program, they are not considered ‘experts’ in the sense that they ‘know’ all the content. During the training the facilitator will experience the processes of operating the program. It is expected that the facilitator will put these processes into place during the running of the Program. It is also expected that the facilitator and participants will be learning together and this feature is emphasised strongly throughout the training.

The facilitator will be responsible for the overall organisation of the sessions, guiding the 10-12 participants in a group through each session, keeping them on task, directing the workshop sections, and guiding them through the readings and activities which make up a large part of the program.

It is important that the facilitator has read all the readings and tried the activities which all participants are expected to carry out before they begin the program. Again, the point is emphasised throughout the training.

A key role for the facilitator is to work with the group as a co-learner rather than an expert.

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTICIPANTS**

It is important that participants understand the nature of the program before they make a commitment to attend. To this end, an Introductory Session has been designed for the facilitator to either photocopy for prospective participants to read or for the facilitator to
use with interested members of the school staff. Participants are advised, before they make a commitment, about the expectations of them during the program. These are, to attend all of the eight sessions, to participate in the discussions within the sessions, to read all Between Session Readings, to attempt all Between Session Activities and to be a supportive member of a community of learners.

**BROAD THEMES RUNNING THROUGH FRAMEWORKS**

The broad themes running through the program are:

- what is learning and how does it 'work'
- what is language and how does it 'work'
- what is writing and how does it 'work'
- what is reading and how does it 'work'
- reading, writing, talking, listening are interrelated modes of language
- we learn language, learn through language and learn about language as we simultaneously use language
- language is learned from whole to part.

**CONCLUSION**

A major purpose of this chapter is to outline the focus of the study whilst establishing that the study is worthwhile. It is also necessary to provide the context for the study, the socio-political as well as personal contexts. The presuppositions and assumptions which underpin the study can be clearly identified throughout the description of the personal context.

The actual locus of the study has been briefly described. More information regarding the site and the participants within the study can be found in following chapters.

Finally the evaluand, Frameworks, has been described.
In the following chapters, much of what has been discussed and described here is expanded upon. Chapter Two explores in more detail the current literature in the field of staff development from the perspective of a future agenda for professional and staff development.

Chapter Three discusses the choice of research paradigm and the appropriate methodology for the study. Furthermore it relates the methodological processes used to carry out the study whilst examining the literature in the research methodology field.

Chapter Four outlines the results of the data analysis of both the primary data and secondary data sources. It describes the socio-political as well as demographic contexts of the study before presenting the results in the form of case studies of the four teachers. The themes and categories which emerged from these case studies frames the case report which focuses on the impact of Frameworks and the nature of change which occurred. The grounded theory which emerged from the data is described.

The final chapter, Chapter 5, explicates this grounded theory, highlighting the key principles and making suggestions to how this theory can be put into action for future staff development.
CHAPTER 2

A FUTURE AGENDA FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT:
A LITERATURE REVIEW

The ultimate goal [of professional development] is changing the culture of learning for both adults and students so that engagement and betterment is a way of life in schools. (Fullan, 1991: 344)

INTRODUCTION

The process of reviewing the literature is quite different from writing a review of the literature. When one reviews the literature it is a process of searching for other writers and researchers in the field. During this process one taps into various fields of knowledge which may or may not be used later in the actual written review. The reading undertaken for this study not only informed me of the current research and writing in the field and guided my research process overall, it took me into quite new realms of knowledge which at the onset of the study I would not have considered.

As the time to actually write the literature review drew closer I was faced with the difficult task of revisiting much of what had been read and then selecting not only particular fields of knowledge upon which to focus, but also selecting a structure for presenting the literature. I wanted to do this in a way that not only demonstrated that I 'knew' the field but which also presented a critical argument which enhanced and supported my study. In this regard the literature review in itself became a research study in that I needed to collect data, analyse them carefully and draw conclusions from them.
The literature review must also respond to the purpose of the overall study. Thus both the reviewing of the literature and the writing of the literature review must respond to the purpose of this study, namely, to develop a grounded theory of staff development. In particular, the questions which guided the study were used to focus the reviewing process.

There is certainly no paucity of literature in the area of staff development. The field is huge, particularly when one begins to move into the overlapping categories of 'school improvement', 'the restructuring and renewal of schools', 'school reform', 'teachers as learners', 'leadership and management', 'quality school management', 'the nature of change and the change process' to name a few. The literature of 'organisational behaviours', 'systems theory' and 'total quality management' from the general business administration field has much to contribute. The fields of learning (both children's learning and the adult learning field) were read widely. Another focus which emerged during the period of the study which seemed highly pertinent to the purpose of the study was the field of paradigms and paradigm shifts and the concept of holism. Finally, an interest which I have had for many years and which I revisited for this study is the field of language and the role that language plays as a semiotic system in our learning and our culture.

When it came to structuring this review it was necessary to begin the process of analysing and synthesising the information into some coherent and cohesive manner. This meant being selective as to which fields of knowledge would be discussed in detail and therefore referenced, and which would serve as supportive background and conceptual knowledge but not directly used and therefore not referenced. I was also aware of the danger of being perceived to have sampled the literature to suit my own ends rather than presenting the views of various advocates in the field.
Thus it was decided that this review would be presented with the focus of a 'case for a future agenda for staff development'.

The 'case' begins with an *Overview of Effective Staff Development*. A framework developed by Barton (1992) based on four models of professional development is used to organise the literature. The four models (Authoritarian Model, Support or Training Model, the Individual to Co-operative Model and the Critical/Collaborative Model) provide a useful framework for categorising the literature. The framework, in a sense, is historical in that one model seems to be the forerunner to the next in the sequence of time and the corresponding assumptions about staff development associated with that era. More importantly, each model depicts a significant difference with respect to who owns the knowledge and who is seen as the generator of that knowledge and all future knowledge. Furthermore, the assumptions underlying these differing views on ownership have a strong bearing on the control and responsibility for the learning which, in turn, impact on the roles that the different stakeholders play in the whole process. As a major focus of this study centres around who controls and has responsibility for the learning of teachers and how this impacts on the role relationships within a school culture, these models serve as a useful organiser for discussing the large body of literature on professional and staff development.

The next section of this chapter, *A Future Agenda for Staff Development*, focuses on change and the change process. There is a strong message coming through the literature that we need to understand more clearly the 'meaning of educational change' as it is the core of all we do in the name of staff development. Just what change is and how it can be successfully implemented and managed in order to improve the learning cultures of both teachers and their students is highlighted.

*The Problem: Why Hasn't Staff Development Worked?* briefly focuses on the conclusions of many in the field; that is, in spite of some ten to fifteen years of much
research and writing, there appears to be overwhelming evidence that most staff development has had little or no long term impact, and therefore has been not very successful in bringing about the desired changes in school cultures and improved student learning.

The section, *An Alternate View to the Problem*, introduces the concept of paradigms and paradigm shift as an alternate mode of thinking about change and the change process. It is argued that this is a more holistic view to staff development and the problems indicated above. These concepts have been used extensively in the domains of business and management with much success according to the writers in the field. Systems theory and the implications of this thinking for education is offered as an alternate view when considering school cultures as holistic systems.

*Towards a Paradigm Shift in Staff Development* continues the discussion from the previous section. In particular it focuses on the work of Michael Fullan and his suggestions for future change; at the same time it suggests that there are some contradictions in the literature as well as some serious omissions which may have resulted in the profession suffering 'paradigm paralysis' so that it is unable to view staff development from a different mind set.

In the next section, *School Cultures as Social Semiotic Systems*, it is argued that maybe we should view school cultures more from a perspective of 'social semiotic systems'. With this view, language plays a major role in all facets of the system, not only in shaping the system but in creating (and, if necessary, changing) the role relationships among those who make up the system. Also, it is proposed that language plays a major role in the learning process itself at the individual levels of both teachers and their students within the social semiotic system.
It is further suggested that although there is much written about teacher learning and
teacher change there is no apparent explicit learning theory driving staff development
and the learning of teachers. A theory of learning is therefore suggested which is
natural or experiential in its intent and seems to best fit what is implicit in the staff
development literature. It is argued that if those who work in the field of staff
development are to have a clearer understanding of staff development needs of the
future they also need an understanding of such a theory. Moreover, the intricate links
between learning and change are highlighted.

The Summary attempts to pull together the 'threads' of the overall discussion In
attempting to do this, special mention is made of the most recent work of Fullan (1993)
which was obtained at the '11th hour' of finalising the writing of this study.

SOME DEFINITIONS

It is necessary to briefly discuss the definitions of the key terms used in the literature to
provide some clarity for the readers of this review.

'Professional development', 'staff development', 'inservice training' are all terms which
are generally used in the literature to depict some sort of 'training programs' and
'learning' activities and processes for teachers. To many in the field, the terms are
synonymous whereas to others they have specific meanings.

'Professional development' is usually perceived to be more than 'inservice
education/training' or 'staff development'. In Professional Development: A Review of
Contemporary Literature carried out by Richard Dunlop (1990) for the Department of
Education, Queensland, Australia, 'professional development' is defined as being 'more
than inservice. It should be understood more broadly as the systematic and formal
attempts to "advance the knowledge, skills and understanding of teachers in ways that
lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behaviour." [Fenstermacher and Berliner, 1983:4] (Dunlop, 1990:1).

Fullan (1991: 326) defines professional development even more broadly as 'the sum total of formal and informal learning experiences throughout one's career from preservice teacher education to retirement'.

'Inservice education' seems to be a term which is used more in the British, Canadian, Australian and New Zealand literature. A definition given in The Report of the Inservice Teacher Education Project carried out by the Australian Government's Department of Employment, Education and Training states:

Inservice training and development for professional educators involved in schooling is deliberate adult learning activity initiated by teachers themselves, by their employers, by tertiary institutions, or by other agencies with a stake in education. It has as its purpose the improvement of the educational enterprise, particularly the quality of teaching, and, in the final analysis, better outcomes for students. (DEET, 1988:5)

The term, 'staff development', tends to appear more in the American and Canadian literature, although it is beginning to appear in current literature in Australia. The definition given by Moore and Hyde (1981:9, cited in Fullan 1991:328) typifies the meaning of the term as it is generally used in the literature. They define staff development as:

... any school district activity that is intended partly or primarily to prepare paid staff members for improved performance in present or possible future roles in the school district.

This definition is somewhat broadened in later writing by Fullan (1992:97) where he states:
Staff development is conceived broadly to include any activity or process intended to improve skills, attitudes, understandings, or performances in present or future roles (Little 1989; Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, 1990).

However, trying to clearly make a distinction among the terms as they are used in the literature is difficult as Fullan (1992:97) himself indicates with this footnote, 'The terms "staff development", "professional development", "in-service" and "on-going assistance" are used interchangeably in this chapter'. It seems that this note sums up how the terms are generally used in the literature.

For the purpose of further discussion in this chapter, the term 'professional development' will be used to mean the the sum total of formal and informal learning experiences throughout one's career from preservice teacher education to retirement whereas 'staff development' will be used to mean any structured activity or process intended to improve the skills, attitudes, understandings, or performances of educators in their present or future roles. However, it is my belief that one does not, or cannot, occur without the other. They are so intertwined (or should be) throughout the teacher's career.

In this study the focus is predominantly on 'any structured activity or process intended to improve the skills, attitudes, understandings, or performances of educators in their present or future roles'. 'Professional development' being the sum total of these experiences will occur in the individual teacher as a consequence of much of the staff development he or she experiences. In other words, it is my assumption that professional development is (or should be) a natural outcome of staff development. Thus, for the purpose of discussion in this review, the term 'staff development' will be used to mean both, rather than trying to use the two terms in their own right. The term 'professional development' will be used when I mean to be more specific or when used in a quote.
Recent reviews of the literature of staff development demonstrate that there is an extensive body of literature in the field (Davies, 1991; Fullan, 1991; Barton, 1992). This literature emanates from many differing domains, such as research on teacher change, the conditions necessary for change, the change process itself, school reform and restructuring, effective schools and total quality management, adult learning as well as the field of organisational management.

An organisational framework developed by Barton (1992:25) has been used in this chapter to discuss the staff development literature. These 'models of professional development' reflect my underlying assumptions about professional and staff development as outlined in the description of the development of a personal theory of staff development (see Chapter 1, page 33). The four different models highlight 'the major differences [in professional and staff development] with particular reference to the roles that participants play in the process, where the control and responsibility for the learning is centred and where knowledge comes from'. Furthermore, Barton argues they are both a culmination and extension of those developed by Ingvarson (1987), Johnson (1988) and Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989), (cited Barton, 1992:23).

The following figure illustrates Barton's four models.
The Authoritarian Model represents an approach to staff development which arose in response to a perceived need to disseminate knowledge from those believed to be authorities in a given field to teachers who, it was believed, did not have such knowledge but needed it in order to be better teachers. These authorities included people such as university academics and central office personnel such as those
employed as staff developers and curriculum instructors. It is a model which makes 'a clear distinction between expert and novice, reflects a deficit view of teaching and learning' (Barton, 1992:26) and focuses on a one-way delivery methodology; namely, a transmission methodology.

Staff development within this model is manifested through one-shot lecture/workshops at school and district level. These courses are typified by a presenter delivering the 'knowledge' or information. A variety of media may be used - film, video, overhead projection - to deliver the message but overall these sessions are based on topics which the organisers believe teachers need to know, rather than want to know. Lecturers are often brought in at great expense to deliver the message and a 'guru' mentality operates.

This is not to say that there may not be a place for such a model of staff development as recent research by Maxwell (1993:63) found. From the analysis of survey and interview data from teachers, principals and cluster directors in a rural area in New South Wales, Australia, Maxwell found that 'the one shot course is still among the top preferences for school personnel despite the growing body of opinion against this type of learning experience'. However, he points out that this may be because the teachers had not experienced many (if any) other modes of delivery. The research was carried out in rural, and sometimes isolated, areas of New South Wales and there may have been other factors (such as the chance to meet and talk with other teachers) which served as an intrinsic motivator towards this type of one shot withdrawal course. The research methodology used would not have been able to identify these factors.

Maxwell (1993:63) points out, however, 'that the one shot course may still have a place where the situation warrants it, for example, where the input is needed and wanted and the presenter is especially good in this role'. It would seem that the key here is the notion of 'want' and 'need'. While it can be argued that there is a need for information exchange which is best delivered through a transmission mode, there need to be
choices available so that those who believe they 'want' or 'need' the information can choose this mode of information sharing.

Fullan (1991:316) summarised ten years of literature on 'inservice' education, much of which could be categorised into the Authoritarian Model, and found that overall much of it had failed due to the following reasons:

1. One-shot workshops are widespread but ineffective.
2. Topics are frequently selected by people other than those for whom the inservice is intended.
3. Follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in inservice programs occurs in only a very small minority of cases.
4. Follow-up evaluation occurs infrequently.
5. Inservice programs rarely address the individual needs and concerns.
6. The majority of programs involve teachers from many different schools and/or school districts, but there is no recognition of the differential impact of positive and negative factors within the systems to which they must return.
7. There is a profound lack of any conceptual basis in the planning and implementing of inservice programs that would ensure their effectiveness.

Barton (1992:36) summarises the ineffectiveness of this model of staff development thus:

...the weaknesses of this approach to inservice included failure to acknowledge the complex nature of the improvement and change process. It served to highlight the problems associated with the diffusion of new educational knowledge and demonstrated the limited perceptions of the needs of adult learners. As a result, curriculum reforms were never realised at the school level and failed to have any impact on either teachers or the students.
The Support or Training Model presents strategies which have emanated from the research on school reform and improvement. Barton (1992:37) explains that this model was 'so called because of the strategies that comprise it. It placed emphasis on the support of teachers as they made changes to their classroom practice, and grew out of the realisation of the ineffectiveness of the "one-shot" inservice presentations to effect change at the school level.'

There is a shift in focus within this model to changing classroom practice rather than simply exchanging information. This resulted in a focus on the technical skills that teachers employed in their own classrooms. Barton (1992:38) points out that one of the major strengths of the model is the body of research that supports it. 'What had been learnt about the process of change served to sustain the development of many new initiatives for professional development, many of which are still being widely used both here [Australia] and overseas.'

Fullan's (1985:404) 'innovation focused strategy' fits within this model, as researchers began to turn their attention to 'the conditions which influence the adoption and implementation of specific proven or promising programs or practices' (Invargson, 1987:27). Staff development of the withdrawal one-shot type was being seen as only one component or strategy within a coordinated set of strategies for promoting change. Thus emphasis was now being placed on exemplary practices. It seems that it was assumed that those teachers who were being 'trained' or 'inserviced' or 'staff developed' did not have such practices or were in need of improving those they had.

A promising feature of much of this research, Invargson (ibid.) stresses, is that it recognises the 'haphazard phase' of the implementation of new practices back in the teachers' classrooms. It is during this phase that frustration levels are high and feelings of incompetence are likely to be felt. Thus, support during this phase is vital through such strategies as 'coaching' (Showers 1985) and other on-going peer support, and
follow up if the new teaching strategies or curriculum innovations are to be understood and become part of the teacher’s classroom repertoire. (Fullan, 1985, 1991; Huberman and Miles, 1984; Joyce and Showers, 1982, 1988; Huberman, 1992)

Guidelines within this model for effective staff development emphasis are proposed by Invargson (1987:27) with reference to Fullan, 1982:ch. 14):

Professional development should focus on job or program related tasks faced by teachers.

Professional development programs should include the general components found by Joyce and Showers (1981) to be necessary for change in practice: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and application with coaching.

Follow through is crucial. A series of sessions with intervals between in which people have the chance to try things (with some access to help or to other resources), is much more powerful than even the most stimulating one-shot workshop.

A variety of formal and informal elements should be coordinated: training workshops and sharing workshops, teacher-teacher interaction, one-to-one assistance, meetings.

It is essential to recognise the relationship between professional development and implementation of change.

Within this model there are many assumptions about the nature of change. Guskey (1986:5) argues that 'staff development programs are a systematic attempt to bring about change - change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students. He argues that staff development in the past has been ineffective because it has failed 'to consider the process of teacher change'. (op. cit. : 6). Furthermore, he purports that staff developers have wrongly assumed that 'a change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes will lead to specific changes in their classroom behaviours and practices, which, in turn, will result in improved student learning'.
Guskey offers an alternate model based on a synthesis of 'current research'. It is a model which is quite linear (see Figure 3) and suggests that 'significant change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes is likely to take place only after changes in student learning outcomes are evidenced. The changes in student learning result, of course, from specific changes teachers have made in their classroom practice' (Guskey, 1986:7).

Figure 3: A Model of the Process of Teacher Change (Guskey, 1986:7)

Guskey proceeds to outline the following implications of this model for staff development. Staff developers need to:

- recognise that change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers
- ensure that teachers receive regular feedback on student learning
- provide continued support and follow-up after the initial training.

Fullan's (1985:396) analysis of effective staff development is more detailed and appears to be less linear than Guskey's. He notes that 'change at the individual level is a process whereby individuals alter their ways of thinking and doing...It is a process of developing new skills and above all, of finding meaning and satisfaction in new ways of doing things'. Fullan appears to view beliefs, attitudes and practices as highly interrelated aspects of the change process which ideally change simultaneously rather than in the highly linear fashion offered by Guskey. Fullan's (1985:396) summary of the key points of effective staff development emanating from his analysis are:
• change takes place over time

• the initial stage of any significant change always involves anxiety and uncertainty

• ongoing technical support assistance and psychological support assistance are crucial if the anxiety is to be coped with

• change involves learning new skills through practice and feedback - it is incremental and developmental

• the most fundamental breakthrough occurs when people can cognitively understand the underlying conception and rationale with respect to 'why this new way works better'

• organisation conditions within the school (peer norms, administrative leadership) and in relation to the school (eg external administrative support and technical help) make it more or less likely that the process will succeed

• successful change involves pressure, but it is pressure through interaction with peers and other technical and administrative leaders.

There are many programs or 'packages' which fit within the Support Model. The focus of these is very much on exemplary teaching practices using a teaching methodology which aims to focus on the needs of the learner. The work of Joyce and Showers (1982, 1988) is evident in many of these programs. Joyce and Showers (1982:5) identify key elements which they believe 'guarantee the successful implementation of almost any approach'. These include:

• study of the theoretical basis or rationale of the teaching method

• observation of demonstrations by persons who are relatively expert in the model

• practise and feedback in protected conditions (such as trying out the strategy on each other and then on children who are relatively easy to teach)

• coaching one another as they work the new model into their repertoire.
A widely implemented Australian program which is an exemplar of this model is the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC). The success of the program was heavily dependent on a highly trained tutor and although teachers perceived this approach to staff development to be far more useful and practical than any previous staff development, the long term effects on teacher change have not been clearly established. A two year evaluation of the impact of the program on teachers in the state of New South Wales demonstrated that there was a high level of impact on teachers' classroom practices, but the predicted impact on student outcomes and teachers' beliefs which Guskey's model suggests was not apparent. (Cambourne et al., 1988)

Barton (1992:50) describes how a series of 'copy cat' packages developed within this model following the apparent success of ELIC in Australia. However, she suggests that although they were 'loosely based on the Joyce and Showers (1980) training components they failed to recognise the importance of ongoing support'. Furthermore, Barton suggests that 'the "package" concept of professional development whilst initially popular with teachers, remains patronising and "expert" designed. Teachers had little input, control or responsibility for the learning'.

At worst these approaches still viewed teachers as practitioners or technicians rather than professionals. At best the strengths in the programs, such as shared talk, the opportunity to collaborate with each other, the networking which often resulted in the school, were becoming recognised as strategies which needed to be maximised. The potential for social interaction, collaboration and reflection to be recognised as staff development tools was still basically untapped.

The Individual to Co-operative Model is characterised by Barton (1992:52) as one which focuses on 'the improvement of local practice, the fine-tuning of existing repertoire' rather than 'the production and dissemination of new knowledge'. This
model is characterised by the process of action research and the setting up of in-school learning/research partnerships. Thus the source of the change strategy is the teachers themselves and arises from the questions they identify as being important. Knowledge generation is in the hands of the teachers.

Invargson's (1987:27) 'action research model' fits into this category as well as the strategies of clinical supervision and interactive research and development. The common threads which bind these strategies, Barton (1992:54) suggests, 'relate to a knowledge source which is developed through "reflection in action" by individual teachers or between "co-operating pairs" and a learning design which sees practitioners learning for themselves by systematically reflecting on their practice'.

Invargson's (1987:28) proposal that the innovation-focused and action research models represent two very different strategies for promoting change supports Barton's categories. The latter, he suggests, is 'learning for ourselves' whereas the former is 'akin to learning from others'. Action research is seen as a knowledge generating process which, as a strategy for change, 'aims to give greater control over what is to count as valid educational knowledge to teachers'. However, he further argues that these two models are not, and should not, be mutually exclusive as they often are perceived to be. There is much to gain from drawing upon both.

Action research is based upon 'action' and 'reflection'. Reflection as a tool for learning is becoming an increasingly valued process. Schon (1983:68) comments,

> When someone reflects-in-action, he becomes a researcher in the practice context. He is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case.

The work on 'action research' of Kemmis and McTaggart (1982) has been a useful strategy for staff development for many schools staffs in Australia. They argue that the
strategy must involve the process of sharing with others, however, the 'others' should be participants who have a similar interest or focus. They do not generally recognise that there is the need for an outside expert to assist in the generation of new knowledge.

Ingvarson (1987:28) proposes that action research is 'a necessary but not sufficient basis for professional development'. Furthermore he argues that 'there can be no professional development without self-reflection and an honest self appraisal of the effects of what one is doing'.

It would appear that the process of teachers stopping, taking stock and reflecting on their current practices and beliefs, in an organised fashion from time to time, is the important strategy for staff development which grows out of this model. (Mossip, 1990; Cho, 1990; Bryant, 1993)

Clinical supervision fits neatly into this school model of professional development (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). However, Barton is quick to point out that as a strategy for staff development the various practices which actually occur within the guise of 'clinical supervision' are problematic. A growing literature in the area of teacher supervision argues that there is a strong need for this strategy to involve both collaboration and self-reflection, whilst locating the responsibility of the issues/problems and knowledge generation in the domain of the teacher (Webb, 1991; Davies, 1991).

The third strategy Barton places within this category is 'interactive research and development'. Duffy (1990) has strongly pointed out that for too long university-based researchers have been active in developing a body of knowledge which they expect teachers to follow. This practice has its basis in the Authoritarian Model. Duffy believes that teachers themselves need to be an integral participant in the research
agenda. Thus the concept of action research is considered an appropriate methodology for joint research with teachers and university personnel. Duffy (1990:1) believes that such an agenda will not only increase the professional development of teachers but 'put teachers in charge of their teaching', that is, 'empower teachers to take control of their work' (op. cit. :7). This in turn, Duffy argues, results in teachers who 'combine, adapt and orchestrate what they know, creating new ways to achieve [it]' (op. cit. :9). Teachers and university-based researchers 'must establish partnerships with teachers instead of directing them ... so both take responsibility for accommodating research findings to the dilemmas' (op. cit. :12).

Negin (1993:33) has made a similar plea from a teacher's perspective when he argues:

Reformers (and researchers) are insensitive to realistic classroom contexts when they describe their magical, mystical silver bullets. Reformers (and researchers) write about what they think we should be doing in our classrooms, but they don't know Mustafa or Qua or John or Sophi or Maria or Tamarindu. They don't know about the personality of my class or the culture of my school ... All teachers ask is that others respect our contributions. Recognise that there is much that can be learned from the world of practice and treat us like professionals.

The perspective on collaborative research has led to classroom ethnographies in which outside researchers not only collaborate with the teacher but actually are participant observers of the classroom context for long periods of time. (Cambourne and Turbill, 1987; Cambourne, 1988; Graves, 1983; Harste, Woodward and Burke, 1984; Atwell, 1987; and others.)

What has emerged from this body of literature has been an identification of the importance of collegiality, in particular 'the nature of role definitions, the shape of the role relationships and the degree to which existing role expectations permit or encourage teachers' professional development' (Little, 1982:326).
The Collaborative Model accounts for much of the current work in staff development. The notion of teacher-as-researcher has grown in acceptance, so much so that many journals have sections which report on teacher-as-researcher projects. Similarly, many universities have courses which require the teacher, at both preservice and postservice levels, to carry out classroom-based research or inquiry.

As teachers generate their own questions and theories about teaching and learning, there is a demand for them to examine and make explicit the emerging beliefs and assumptions which underpin such theories (Cambourne, 1991). It is argued that only when this occurs will teachers be in a position to feel confident in making the curriculum decisions which are important for their students' learning; they are able to justify these decisions from their belief system.

To this end Fullan (1991:117) comments:

> Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple and complex as that ... If educational change is to happen, it will require that teachers understand themselves and be understood by others.

This aspect of educational change is being recognised not only by researchers who are interested in the professional development of teachers. It forms part of the changing perspective on the important role teachers play in generating new knowledge in all areas of the education field. The school, and the classroom nested within the school, have become the unit of research, and the teacher has become a key stakeholder in this research. More and more, teachers and the children in their classrooms are participating in research in order to develop grounded theories in various fields of education using a naturalistic research paradigm and methodologies (Cambourne, 1988; Harste, Burke and Woodward, 1984; Bissex, 1980; Calkins, 1983). Teachers are working together and/or with their children to generate grounded theories which they write about for
The effects that a change towards a naturalistic research paradigm in education has had on new methods of inquiry in classrooms and schools is evident in much of the literature which falls within the Collaborative Model. There has been greater value placed on the processes of teaching and learning (Fullan, 1991, 1992). Identifying, for instance, the processes of collaboration and how they operate requires setting up collaborative relationships which, in turn, sheds light on the characteristics of successful collaborative enterprises and the collegiality that these require. This seems to have led towards a clearer understanding of the concept of a learning culture or 'community of learners' (Barth, 1990).

Teacher as Co-researcher (TACOR) is a methodology which Cambourne and Turbill (1991) explain grew out of their work in research projects with teachers in their schools and classrooms. However, they also realised it served as a powerful strategy for the professional development for all those involved. Drawing on the tools of anthropology and ethnography, researchers (teacher-teacher, teacher-academic, teacher-student and so on) form a team which has 'co-equal status'. Each member of the team is recognised and valued as having particular skills and expertise which are necessary to the team as they identify the problem(s) and questions to be researched. Together the team analyses the data and generates the knowledge. The generation of 'grounded theory' is carried out with the cooperation of all and hence is owned by all members. The tools of collaboration, reflection, sharing and collegiality are necessary to the success of the methodology.

What the concepts 'collaboration' and 'collegiality' mean and how they are actually manifested in staff development enterprises remain problematic. Some schools and school districts seem to have simply adopted these strategies as the latest fad in staff
development rather than really understanding the paradigm inherent within them.

Hargreaves and Dawe (1990:230) sum up this concern when they warn that:

Collaborative professional development ... is locked within two very different contradictory forms of discourse. In the one, it is a tool of teacher empowerment and professional enhancement, bringing colleagues and their expertise together to generate critical yet also practically grounded reflection on what they do as a basis for wiser, more skilled action. In the other, the breakdown of teacher isolation is a mechanism designed to facilitate the smooth and uncritical adoption of preferred forms of actions (new teaching styles) introduced and imposed by experts from elsewhere, in which teachers become technicians rather than professionals exercising discretionary judgements.

Hargreaves and Dawe further argue that given such contradictory meanings it is not surprising that collaborative professional development strategies are often misinterpreted so that instead of being empowering strategies for teachers they may actually serve to disempower them. They (1990:230) refer to this as 'forms of contrived collegiality which are administratively designed to smooth the path of externally imposed innovations'.

Fullan, Bennett and Rolheiser-Bennett (1990) propose that these distinctions occur when staff development is used as a strategy to improve teachers' competencies rather than a strategy which is designed to change the culture as a whole. The 'science' and 'technology' of teaching should not be seen as separate entities but should be combined and enhanced simultaneously. What is needed is 'interactive professionalism', Fullan (1991:142) argues. 'Teachers would be continuous learners in a community of interactive professionals ... Thus, the meaning of change for the future does not simply mean implementing single innovations effectively. It means a radical change in the culture of schools and the conception of teaching as a profession.' To achieve this change, Fullan (1991:143) further argues that those involved need to be aware 'how deep a change they are getting into'. Not only do teachers need to change but everyone
and everything associated with schools will need to be part of that change. There are pockets of this process occurring as can be seen in exemplars such as Karen Foster’s (1990) article *Small Steps on the Way to Teacher Empowerment*, which describes the process of a school staff who moved towards school restructuring which resulted in teacher empowerment. But the questions we must ask ourselves are, 'Is what is happening enough?' and 'Will the changes that have been put in place endure?'.

Fullan has written extensively on this issue and has proposed a model to describe how this change process might be best achieved within the school culture. This will be discussed in detail later in the chapter.

**A FUTURE AGENDA FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

It is impossible (or should be) to read the literature on staff development without moving into the fields of school improvement; school reforms and restructuring; school leadership and educational change.

> Significant educational change consists of changes in beliefs, teaching style, materials, which can come about only through a process of personal development in a social context. (Fullan 1991:132)

There is a strong call for change in the current literature on 'education leadership' and 'organisation and management of schools': change in curriculum; change in school structures; change in teaching methods; change in the assessment and evaluation system; change in staff development and more. While identifying what change and how we should change is still problematic, the bottom line for all those who have a stake in education is a call to improve learning outcomes for students - all students - by improving their schools. (Some examples are *Teacher Learning*, 1988; *Education 2000*, 1991; *Carrick Report*, 1989; *A Nation at Risk*, 1983; *America 2000*, 1991.) For many this means an improvement in teachers and their teaching.
The ultimate goal is changing the culture of learning for both adults and students so that engagement and betterment of a way of life in schools. We will have arrived when professional development as the workshop or the course gives way to how the teacher and the administrator go about seeking and testing improvements as part of their everyday work inside and outside the school. In this way the variety of formal and informal learning experiences would merge - training and sharing workshops, teacher-teacher interaction, one-to-one assistance through coaching and mentoring, meetings, trying new approaches, observing and being observed, individual and team planning, monitoring results and other inquiry, and the like. Thus, learning by educators would not just occur during formal workshops, but would become part of the work setting. (Fullan, 1991:344)

Within this and many other similar powerful statements by Fullan, it is interesting to note the 'would' and 'should' statements. The use of such language gives the message that we know what we want in schools and in professional or staff development, but we are unsure of how to get there. In other words, the rhetoric is rich but the problems seem far from solved. Fullan (1991:345) sums up this theme:

All change including progress, contains ambivalence and dilemmas because, when we set off on a journey to achieve significant change, we do not know how to get there, or even what it is going to be like when we arrive.

Powerful rhetoric abounds even when Fullan (1991:353) attempts to offer solutions to the problems.

The only solution is that the whole school - all individuals - must get into the change business; if individuals do not do this they will be left powerless. The current school organisation is an anachronism. It was designed for an earlier period for conditions that no longer hold. It constrains the creation of a new profession of teaching that is so badly needed. Massive effort is required but it must come from individuals putting pressure on themselves and those around them.
It is clear that the focus for the future agenda in staff development is on change (Fullan 1992, 1993). Change is at the core of all we do in the name of staff development. It is both the expected outcome of the implementation of particular innovations but it is also at the core of how such innovations are implemented. Innovations, implementation of such innovations, school development (improvement, reform, renewal, restructuring) and improved student outcomes are all inextricably linked with the teacher as the pivotal player in the whole process.

Dealing with an innovation effectively means changing the behaviours and beliefs of teachers, students and all other stakeholders in the educational process. Fullan (1992:22) points out that such '[c]hanges in behaviours - new skills, activities, practices - and changes in beliefs - new understandings, commitments - are at the core of implementation'. Furthermore, he adds, 'the key issue from an implementation perspective is how the process of change unfolds vis-a-vis what people do (behaviours) and think (beliefs) in relation to a particular innovation'.

Over the past ten years considerable insights and knowledge have been gained into the change process. Fullan categorises this knowledge thus:

1. active initiation and participation
2. pressure and support
3. changes in behaviour and beliefs
4. the overriding problem of ownership.

Active initiation and participation appear to be self-evident, however it is surprising how many staff development initiatives do not take this into account. Initiating reform in schools and districts which involve large numbers of people is difficult. 'Where to start', and 'with whom to start' are important questions which need to be considered. Forcing people to implement new initiatives goes against what we know about the learning process (Cambourne, 1988; Kolb, 1984; Gardner, 1991), yet we still aim to
staff develop', 'to inservice' everyone as 'if they were lowly residents in some kind of education farmyard' (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991:17). Active initiation through starting small with interested volunteers who want to learn makes the change process more manageable by getting the process off and running in the right direction. This is not to say that there should not be a plan for the ultimate innovation to become part of the whole school culture, but any plan needs to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the unknown directions that an innovation will take (Fullan, 1991, 1993).

Pressure and support, Fullan (1992:25) argues, are necessary for success. 'Pressure' or 'tensions' are viewed as creating impetus for change through questioning the status quo, the accepted, the known. This concept has been well documented as a precursor to learning, to changing one's beliefs and practices, in the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, Dewey and others (Kolb, 1984). Thus the build up of pressure towards change is important but equally as important is the support given through the change process. Fullan argues that 'successful change projects always include both elements of pressure and support' (ibid.).

Changes in behaviours and beliefs are both necessary for successful change to occur. It is the relationship between the two which needs to be considered carefully as well as which does one change first. Guskey (1986) argues strongly that staff development needs to focus on changing behaviours or practice first. Fullan (1992:25) supports this stance when he says, 'In many cases, changes in behaviour precede rather than follow changes in beliefs'.

It would appear that it is a generally accepted view that most people need to be actively involved before they begin to discover new understandings. The process of trying something new often leads to a sense of insecurity, frustration and anxiety. Fullan (1992:25) refers to this as the 'implementation dip'. It is a process which can be likened to the notion of 'pressure' referred to above and which Cambourne (1988) refers to as
'intellectual unrest'. Reflection on existing practice may cause a similar process to take place which in turn may lead to a change in beliefs (Schon, 1983). It would be dangerous to view the process as a clearly linear one as Guskey's model suggests. It would seem from the literature on learning that the process needs to be viewed as reciprocal or symbiotic (Barton, 1992). As a symbiotic process it is difficult then to identify what comes first and in fact this is not the issue. What is important is that the initiative offers the opportunity for changes in practice and beliefs to occur simultaneously, each feeding of each other as they both evolve.

A sense of ownership of the innovation in the sense of clarity, skill and commitment is a progressive process. In the first instance, when there is some confusion and lack of clarity about the purpose of the innovation and its expected outcomes, a sense of ownership of the knowledge is rather tenuous; as people begin to gain a greater control of what it is they are doing and why they are doing it, a greater sense of commitment and ownership results. 'Deep ownership comes through the learning that arises from full engagement in solving problems' (Fullan, 1993:31). Again this can be likened to what Cambourne says about learning. Learners have a greater sense of ownership and responsibility of that which they are learning and will engage more deeply in the learning when they can see the purpose for the learning and how it is going to 'better their lives' (Cambourne, 1988).

The key to this whole process are the individuals 'who have to develop new meaning, and these individuals are insignificant parts of gigantic, loosely organised, complex, messy social systems that contain myriad different subjective worlds' (Fullan, 1992:26).
THE PROBLEM: WHY HASN'T STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKED?

With all that we know about what makes effective staff development and how it should work, why is it that many writers in the field are so pessimistic about the success of staff development and its impact on school improvement overall. (Invarson, 1987; Brown, 1991; Fullan, 1991; Fullan, 1992; Fullan, 1993 (a), 1993 (b); Fullan and Miles, 1992; Sarason, 1990; Barth, 1990; among others.)

Fullan and Miles (1992:745) go so far as to say, 'Schools and districts are overloaded with problems - and ironically, with solutions that don't work. Thus things get worse instead of better'. In their article called 'Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't' they identify seven reasons why change fails and offer seven propositions for successful change. They conclude the paper with the following warning:

Modern societies are facing terrible problems, and education reform is seen as a major source of hope for solving them. But wishful thinking and legislation have deservedly poor track records as tools for social betterment. As educators increasingly acknowledge that the "change process is crucial" they ought to know what that means at the level at which change takes place. Whether we are on the receiving or initiating end of change (as all of us are at one time or another), we need to understand why education reform frequently fails and we need to internalise and live out valid propositions for its success ... Being knowledgeable about the change process may be both the best defence and the best offence we have in achieving substantial education reform. (Fullan and Miles, 1992:752)

AN ALTERNATE VIEW TO THE PROBLEM

The current literature seems to be at a stalemate as to what to do next. Is it possible that we have been looking at the same problems from the same perspective for too long? Fullan and Miles (1992:749) refer to one of the problems of successful school reform
as people having 'faulty maps of change'. Is this really the problem or is the problem with our inherent view of the term 'change' itself?

Covey (1992:173) suggests that:

[I]f you want to make slow, incremental improvement, change your attitude or behaviour. But if you want to improve in major ways ...dramatic, revolutionary, transforming ways - if you want to make quantum improvements, either as an individual or as an organisation, change your frame of reference. Change how you see the world, how you think about people, how you view management and leadership. Change your paradigm, your scheme for understanding and explaining certain aspects of reality.

Barker (1992:30) warns that "paradigm" has become a buzzword and people use it loosely. But it is not a loose idea. Thomas Kuhn (1970) first brought the concept into prominence in the science world when he argued that scientific paradigms are 'accepted examples of actual scientific practice - examples which include law, theory, application and instrumentation together - [which] provide models from which spring coherent traditions of scientific research' (Kuhn, 1970:10). Thus Kuhn (op. cit. :11) suggests that '[m]en whose research is based on shared paradigms are committed to the same rules and standards for scientific practice'. When discussing how paradigms change, Kuhn (op. cit. :152) notes, '[t]hough a generation is sometimes required to effect the change, scientific communities have again and again been converted to new paradigms'. New paradigms occur for many reasons. However, Kuhn (1970:153) believes:

... the single most prevalent claim advanced by the proponent of a new paradigm is that they can solve the problems that have led the old one to a crisis. When it can legitimately be made, this claim is often the most effective one possible. In the area for which it is being advanced the paradigm is known to be in trouble.
Capra (1988:22) defines a paradigm as 'the totality of thoughts, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, a vision that is the basis of the way a society organises itself'. In moving from one vision of reality to another, Capra (1982:11) says, we experience a paradigm shift which he defines as 'a profound change in the totality of thoughts, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, a vision that is the basis of the way a society organises itself'.

Ferguson (1980:26) writes, '[a] paradigm is a framework of thought (from the Greek paradigma, "pattern"). A paradigm is a scheme for understanding and explaining certain aspects of reality ... A paradigm shift is a distinctly new way of thinking about old problems'.

Barker (1992:32) defines a paradigm as being 'a set of rules and regulations ... that does two things: (1) it establishes or defines boundaries; and (2) it tells you how to behave inside the boundaries in order to be successful'. A paradigm shift, Barker says, 'is a change to a new game, a new set of rules' (Barker, 1992:37). This in turn effects us all, he argues, because 'when the rules change the whole world can change'.

The concept of paradigm and paradigm shift is not new and has been discussed in the New Age literature quite extensively. For instance, Capra's (1983) book, *The Turning Point*, examines the paradigm shifts which have been occurring in various disciplines of knowledge such as medicine and physics. For the purpose of the field of staff development and school improvement the concept offers us an alternate perspective to the change process. For instance, rather than viewing change from the perspective of 'reform', 'restructuring', 'renewal' - where the focus is on the prefix 're' from the Latin meaning, 'again', 'back' (*Oxford Dictionary*, 1964; *Macquarie Dictionary*, 1981), it may be more useful to develop a different 'set of rules' or to develop a different 'vision' or 'framework of thought' about staff development if we are to view change from a more evolutionary process. 'The opening up of a new paradigm is humbling and
exhilarating', writes Ferguson (1980:30); we realise 'we were not so much wrong as partial, as if we had been seeing with one eye. It is not more knowledge, but a new knowing'.

Words such as 'reform' which, according to the dictionary, means 'to restore to a former state' or 'the improvement or amendment of what is wrong, corrupt' (Macquarie Dictionary, 1981) or 'make (person, institution, procedure, conduct, oneself) become better by removal or abandonment of imperfections, faults, or errors' (Oxford Dictionary, 1964), could all be considered to be backward looking rather than visionary. There is an inherent message in the use of such language that 'we have been doing it all wrong' rather than 'what we have been doing has been the best we could, but given what we now know we could do better still'. Thus rather than stand in the same position and view the problems from the same perspective it may serve educators better to change the paradigm and take a fresh stance and view on the change process (Covey, 1992; Ferguson, 1980; Brown, 1991).

Ferguson (1980:71) identifies four basic ways 'we change our minds when we get new and conflicting information'. The first she refers to as change by exception. This occurs when we add information to our existing knowledge and beliefs and although the knowledge seems incongruent to what we believe, we take it on board as an exception to what we know and believe. The second, incremental change, occurs bit by bit without the person being aware of the change taking place. Pendulum swing is the third change mode. This occurs when people abandon one way of operating for another without any real understanding as to why they have done it. These three modes of change, Ferguson argues (1980:72), 'stop short of transformation. The brain cannot deal with conflicting information unless it can integrate it'. When integration of ideas and new knowledge occur transformation occurs. This process of learning, she argues, is 'a paradigm change'. This is the fourth mode or 'dimension of change: the new
perspective, the insight that allows the information to come together in a new form or structure ... Paradigm change integrates'.

Ferguson (1980:72) posits that paradigm change is the most challenging kind of change 'because it relinquishes certainty'. In her summary she says,

*Change by exception* says, "I'm right except for __". *Incremental change* says, "I was almost right, but now I am right". *Pendulum change* says, "I was wrong before but now I'm right". *Paradigm change* says, "I was partially right before, and now I'm a bit more partially right". In paradigm change we realise that our previous views were only part of the picture - and that what we know now is only part of what we'll know later. Change is no longer threatening ... Each insight widens the road, making the next stage of travel, the next opening, easier.

Frank Betts (1992:38) takes up this argument from a 'whole-systems' approach, when he argues, '[n]early a century of change has left schools playing catch-up, and it will take a whole-system approach to meet society's evolving needs'. Betts offers an interesting argument and set of solutions which can only be summarised here. He believes that 'we must seek improvement through systemic change'. However, as he points out, the concept of systems and systemic change in education has become the latest fad without a clear understanding of what it means or what the implications of such an approach are. Furthermore, he argues (ibid, emphasis added), 'popular interpretations of systems tend to use inappropriate mechanical models and metaphors. Decision makers need to fully understand why our current approaches won't work and what is different about the systems approach'. (It is interesting that Betts argues that current approaches 'won't' work rather than they haven't worked.)

Banathy (1991, cited Betts, 1992:38) suggests five reasons why change efforts have been so unsuccessful. These are:

- the piecemeal, or incremental approach
failure to integrate solution ideas
- a discipline-discipline study of education
- a reductionist orientation
- staying within the boundaries of the existing system (not thinking out of the box).

These, Betts argues, are all examples of 'paradigm paralysis' which he defines as being the attempt to interpret current experiences using old models and metaphors that are no longer appropriate or useful.

If the old paradigms won't work, something fundamentally better suited to the task is needed, a paradigm that illuminates the whole, not just the parts; one that is synthetic, rather than analytic; one that integrates, rather than differentiates. The new paradigm is systems thinking. (Betts, 1992:38)

It is necessary at this point to describe briefly some fundamentals about systems thinking, as outlined by Betts, as there are many similarities to the concept of 'a social semiotic system' (Halliday, 1978) discussed later. A 'system' is a set of elements, characteristics or conditions which operate as a whole to achieve a common purpose. There are 'sub-systems' which function as components within the system but are also a necessary part of the whole system, or 'supra system' if one is referring to the overall system within which many sub-systems function. The whole system, it is argued, is greater than the sum of its parts (elements, conditions) in that the relationship between and among the parts are symbiotic and add value to the whole system. Thus systems are characterised by synergy.

Language, for instance, can be viewed as a system. There are many sub-systems within it which can be examined in their own right, such as the phonology system, the grammar system and so on, but taken away from the whole system become meaningless and in turn render the supra system meaningless. Language can be interpreted as a system of meanings, accompanied by forms (sub-systems) through which the meanings are realised (Halliday, 1985).
Thus viewed, 'language as any other semiotic system is interpreted as networks of interlocking options' (Halliday, 1985:xiv). Any series of words and sounds are meaningless unless they are connected in particular combinations and order (relationships) so that together they create a whole text. Meaning that the words and sounds hold is minimal (if anything), but at the whole text level is far greater because the relationships between and among the words and sounds. This is often referred to in language as the deep structure of language (Chomsky, 1976; Halliday, 1985). Such a deep structure underlies all systems (Capra, 1982, 1988).

The relationships between and among the different elements within a system are maintained through the exchange of 'energy' (meaning in a language system; information in a learning system). Systems are constantly striving for dynamic balance. Thus the relationship between and among elements is maintained by a difference in energy potential among elements, which allows for the constant interchange (Betts, 1992:39). When there is no longer a difference in energy levels in the system, it dies or breaks apart. Thus, to continue to exist, a system must be constantly on the move to maintain the relationships within it. In order to do this it must be able to import energy or have the capacity to create energy. Open systems are those which can import and export energy. Schools are perceived to be open systems because they interact with their environments (Owens, 1991) and are:

...composed of a unique set of elements arranged in a unique constellation of relationships. Furthermore, the relationships among elements, subsystems are continually changing in search of equilibrium while avoiding entropy (Betts, 1992:39).

Betts suggests that we need to design an educational system that not only optimises the relationship among the elements but also between the educational environment. Thus we need to move from a dictatorial to a participative organisational style. Betts sees evidence of this move occurring, however there needs to be a shift from a style based
on teacher as knowledge-giver to many students to one which has many information sources (one of which is the teacher) made accessible to the one student. This shift would also necessitate a move from an emphasis on instruction to an emphasis on learning. There is an implicit message here that there needs to be a shift in learning theory that has traditionally underpinned educational practice. And so it should be for teacher learning.

It would be presumptuous to believe that what Betts is suggesting is a totally new notion in staff development. Fullan (1992:106) has been arguing that what is needed is 'to refocus staff development so that it becomes part of an overall strategy for professional development and institutional reform'. He and his colleagues have developed a model which they claim has grown out of classroom and school based research and thus can be viewed as a grounded theory of staff development and school improvement (Fullan, Bennett and Rolheiser-Bennett, 1990; Fullan, 1992).

The next section will describe this model and discuss its relevance as a future agenda in overall school improvement.

TOWARDS A PARADIGM SHIFT IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Fullan (1992:108) suggests that the model or 'comprehensive framework for classroom and school improvement' aims to 'understand and influence both the classroom improvement and school improvement through identifying and fostering links between the two'.
Fullan uses a mechanical clockwork (cogs) metaphor to demonstrate and explain the relationships between and among the principal components in classroom and school improvement. It is a metaphor which depicts a theory of school improvement. It tries to explain how to change the school culture in order for classroom and school improvement to be realised.

There are three major 'cogs' in the process of change with the teacher-as-learner being pivotal to the two other cogs which serve two critical uses. There are four aspects actually operating within the teacher-as-learner, which although not depicted in this figure are described in the text as four connecting cogs (ibid.). These aspects or components, technical, reflective, inquiry and collaborative must be seen as working in combination with each other, Fullan explains.

*Technical aspect* refers to the mastery of teaching practices which in turn improves teachers' instructional repertoire and ability to choose appropriate practices to suit the needs of their students. *Reflective practice* enhances the teachers' understandings of
what they are doing and can lead to a better understanding of why they do it. This can result in a higher degree of congruence and cohesion between beliefs and practices. The *inquiry* aspect fosters investigation into classroom practices as teachers become researchers in their own classrooms. *Collaboration* allows for the sharing and exchange of ideas and new knowledge.

Each of these aspects has been a major focus in its own right and it is rare to find all four receiving intensive attention in the same setting or staff development activity, Fullan argues. Yet, one must ask why this is not so as they are so clearly related. Once teachers begin to reflect on their practices, they are in a position to explore existing practices as well as to try new ones which they hear about in collaboration with each other. As they reflect on their current teaching practice and their new practices they are forced into an inquiry mode. As they share and collaborate with each other they are forced to articulate their emerging beliefs as well as clarify existing ones and so the process continues. The teacher-as-researcher becomes a realisation. An important outcome of this interactive process is the adoption, adaptation and creation of new teaching practices whilst existing practices are refined and honed. Another outcome is (or should be) the articulation, clarification and development of a cohesive and coherent personal set of beliefs or theories which teachers can draw on to drive their future teaching.

It is my belief that Fullan's concern (1992:109) that 'the strengths of each of the four traditions be integrated and established in the teacher-as-learner' must surely be one of the challenges of an alternate paradigm for staff development.

The second critical feature about the teacher-as-learner component of the model, Fullan suggests (1992:109), is to distinguish between 'specific and generic levels of development of teacher as learner'. The specific level is concerned with where to start - with the hope that a focus on one will draw on the other three indirectly. As discussed...
earlier this has been the direction that many staff development strategies have taken. However, it would be best if all four aspects are activated in any one program in order that all are developing together in a symbiotic process so there is synergy in the teacher-as-learner-system.

In this way teachers will develop 'generic capacities to function on all four cylinders'. Fullan (1992:110) proposes in this case:

[I]t is not just being good at co-operative learning but mastering an array of instructional models; it is not just being involved in a reflective practice project but being a reflective practitioner; it is not participating in an action research investigation but conducting constant inquiry; it is not being part of a peer coaching project, but being collaborative as a way of working. In short, teachers come to internalise these ways of being to the point where it becomes second nature to be a perpetual learner.

The teacher as a perpetual learner will impact in various ways on the classroom and the school overall. These are depicted by the two interlocking cogs in Fullan's model. As teachers work to improve their classrooms, they work simultaneously, although at varying degrees of intensity, on the four areas of content, classroom management, instructional skills and strategies. Thus, in order for teachers to improve classroom practices they need to be learners.

The other interlocking component of the system is the school overall. Improvement in the school results when there are shared purposes, a sense of collegiality, and a structure which allows for collegiality and the drive for continuous improvement to operate in conjunction with the shared purposes.

Fullan argues that when all teachers develop the capacity to become perpetual learners, classroom improvement and school improvement entirely overlap. Although he is quick to add that this is an ideal which cannot actually be achieved, such an ideal
forces us to focus on the importance of teachers becoming perpetual learners; on teachers becoming empowered learners who in turn can empower their students as learners (Duffy, 1990; Turbill, 1991).

A mechanistic model needs to have something driving the cogs as they are not self-generating. Fullan suggests two components drive the cogs: the first powerful force in all education is the drive for 'student engagement and learning'; the second is the leadership potential in the system.

Overall, Fullan's model is an interesting and useful attempt to encapsulate simply a very complex set of concepts and processes. It can be likened to a 'supra system', as described above, and the 'cogs' within the system can be viewed as the elements or characteristics which are all integral parts of the supra system; although the cogs can be studied in their own right, they become meaningless unless they are viewed as interconnecting parts of the whole system. The supra system can be viewed as the school culture itself; a culture in which teachers, students, support staff, parents and the community in general operate but a culture which they also create. It can also be viewed as a semiotic system; a system that comprises a set of meanings which are interrelated and have been created by those in the culture which in turn creates the sets of meanings within that culture (Halliday and Hasan, 1985).

How does, or can, staff development impact on such a culture; on the whole semiotic system?

Fullan (1992:111) argues that it is not an easy task as 'the closer one gets to the culture of schools and the professional lives of teachers, the more complex and daunting the reform agenda becomes'. Therefore he argues that 'more powerful strategies are needed for more powerful changes'. Fullan proposes three implications which need careful consideration. First, he argues that staff development needs to consider the personal
and professional lives of teachers and therefore it should strive to provide lifelong learning for all teachers. Second, staff development needs to work within the total school culture, recognising the concept of the school as an organisation. Fullan (1992:112) warns that 'restructuring schools is complex and unclear and will involve a long term effort by those within schools'. Finally, Fullan proposes that the centralised nature of staff development needs to be reconfigured. Although not purporting that there should be a complete devolution of staff development responsibilities to the school level, Fullan suggests that the evidence indicates that there needs to be greater collaboration among individuals, schools and districts as to what goes on, or needs to go on, in the name of staff development. He concludes:

...staff developers have a much bigger role to play in teacher development than hitherto realised. Successful school improvement as a continuous capacity will never be achieved in the absence of making staff development and institutional development an integrated reality. (Fullan, 1992:112)

In summary, it is evident, I believe, that staff development must go beyond the notion of 'implementation' of a given 'innovation' and become more holistic in its purpose and structure. It needs to focus on how it can initiate, monitor and support multiple changes simultaneously at both the individual and organisation level, that is, at the school culture as a holistic semiotic system level. Thus the focus must not only be on change but how staff development can develop in individuals and organisations the capacity to deal with change.

Fullan and others call for a restructuring of the school culture so that schools can become the centre of change. There is strong argument (Sarason, 1990; Barth, 1990; Davies and Bruning, 1992; Barton, 1992; Elmore, 1992; among others) which supports Fullan's statement (1992:121) that progress can only be made in this direction 'by changing roles and organisers, by creating the conditions for people to change how they deal with change'.
The question that needs to be asked at this point is, can this focus towards staff development be viewed as a new paradigm which, to make it happen, requires a paradigm shift in all those involved? Or is it simply a view which is arguing for more of the same, that is, operating from the existing paradigm? There are several possible interpretations of the stance that Fullan takes and these cause confusion for me.

For instance, Fullan's call for 'more powerful strategies' which, he argues, 'are needed for more powerful changes' could be interpreted as seeking more of the same rather than a new perspective on the problem. This could be viewed as an example of 'staying within the boundaries of the existing system' (see p77) which Betts cites as an example of 'paradigm paralysis'.

Another example is the constant use in the literature of language associated with 'restructure' and 'reforms'. This language, as pointed out earlier, is backward looking. These particular linguistic choices of writers in the field convey a belief that there is a need to eradicate the many problems in the system. It tends to portray a negative stance and causes the reader to concentrate on what has not been working rather than viewing the process as an evolutionary one. If the linguistic choices came from a more evolutionary focus a reader would concentrate on what has been working. As in the evolutionary process, what is unnecessary and doesn't work or is not needed tends to be ignored and eventually left behind and lost. What continues and grows is what works.

Fullan's model is another example of confusion for me. It is holistic in its intent. It tries to depict a holistic dynamic system as outlined by Betts. And at one level, as discussed earlier in this chapter, it attempts to encapsulate a very complex set of concepts. However, the metaphor chosen is deterministic and depicts a clockwork lock-step process; it thus belongs to a rationalistic paradigm. Although the cogs depict movement within the system, in the sense that each part must move when another part moves, it also means that each movement is both determined and controlled by the
other. To take this point further, movement in one aspect such as 'teacher as learner' will determine movement in the two other large cogs in a given direction and by given degree. Thus it is reasonable to argue that if there is a high degree of change occurring within the 'teacher cog' that the movement in the other two cogs will be relatively equal.

A cog metaphor does not allow for one aspect to move further or more quickly than another at any given time, that is, to handle 'multiple movement' (multiple changes) in the large cogs or in the internal cogs within each of these. For example, in Fullan's model it cannot account for change occurring in the 'school improvement cog' and 'the classroom improvement cog' simultaneously. This seems contradictory with much of what Fullan has written. Whilst the model also depicts the teacher as learner as the central cog in the process, it does not allow for any impact that changes in the classroom structure may have on the school improvement cog and vice versa. In other words although the model is holistic in intent, there is a danger that the metaphor chosen to depict the model becomes a barrier to the paradigm shift as it tends to reflect the existing 'framework of thought'. Thus the view for a future agenda in staff development which Fullan is proposing is unintentionally locked into a form of paradigm paralysis.

The concept of the interrelatedness of individuals, schools and districts is a critical one. Fullan's model helps to identify the issues at hand; but even Fullan admits that the task becomes more complex as we learn more about the issues. The general consensus in current literature seems to highlight three critical factors. The first is that schools are organisations in their own right, i.e. schools have a culture of their own. The second is that all change in such cultures must begin within the individuals. And finally, the overall purpose for any change agenda in schools is the need for improved learning conditions and outcomes for the clientele of the education enterprise of schooling.
SARASON STRONGLY ADVOCATES A SYSTEMIC PERSPECTIVE TO EDUCATIONAL REFORM. TWO KEY POINTS HE RAISES WILL BE TAKEN UP AND DISCUSSED FURTHER IN THIS SECTION. FIRST, HE ARGUES THAT CHANGE WILL NOT OCCUR UNLESS THERE IS A CHANGE IN THE POWER RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THOSE IN THE SYSTEM AS WELL AS WITHIN THE CLASSROOM. SECOND, HE ARGUES THAT 'TEACHERS CANNOT CREATE AND SUSTAIN THE CONDITIONS FOR THE PRODUCTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN IF THOSE CONDITIONS DO NOT EXIST FOR THEMSELVES (SARASON, 1990:XIV). FULLAN (1992:121) CONCURS WHEN HE SAYS THAT PROGRESS CAN ONLY BE MADE 'BY CHANGING ROLES AND ORGANISERS, BY CREATING THE CONDITIONS FOR PEOPLE TO CHANGE HOW THEY DEAL WITH CHANGE'.

There are three important issues which I believe now need to be discussed. From my reading of the literature all three issues seem to be either missing (or unintentionally omitted) or are implicit in much of what is written in the area of staff development and teacher change. The first is an understanding of what 'changing the roles and organisers' means in relation to the culture. The second is the lack of an explicit learning theory. And the third is an understanding of the role that language plays in the realisation of the culture and change process (the learning process) which occurs in any culture. All three are highly related, I believe, so much so that when discussing one it is difficult not to touch on the others.

**CHANGING THE ROLES AND ORGANISERS**

Changing the roles and organisers in any culture means examining and changing the power structures of a culture. Changing the power structures will result in a change in the role relationships. Change in relationships will mean a change in the way language is used by those in the differing roles. Sarason (1990:xiv) argues strongly that 'change
will not occur unless there is an alteration of the power relations among those in the system and within the classroom'. Moreover, he argues (1990:28), this obvious fact 'has never been addressed' and that such a change in 'power relationships can have a percolating effect in the system qua system'.

Although Sarason argues strongly for 'altering the power relations' within a system, he is also aware that for many in the field 'thinking in terms of systems is not their cup of tea' (op. cit. :42). He emphasises that adopting a system stance is no easy matter and does not provide us with a clear course of action. In fact, the very thought of altering power relationships is very threatening to most, particularly if one is in the perceived position of power.

Altering the power relationship to Sarason means providing teachers, parents and students the opportunity within their system to be part of the power; to have the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making process on matters which impact on them and the learning of their students. Sarason demonstrates that over the past 20 years these opportunities have become more of a reality. There has been more teacher participation in various facets of the educational system. Teachers are beginning to have a say in what should be taught, who should be hired in their school, how the school should function and other issues. Although it can be argued that the power relationships are being altered in that, teachers are being given opportunities to participate in major decisions which would impact on them, it seems that the ultimate power is still in the hands of those at the top. No one Sarason (1990:59) points out, 'challenge[s] the authority of the administrators to make the final decisions'.

Sarason's view of altering the power relationships allows for democratic representation in the decision making process in schools, but does it really allow for authentic change in the role relationships of those in the school culture? Is each person in the system being valued for what that person can give to the system? It is when people value each
other that the relationships between and among them change in such a way that the language used will change. There is no longer one locus of power. In fact there is no need for it. The concept of power no longer takes on the dictionary definition of 'possession of control, or authority, or influence over others' (Sarason, 1990:49) but an alternate definition of 'the ability to act or produce an effect'. Each person in the system thus has power; power within that part of the system for which they are accountable and together those in the system are the power. Each becomes personally empowered (Duffy, 1990). This view is more in line with what Barth (1990) calls 'a community of learners'. Such a community is based on the nature of the role relationships amongst the members of that community.

Barth (1990: 41) argues that we must 'improve schools from within' and build a 'community of learners'. 'We need to honour learning, participation and cooperation above prescription, production and competition'. He argues that all those who are part of a school culture should see their role as learners first and foremost. Everyone has his/her own agenda but what is common to all, whether that person be a child, a teacher, an administrator, a parent, is that he/she perceives learning to be 'endemic and mutually visible'.

This view is strongly supported by Fullan (1993:63) in his latest book Change Forces.

What then becomes important, above all, is the need to 'discover the conditions that elicit and support human learning and to provide these conditions'. (Barth, 1990:45)

Barth summarises the concept thus:

A community of learners seems to work from the assumptions...

- schools have the capacity to improve themselves, if the conditions are right. A major responsibility of those outside the schools is to help provide these conditions for those inside.
• when the need and purpose is there, when the conditions are right, adults and students alike learn and each energises and contributes to the learning of the other.

• what needs to be improved about schools is their culture, the quality of interpersonal relationships, and the nature and quality of learning experiences.

• school improvement is an effort to determine and provide, from without and within, conditions under which the adults and youngsters who inhabit schools will promote and sustain learning among themselves. (Barth, 1990:45)

If these assumptions are taken seriously there would be a change in the way those in the school culture perceive each other. The role relationships between and among people would change. All would begin to value each other for the expertise that each has. But all would be perceived as learners, including the principal who still may be viewed as being the leader but a leader who is perceived as being the 'head learner' (Barth, 1990:46). Thus the role relationships would no longer be depicted as hierarchical but interconnected in more a web-like structure.

Creating such conditions so that a conducive learning culture exists highlights the other two issues, namely, the need for an explicit learning theory and an exploration of the role that language plays in this learning. It is my belief that these two issues are inextricably linked and when understood and explicitly put in place will impact on staff development.

**The Need for an Explicit Learning Theory**

Although there is no explicit learning theory espoused in the literature on staff development, teacher change and school improvement, the underlying assumption is that learning is (or should be) occurring. In the more recent literature, there has been a growing understanding of what knowledge is, who generates knowledge and who owns it. The focus on teachers not only as practitioners but as theory builders has changed
the relationships between and among educators (be they teachers, administrators or university researchers) as they collaborate in the problem solving process of trying to improve student learning outcomes.

The focus on collaboration, reflection and teacher-as-researcher as staff development strategies has led to a more generic agenda; one in which staff development and the personal development of each teacher is an ongoing expectation of the school culture. Implicit in this literature is a learning theory which values the learner's existing knowledge and the learner's responsibility in that learning process. Cambourne (1988, 1992) has proposed a theory of learning he calls 'natural learning' theory. Kolb (1984) refers to 'experiential learning'. The research and writing of theorists such as Cambourne and Kolb seem to best reflect the implicit theories within much of the staff development literature.

Cambourne argues that successful learning occurs when there are certain conditions operating within the learning context which allow for natural learning to occur. The following is an attempt to design a model from Cambourne's most recent writing in this area (Turbill, 1993).
Demonstration

Cambourne (1992) argues that all learning begins with demonstrations of that which we want to learn and need to learn. These demonstrations can be either real or vicarious. We are often surrounded by such demonstrations as in the area of the written text in our society. However, it is not until learners make the decision to learn to write and assume the responsibility for learning to write that they then choose to engage in those demonstrations of that which they need to learn.

Engagement

Cambourne (1992, in press) outlines four key principles of engagement. These are:

1. Learners are more likely to engage deeply with demonstrations if they believe that they are capable of ultimately learning or doing whatever is being demonstrated.
Learners are more likely to engage deeply with whatever is being demonstrated if they believe that learning whatever is being demonstrated has some potential value, purpose and use for them.

Learners are more likely to engage with demonstrations if they're free from anxiety.

Learners are more likely to engage with demonstrations given by someone they like, respect, admire, trust, and would like to emulate.

Cambourne points out that it is hard to separate the three processes of transformation, discussion and application in time. They co-occur and the seams between them are difficult to find.

Transformation
Cambourne describes transformation as the process of connecting new knowledge with old knowledge; it is the process that learners go through in order to make the knowledge, skill, understandings their own transformation. We often do this by first 'adopting', that is, by trying to do exactly what it is we have seen others do. However, we begin to transform the demonstrations of others by interpreting them in our own personal ways; ways which are influenced by all our life experiences (and this obviously means our culture). As we begin to make it our own, we begin to connect that which we are learning into the existing world view that we have and so change our knowledge base. Viewed in this way learners and that which learners are learning, are in a constant state of change.

Cambourne states that the process of transformation has occurred when learners can describe and explain concepts or sequence of events in their own words whilst, at the same time, closely approximating the core meanings involved. It is a process of 'making the information one's own'. And just what that information is for each learner will differ from learner to learner.
The skill equivalent of paraphrase is the development of one's own 'personal style'. No two highly skilled golfers have exactly the same swing as that which was demonstrated by their original teachers and/or coaches. No two pianists will play the same piece exactly the same way. Why else would we have cisicddfods? No two ironers ever iron the same way. As a consequence of talking to others and ourselves (i.e. reflecting) we each transform what we originally witness into a form that reflects how we interpret the world. We each develop our own unique style.' (Cambourne, 1992, in press)

Discussion

Being able to 'talk one's way to meaning' has long been recognised as important to learning. What we are beginning to understand more is that language is not just a vehicle for carrying meaning but it is a powerful tool for connection-making. Thus the process of transformation is enormously enhanced through discussion, i.e. the exchange and interchange of interpretations, constructed meanings and understandings.

When discussion is a valued process in any teaching/learning enterprise the locus of power is not only in the hands of the teacher. The learner has some status and can seek clarification, air newly formed ideas and knowledge and request further information and so on. Through discussion, the teacher can make explicit the processes which so often are assumed or not ever known as they are invisible to a learner. It is through discussion that the teacher can provide the scaffolding that learners need in the transformation process.

Application

In this model, application is more than the learner showing that he or she has learned that which he or she was supposed to learn. That is one aspect of the process. However, as learners, through discussion with others, begin to transform that which they are trying to learn, they will begin to apply their newly formed concepts and skills. These are usually in the form of what Cambourne has referred to as 'approximations'. They are tentative attempts to apply that which we as learners are learning. The right to
approximate, to have a go, is a critical aspect of the whole process and is inextricably linked to the next process in the teaching learning cycle - evaluation.

**Evaluation**

Evaluation is occurring by learners and by those around them as they are engaged in any learning enterprise. Learners want to know, 'How am I going?' 'Is this right?' 'What do I do next?'. Often learners ask these questions of themselves first, then move to ask a trusted peer before asking the perceived expert. What is critical in this process of responding to learner's questions and needs is the relationship established between and among learners and teachers. This relationship needs to be one which is supportive yet honest. Learners do not want platitudes any more than they want criticism. They want help. They want support. When there is a sense of trust between and amongst learners and their teachers there is a sense of what Barth (1990) calls a 'community of learners'. Within such a community, learners are prepared to discuss openly, to take risks when applying newly formed learning and give and receive evaluation from others which may be in the form of support, or repeated demonstrations or new demonstrations. And so the process of transformation continues to occur.

Kolb (1984) argues that all learning grows out of previous experiences. The process of observing and reflecting on some concrete experience leads to the formation of abstract concepts and generalisations. Once these begin to emerge in the learner's head the process of testing these out in new contexts proceeds; this is a concrete experience in itself and so the cycle proceeds. Kolb's and Cambourne's theories have many similarities. They are both learner centred, they are both cyclic, they both believe the responsibility of the learning lies in the hands of the learner; they both view learning as being an ongoing natural process which is continuous and grounded in experiences; they both place great value on the feedback that learners receive from themselves and others. They both see learning as being an holistic process and they both argue that
learners will only learn when they are convinced that what is to be learned is useful to them.

Both these learning theories have much to offer to those of us who work in the field of staff development. If we are to develop a community of learners within schools, if we are to change the culture of schools so that all who operate in them become perpetual learners, we need to have an explicit learning theory driving the learning enterprise.

Kolb’s theory provides us with particular insights into learning as a change process and what this might mean for the teaching process, whereas Cambourne’s work provides us with particular insights into the conditions which need to be in place so that a community of learners can be established. It also provides an understanding of the relationships between and among the learners within that community and finally some insights into the role that language plays in the learning process.

For Kolb, learning involves change; i.e. learning is change. It brings with it ‘tensions and conflicts’ and ‘learning results from the resolution of these conflicts’ (Kolb, 1984:29). If we view learning as a process of changing one’s world view as new experiences are integrated with old experiences and transformed into new knowledge, then the focus in staff development should not just be a focus on the change process and understanding the nature of change alone but an equal focus on the learning process and the nature of learning. The two processes become seamless as they operate together - one and the same.

ROLE OF LANGUAGE

Cambourne shows us that language plays a major role in the learning process itself, however, language does not occur in a vacuum. It is a functional semiotic system in itself and emanates from the culture which uses it. Halliday and Hasan (1985:5) argue:
Learning is, above all, a social process; and the environment in which educational learning takes place is that of a social institution ... with their clearly defined social structures ... Knowledge is transmitted in social contexts, through relationships ... that are defined in the value systems and ideology of the culture. And the words that are exchanged in these contexts get their meaning from activities in which they are embedded, which again are social activities with social agencies and goals.

The learning culture as a social semiotic system must be evidenced by certain conditions if we are to promote effective learning and change; if we are to promote successful staff development.

When staff developers are guided by an explicit learning theory and when they have an explicit understanding of the role that language plays in this learning they will establish learning cultures which are 'social semiotic systems' in which:

• learning takes place in social contexts in which there are shared problems so that shared meanings will develop. This in turn leads to a shared knowledge and shared language amongst the group
• there is more than one way to do something
• feedback given will be shared, justified and clarified as needed
• there will be many opportunities for interaction, decision-making and problem solving
• there is opportunity for 'application' and 'evaluation' by self and peers as well as by others
• the purposes for learning are made explicit so that the learner knows the framework of the learning culture as well as the expectation of those in it
• strategies such as reflection, collaboration, sharing, demonstrations, action research are highly valued and frequently used
• language and literacy are valued and being used for learning, for thinking, for questioning, for coming to know how, rather than just what
- the knowledge and expertise of each member is valued so that co-learning is possible
- the role relationships are web-like in their connections
- power is shared amongst all
- all members are responsive to the needs of others
- the 'change forces' both drive learning and the learning enterprise and result from it.

SUMMARY: A FUTURE AGENDA FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter I have attempted to present a case for a future agenda for staff development. I have tried to present a case which ultimately leads to the notion that all staff development plays a major role in the learning culture of teachers. The learning culture of teachers is nested within a larger learning culture of the school in which there are many participants, all of whom interrelate with each other to create the nature of that culture.

I have tried to argue that the concept of staff development needs to be viewed from a different perspective. It needs to experience a paradigm shift as, currently, it would appear that the apparent failures of such an enterprise seems to be suffering from stagnation - from 'paradigm paralysis'.

I have suggested that a future staff development agenda needs to be driven by an explicit learning theory; one which focuses on what we know about 'natural learning' and the role that language plays in such learning. I have further suggested that such a learning theory not only inextricably links language and learning but also the concept of change. The cyclic argument goes something like this: the process of change involves learning; the process of learning involves change; the process of learning involves language; the process of change involves language and so on. Thus the nature
and process of language, of learning and of change are clearly one and the same thing. All begin within the individual teacher - however individual teachers are elements of a larger supra system called school cultures.

Cultures, I have argued, are social semiotic systems which are in themselves 'an edifice of meanings' (Halliday, 1978). Language, and the way language functions, is one of the social semiotic systems which constitutes the 'supra semiotic system' - the social semiotic culture. Language is the social semiotic that is vital in the supra semiotic system as it also serves as an encoding system for most of the other semiotic systems within the supra social semiotic system.

Language, I argue, is the pivotal force in the overall process; it is both the meaning maker and meaning encoder; it serves to both construct knowledge, as well as exchange knowledge; it establishes the relationships between and among people within the system and maintains or changes the roles these relationships create.

Thus, a more in depth understanding of language and the nature of language, learning and the nature of learning, would add to what we are beginning to understand about change and the nature of change.

Fullan, in his latest publication *Change Forces*, argues that:

... the study of educational change has brought us to the beginning of a new phase which will represent a quantum leap - a paradigm breakthrough - in how we think about and act in relation to change. It is a world where change is a journey of unknown destination, where problems are our friends, where seeking assistance is a sign of strength, where simultaneous top-down bottom-up initiatives merge, where collegiality and individualism co-exist in productive tension. (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan and Miles, 1992). It would be a world where change mirrors *life itself* in which you can never be perfectly happy or permanently in harmony, but where some people (those with knowledge of how to view, how to cope with and initiate
change) manage better than others. It is a world where one should never trust a change agent, or never assume that others, especially leaders, know what they are doing - not because change agents and leaders are duplicitous or incompetent - but because the change process is so complex and so fraught with unknowns that all of us must be on guard and apply ourselves to investigating and solving problems. (Fullan, 1993(b):vii-viii)

In such a world it may be time to leave behind the term 'staff development' as it too tends to have negative overtones. Maybe it is time to simply refer to 'teacher learning' and 'teacher needs' as is done when referring to the student component of the learning culture. We, as a profession of educators, are all in the business of learning and providing the most conducive learning conditions within the overall learning culture for the group for whom we are accountable.

If such learning cultures are viewed as social semiotic systems in which language plays a pivotal role, I believe the forces of synergy can be unleashed so that they not only are acknowledged but are also used to energise the ongoing complex learning/change process. Our individual and collective visions can begin to become a reality.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the constructivist is very different from the conventional inquirer ... It is iterative, interactive, hermeneutic and at times intuitive and certainly open ... It makes demands of its own so heavy that anxiety and fatigue are the constructivist's most constant companions. It is a different path, one strewn with boulders, but one that leads to an extravagant and hitherto virtually unappreciated rose garden. (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:183)

INTRODUCTION

The overall purpose of this study is to develop a grounded theory of staff development. The study aimed to achieve this purpose through the evaluation of the impact of a staff development program called Frameworks on teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education whilst simultaneously evaluating a personal staff development theory upon which the program was based. Thus, as a consequence of such an evaluation, it was anticipated that a staff development theory which had been formally grounded in the real world of classrooms and schools would emerge.

The study was located within a larger research and development project being carried out across 30 school districts in New York state. The purpose of the research and development project was to formally evaluate a pilot version of Frameworks and change it accordingly for commercial publication. My involvement in such a large project gave me the opportunity to focus in more depth on one school district for the purpose of this study.
The research and development project was located within a naturalistic paradigm and was designed to follow a classic 'responsive evaluation' methodology as set out by Guba and Lincoln (1981). Eight school districts were identified as the primary data sources, whilst the remaining 22 became the secondary sources.

Data were collected from each of the primary sites in the form of field notes taken from observations of the facilitators running the eight sessions (these sessions were also videoed), semi-structured interviews which were also audiotaped with the facilitator and selected case study teachers, and various artifacts. Field notes and reconstructed interviews were returned to the participants for checking and further response each week. Artifacts including learning journals were kept by the participants as part of the on-going expectation of the program.

The data collected from the secondary sites were in the form of weekly response sheets filled out by each of the facilitators and sent into a central location for analysis, the facilitator's learning journal kept over the eight sessions, and 225 teacher participants' surveys completed at the end of the training period.

These data were analysed weekly in order to identify what seemed to be working and what seemed to be causing problems within the program. Suggestions for changes in the program from participants were considered and put to facilitators and teachers in the primary sites for further consideration. This form of the 'hermeneutic dialectic process' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:44 and 149) was continued weekly with the intention of reaching a 'sophisticated level of consensus' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:149) which in turn informed the authors of the changes needed in the program. A final two day debriefing with all facilitators and authors at the end of the pilot period of the program further allowed for the hermeneutic dialectic process to continue between facilitators and authors around the findings of the weekly analyses. The data emanating from these days were further analysed and used to inform the revisions of the program.
This doctoral study was located in one of the primary sites, Marcus Whitman Central School District. The following demonstrates diagrammatically the funnelling process which occurred in identifying the research site for this study. It also demonstrates how my involvement in the larger research and development project provided me with a great deal of secondary data which, for the purposes of this study, could be referred to as my 'tacit knowledge' (Polanyi 1966, cited Patton, 1990:72; Guba and Lincoln, 1989:176); knowledge which I had but did not need to articulate. However, when and where necessary such knowledge could be forced to a conscious level and thus be used as propositional knowledge which could in turn be used to confirm or reject developing 'working hypotheses' which began to emerge from the data.

30 school districts across New York state all 30 trained facilitators took the pilot program and simultaneously ran it with approx 12 teachers Grades 4-8

8 school districts became case study sites. Alternate weekly sessions were observed by researcher and approx 3 case study teachers interviewed post session.

One school district became the core case study site. Sessions observed, field notes taken, facilitator interviewed, 4 teachers interviewed, classroom practice observed, learning journals kept.

Figure 6: Doctoral Study in Relation to Frameworks Pilot Evaluation
METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATION FOR THE STUDY

The choice of a naturalistic research paradigm for this study was an obvious one, as it was highly congruent with the educational paradigm in which the program under study was located. The principles underpinning the content inherent within the program and the methodology for putting its structures and processes into place so that the content was understood, were not only similar but often the same as those principles which underpin naturalistic inquiry. All, therefore, were driven by the same overall sets of beliefs and principles; a 'mega-paradigm' which could be called an holistic paradigm (refer to Chapter 1).

Thus it was never a matter of debating the relative value of the inquiry paradigm of research chosen for this study, i.e. that a naturalistic research paradigm which advocated more 'qualitative and naturalistic approaches to inductively and holistically understand human experience in content-specific settings' was better than 'a logical positivist paradigm which uses quantitative and experimental methods to test hypothetical-deductive generalisations' (Patton, 1990:37). Rather than to align with one methodology or another it seemed that Patton's notion of a 'paradigm of choices' was more pragmatic. Patton argues that 'a paradigm of choices rejects methodological orthodoxy in favour of methodological appropriateness as the primary criterion for judging methodological quality' (Patton, 1990:39). The issue then became 'whether one has made sensible method decisions given the purpose of the inquiry, the questions being investigated, and the resources available' (ibid).

As stated, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact that a particular staff development theory had on the beliefs and practices of teachers in literacy education. In the process of carrying out such an evaluation the study also aimed to evaluate the staff development theory and how that 'worked'. Thus it was an evaluation which was responsive to the claims, issues and concerns of the stakeholders and could be called a
'responsive evaluation' (Stake, 1975; Guba and Lincoln, 1981, 1989; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). However, it was also an evaluation which needed to focus on the process which participants experienced as a consequence of their involvement in the program and thus could also be called a 'process evaluation' (Patton, 1990:95) or an 'illuminative evaluation' (Parlett and Hamilton, 1976, cited Patton, 1990:119).

Thus it seemed irrelevant that this study be labelled a 'responsive evaluation' or a 'process evaluation' or an 'illuminative evaluation'. It is a study which drew on all three models of evaluation and which incorporated a methodology which would best respond to the purpose of the study and the questions the study was addressing. 'Methodological appropriateness' therefore orchestrated the methods chosen to identify the locus of the study, the participants in the study, the data collecting procedures, and the data analysis. The most appropriate methodology in the first instance appeared to be what was referred to by some as 'qualitative' methodology (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:2; Patton, 1990) and by others as 'naturalistic' (Guba and Lincoln, 1981; Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

However after further reading, the later work of Guba and Lincoln (1989) appeared to be even more appropriate as a guide for methodological decisions for this study. Guba and Lincoln propose a 'fourth generation evaluation' (a responsive constructivist evaluation) which uses a 'constructivist methodology' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:158). This methodology employs the methods of naturalistic inquiry whilst focusing strongly on 'a hermeneutic/dialectic process that takes full advantage, and account, of the observer/observed interaction to create a constructed reality that is informed and sophisticated as it can be made at a particular point in time' (op. cit. :44). It is this methodology which was put in place with some variations due to the nature of the study.
The following figure attempts to sum up the perceived interconnectedness discussed thus far between the overall paradigm which was the guiding 'worldview ... general perspective ... way of breaking down the complexity of the real world' (Patton, 1990:37) for both the design and delivery of the program as well as the choice of model for the evaluation of such a program, and the appropriate methodologies for putting both in place. The hermeneutic dialectic process was perceived to be the dynamic process in action for both activities.

![Interconnectedness between the Paradigm of the Staff Development Model and the Research Methodology](image)

**Figure 7:** Interconnectedness between the Paradigm of the Staff Development Model and the Research Methodology

**THE CONSTRUCTIVIST METHODOLOGY IN ACTION**

The methodology of constructivist inquiry is a complex process as pointed out by Guba and Lincoln (1989) when they attempted to flow chart it. They warn their readers that 'the idea of devising a flowchart that captures an essentially nonlinear process seems far-fetched and unlikely to produce satisfactory results' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:173).
However, their flowchart is useful as an organiser in order to best explain the methodology and methods used in this study.

Figure 8: Diagrammatic View of the Methodology of Constructivist Inquiry

Guba and Lincoln (1989:174) argue that there needs to be a set of entry conditions for the study to be 'meaningful in constructivist terms'. These four, depicted in the model
above, are a natural setting, the human instrument, qualitative methods and tacit knowledge. In the following each will be explained and demonstrated in light of this study.

NATURAL SETTING

It is essential that the study be carried out in the same context and time frame the inquirer is seeking to understand. Only then, Guba and Lincoln argue, can the multiple realities constructed by those in the context, and which are dependent on that context, be identified and examined in light of that context. 'Contexts give life to and are given life by the constructions that are held by the people in them' (op. cit. :175).

The Marcus Whitman Central School District was chosen as the context for this study. It is a small rural district which in the words of the Superintendent is 'typical' of the majority of rural schools districts in New York state. There are two elementary schools in the District, Rushville and Gorham. The schools are approximately 20 miles apart.

The smallness of the District was perceived to be an advantage as it would enable me to establish a co-researching relationship (Cambourne and Turbill, 1991) with not only the facilitator and the teachers participating in the pilot of Frameworks, but also with other members of the staffs, the principals and the Superintendent. It was believed that such a relationship would facilitate the process of me being accepted by all the key stakeholders within the district as a 'trusted peer' and thus being in a position within the time frame to have access to the multiple realities being constructed by all the key stakeholders in the context.

'Prolonged engagement at the site' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:303) is one of the key criteria for maintaining the credibility of the data being collected as it enables the researcher to 'overcome the effects of misinformation, distortion, or presented "fronts", to establish rapport and build the trust necessary to uncover constructions, and to
facilitate immersing oneself in and understanding the context's culture' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:237).

The key participants in this study were Jackie, the facilitator trained to run the Frameworks program in the District, and the twelve participants in her group. Four teachers (two from each school) were selected from a group of teachers who volunteered to be 'case study teachers'. This 'purposive sample' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:178; Patton, 1990:169) of teachers was prepared for me to interview them in depth after each session and to observe them and their students in the classrooms. The four teachers, one male and three females, were all experienced teachers who had had various previous experiences in 'whole language' education. Lonnie admitted that he was more of a 'traditional' teacher, whilst Ginny, Gail and Denny had been attempting to implement the philosophy for several years from differing perspectives. Ginny and Lonnie were from Gorham and were teaching Grades 4 and 5 respectively, whilst Gail and Denny were at Rushville and taught Grades 4 and 6.

The opportunity to focus on the facilitator running the sessions with all twelve teachers followed by the opportunity to interview the facilitator and the four teachers within their natural settings allowed me the opportunity to fulfil a second criteria to ensure the credibility of the data collection process, namely 'persistent observation' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:304). Persistent observation provided me with sufficient observations to 'identify those characteristics and elements in the situations that [were] most relevant to the problem or issue being pursued and [to focus] on them in detail'.

THE HUMAN AS INSTRUMENT

The constructivist methodology not only values the human's role in the research but actually requires it. It denies that the human mind is subjective, biased or unreliable arguing instead that the human mind is the only instrument that can respond to the personal and environmental cues that operate in a context, thus demonstrating how
'infinitely adaptable' it is. 'The multi-purpose human can collect information about multiple factors - at multiple levels - simultaneously. Like a smart bomb, the human instrument can locate and strike a target without having been programmed to do so' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:194). Thus the human instrument can be demonstrated to be both 'responsive' and 'adaptable'.
needs of the study and could be viewed as an 'emergent design' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:179), which the 'constructivist seeks continuously to refine and extend' (op. cit.:180).

The human instrument can lead to knowledge base expansion. Being in a position to '[extend] awareness of the situation beyond mere propositional knowledge to the realm of the felt, to the silent sympathies, to the unconscious wishes and to the daily unexamined usages will lend depth and richness to our understanding of social and organisational settings' (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:135-136). 'Knowledge base expansion' occurred on many occasions during observations of sessions, observations in the classrooms and interviews with the teachers. Often I observed certain behaviours or gained a sense of certain feelings during the sessions or in the interviews which enabled me to make explicit or help the teacher(s) make explicit 'those portions of the context that have become, for the participants the latent dimensions' (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:135). This process, it can be argued, was 'persistent observation' in action and served also as a credibility check.

The next three characteristics often were connected or even seemed to co-occur. Guba and Lincoln call these processual immediacy, opportunities for clarification and summarisation and opportunity to explore atypical or idiosyncratic responses.

'Processual immediacy' occurs when the human instrument begins to process the data as soon as they become available. This occurred for me at all stages of the data collection. For example, during the observations of the sessions I would often have to stop writing in order to reflect on something that happened or was said. As I was writing, I was processing what I saw and heard and creating tentative hypotheses which I needed to clarify and/or test with the participants or the facilitator at the first opportunity. Therefore I always wrote field notes only on the right hand side of my note book so I could use the left hand side to write my own comments and questions.
These notes to myself then became the focus questions in the interview with the facilitator and the teachers.

During interviews, I would often orally summarise the teachers' comments before moving to the next question or point as a form of recapping the information just shared, whilst also checking my interpretation of what was said. Clarification was sought wherever necessary and this often led to amplification of the topic under discussion.

It was also necessary to explore the atypical and idiosyncratic responses as clarification of these responses often led to new knowledge.

Guba and Lincoln stress that the human 'is the instrument of choice for the constructivists, and it should be stressed, the only possible choice during the early stages of an inquiry' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:175).

QUALITATIVE METHODS

The methods used for data collection became obvious given that the human instrument was to be employed. Humans collect information best and most easily when they use methods which come naturally to them; namely, talking to people, observing the context and people's behaviour, including non-verbal cues, in that context and reading the various artifacts from the context.

Observations

Patton (1990) points out that there is a need when gathering observational data to consider the degree to which the observer will be a participant in the context which is being observed. He advocates 'an interdependence between the observer and what is observed' (Patton, 1990:272). Thus I perceived my role as a participant observer to be as Bruyen (1966:14, cited Patton, 1990:272) suggests - somewhat detached whilst still being personally involved.
I observed sessions 2, 4, 6 and 8. However all sessions were videotaped which allowed me to also 'observe' sessions 1, 3, 5 and 7 as well as being able to revisit the other four sessions during the data analysis phase for the purpose of cross-checking and clarification.

My field notes taken of the sessions focused on 'capturing a slice of life' (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:84). I recorded the physical set-up of the room, the charts and diagrams that were used and the seating arrangements. When taking notes of the session in action I noted the time as the group moved through each segment and I tried to quote the actual language used by the facilitator and participants. I focused on how the facilitator introduced the various sections of the program; how she monitored the group activities as she roved around them; how she closed each section and her overall interaction with participants. I focused also on the participants' responses and involvement both in the whole group and small group activities. My notes were handwritten on every second line on the right hand page of my notebook. Comments, questions, and confusions that I experienced during the session I noted on the left hand page so that I could follow them up in later interviews.

These notes were filled out that evening and tidied up as I typed them into a computer. The rewritten edited construction of what I perceived to be the reality also included my questions, comments and points of confusion. These were formatted in italics at the point of the session where the reflection occurred for me. This construction of the reality was then taken back to the site the next day and given to the facilitator. It formed the basis of the discussion on the session. (See Appendix A:1 for sample)

Other observations included retrospective notes taken after my visits to the classrooms. It was more difficult to take notes during these visits as the children often came to talk to me, or I moved around the groups and talked with them about what they were doing.
and why they thought they were doing it. These notes became a secondary data source and used to gain a more holistic picture of each of the teacher's perceptions of the impact that the program was having on them. They also were a source of data which could be used to verify and/or clarify data collected through interviews. This process often referred to as 'triangulation' is a 'mode of improving the probability that findings and interpretations will be found credible' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:305).

Interviews

Interviews within a constructivist methodology can range from structured to semi-structured interviews, can have various purposes within the one interview, as well as across interviews and, as time passes, are likely to become less structured in general terms but more focused on the particular issues and concerns pertinent to the interviewee (Patton, 1990; Guba and Lincoln, 1981, 1989).

In this study, interviews were organised the day after each of the observed sessions (Sessions 2, 4, 6 and 8 on alternate weeks) with the facilitator and the four case study teachers. A substitute teacher was employed for the day so that the teachers could be released from their classrooms for the interview. The purposes of these interviews were to gain a 'reconstruction' of the session from the facilitator and each of the case study teachers; a 'projection' of the usefulness of what the teachers were experiencing and learning; verification and extension of constructions of what was observed or heard by me during the sessions (triangulation), and verification and extensions of constructions gained in earlier interviews with them (member checking), (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:268).

1It should be noted that in their later work Guba and Lincoln no longer believe that the technique of 'triangulation' to be a useful credibility check unless it is being used to cross-check quantitative facts. 'Member-checking' processes they argue 'ought to be dedicated to verifying that the constructions collected are those that have been offered by respondents' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:241).
As mentioned above, the reconstructed observation notes of the sessions with my questions and comments embedded throughout in italics formed the basis for the interviews with the facilitator. There were no set predetermined questions.

The broad interview questions for the case study teachers were determined with the facilitator during the final stage of each of her interviews. These questions focused around the broad area of 'what had they learned and what helped them in this learning'; 'what did they find confusing in the session and what caused this confusion'; 'what were they doing in their classrooms as a result of what they were experiencing in the sessions'; 'what clarification did they need' and 'what other issues and concerns did they want to share'. As the weeks passed there were specific questions which were asked of each teacher which related to earlier discussions or were views (comments, issues and concerns) put up by other teachers which needed to be shared and discussed. (This process will be discussed in more detail in the section on the hermeneutic dialectic process which was occurring during these interviews.)

The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed at a later date. These transcriptions were used in the final data analysis and as many actual quotes were used in the case study reports as possible because I wanted each case study to reflect the 'voice' of each of the participants.² However, during this early period I jotted down as much of the responses of the teachers as was possible during the interview. That evening and the next day using my notes and the audiotape as a back up I typed up the key points from each of the interviews. (See Appendix A:2 for sample of reconstructed interview.) All original questions asked in the interview were included in the text as well as additional questions which surfaced during the writing of the interview and thus sought clarification or additional information. These latter questions were written in italics at

²Using direct quotes and participants' names raises the whole issue of ethics. It should be noted that all participants agreed to have their first names used in the case reports and having read their respective case agreed to the quotes being used.
the point of need for the information. The reconstructed interviews were posted to each teacher within a few days of the interviews and formed the basis of the beginning of the next interview. Often the teachers came to the next interviews with many of their responses written in their journals so as not to forget to tell me.

There were three other interviews with the facilitator and each of the case study teachers. The first was scheduled the week after the program was completed in the District. The purpose of this interview was to ask each of the teachers to reflect on the program as a whole and consider what they learned from their participation in it. They were also asked to consider what aspects of the program seemed to assist them in their learning and what aspects caused confusions.

A second interview was scheduled three weeks later. This group interview involved the four teachers and facilitator meeting for the day with me and a fellow researcher who had been working throughout this period in the larger evaluation of Frameworks in the 30 school districts. This day was seen as an opportunity for all stakeholders to engage in the hermeneutic dialectic process (see page 120) around the early analysis and identification of the claims, issues and concerns from them all. These were put to the group by me and the subsequent discussion was recorded by audiotape. The key points which emerged as the group moved to a sophisticated level of consensus were listed on chart paper for all to see. From this early analysis broad themes and categories began to emerge. (See page 133 for discussion of themes and categories.)

The final interview occurred two years later. Whilst contact with the group had been maintained through surveys and telephone conversations with Jackie, the facilitator, I had not been able to interview the case study teachers again in person. Therefore once all the data had been analysed for each teacher and a case report written up for each, I decided that it was important to not just simply send these to the teachers for them to
Some time before these scheduled interviews each teacher was sent copies of his/her original reconstructed interviews, the case study report written as a result of analysis of these interviews in light of the questions asked in the study and a cover letter (see Appendix A:3) explaining the purposes of the interview. One purpose of the interview was to engage the process of 'member checking', that is, 'the process of testing hypothesis, data, preliminary categories, and interpretations with members of the stakeholding groups from whom the original constructions were collected' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:238-239). Another purpose was to seek any additional information the teachers wished to share with me. These interviews were very much in the form of an informal conversation. All confirmed the overall accuracy of the facts and the interpretations as well as commenting that the experience of revisiting constructions of their involvement in the program through the case study report was a personal learning experience in itself. All agreed that their first names could be used in the final report of the study and that all direct quotes could also be used. (A copy of the letter appears as Appendix A:4.)

A telephone interview was held between Australia and the US with the Superintendent of the School District one year after the completion of the program. The interview questions were framed by the analysis of the interview data from the facilitator and the teachers. (See Appendix A:5.) These questions were sent to the Superintendent several weeks before the scheduled interview. Permission was granted for the interview to be audiotaped and direct quotes to be used. This was transcribed and a copy of the transcription sent to the Superintendent for his verification and records.
Surveys

There was only one survey used in this study. This was sent to the case teachers and the facilitator one year after the completion of the program. The questions were open-ended and also were framed by the analysis of the interview data.

It was at this point in time that the two principals were also asked to respond to a survey. (See Appendix A:6.) They had both participated in the program during that year with the facilitator and it was felt that their perceptions of the program would be useful support data. They were also asked to comment on any impact they had observed in their respective schools as a consequence of almost all the teachers of the intermediate grades having participated in the program by that time.

Documents

Document analysis is a rich source of information about programs and their implementation. Patton (1990:233) points out that documents not only provide a rich source of information but also can give the evaluator ideas for asking other questions. In this study an important document was the actual Frameworks Program itself. A discussion of the structures and processes inherent within the program was necessary as well as identification of the expected learning outcomes for teachers following participation in the program. This is found in Chapter 1.

Another important document source were the notes and charts which Jackie wrote in preparation for sessions and subsequent charts which were developed by the teachers and herself during the sessions. These were analysed along with the observations, interviews and journal entries in order to construct the 'context created by the facilitator'; that is, a construction of Frameworks as it was run in the library of Gorham School.
A vital documentation was the learning journal which each of the participants kept throughout the program. In this journal, participants were expected to reflect on the Between Session Readings and Between Session Activities. The facilitator and case study teachers were asked to also reflect on what they thought they learned during the sessions and what they believed helped or hindered their learning. I also kept a personal journal throughout the data collection and analysis period.

It was negotiated with the case study teachers and the facilitator at the beginning of the program that I could read the journals at any time and have a copy of them when the program finished. It became unnecessary for me to read these through the program as they each brought their journals to the interviews and shared much of what they had written. However, the journals were copied at the end of the program and analysed. They formed a useful cross-checking source (triangulation) when the case studies were being developed and the categories and themes were beginning to emerge. Comments which may have been made in the interviews were often written in more detail in their journals. They also had begun to use their journals as a forum to follow up on certain issues which may have arisen during an interview. In some cases there were points made in the journals which were directed to me as if they were talking to me. The journals were also used as a forum for debating certain issues which they were struggling with at that point in time.

**TACIT KNOWLEDGE**

Guba and Lincoln argue strongly that the constructivist has the right to incorporate and use 'tacit knowledge'; a concept defined by Polanyi as: 'Tacit knowing [now] appears as an act of indwelling by which we gain access to new meaning' (1967, cited Patton, 1990:72). Guba and Lincoln (1989:176) define tacit knowledge as 'all that we know minus all that we can say - the latter ... is propositional knowledge'. They maintain that 'tacit knowledge becomes the base on which the human instrument builds many of the insights and hypotheses that will eventually develop (and that will be cast as...
propositional knowledge) … The tacit knowledge must be converted to propositional knowledge so that the inquirer can both think about it explicitly and communicate it to others' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:198).

I brought many years of experience as a staff developer as well as a researcher to this study. I was also researching the impact of Frameworks in three other sites within a similar methodology during the period of this study. I already had much tacit knowledge regarding school settings and school based staff development. By working in three other sites I was also gaining tacit knowledge about American school settings. This knowledge was constantly being made conscious by being pushed through my human instrument, my mind. Through the interviews, the classroom visits, through the sharing with colleagues and peers, the process continued and tacit knowledge was forced to become propositional knowledge which then could be put to the facilitator and case study teachers for member checking and triangulation. The hermeneutic dialectic process was constantly in action.

THE HERMENEUTIC DIALECTIC PROCESS IN ACTION: DATA ANALYSIS

In their book Fourth Generation Evaluation, Guba and Lincoln (1989:177) clearly set out procedures for putting the hermeneutic dialectic process into place (see Figure 8: The Methodology of Constructivist Inquiry on p107). In this study, I believe there were three phases involved in this data analysis process, all used the hermeneutic dialectic process as the driving analysis tool.

Phase One occurred in the three month period during the piloting of Frameworks in New York state. Throughout this period there was a strong focus on the data collection, although data analysis was constantly occurring also.
Phase Two saw the focus shift to data analysis, although there was still some data collection going on. The outcomes of Phase Two were the case study reports written for each of the teachers. A set of themes and categories emerged from this phase which were seen to apply to all case study teachers.

Phase Three was another layer of data analysis and data collection. During this period the case reports were analysed and synthesised into a 'joint construction' which was then set within the constructions of the Superintendent and principals at the district level and the construction of Frameworks as it occurred within this District from the facilitator's level. This embedding process led to the case report as written in the following chapter.

Figure 9 demonstrates the process which was occurring during Phase 1 as I collected data from each teacher and the facilitator at each visit to the site every second week. As a result of my hearing the 'constructions' of each person, I began to analyse and synthesise these into a construction of my own which seemed to explain what was going on. The claims, concerns and issues which began to emerge weekly were taken back to each of the teachers, and so the hermeneutic dialectic process was put into action. This process could be likened to a formative process of evaluation.
Figure 9: My Construction of Each Teacher's Interviews

Figure 10 represents the process which occurred during Phase 2 as I analysed all the data for each of the case study teachers. The resulting case study reports formed the main data sources for the cyclic data analysis process for Phase 3.

Figure 10: Process of Construction of each Case Report
Figure 11 demonstrates the final stage of the data analysis process as all the constructions of the stakeholders involved were merged and a sophisticated level of consensus reached.

![Diagram showing the final case report process](image)

**ACTIVATING THE HERMENEUTIC DIALECTIC PROCESS**

Guba and Lincoln (1989:177) purport that 'four continuously interacting elements are involved [in the hermeneutic dialectic process], cycling, and recycling until consensus (or nonconsensus emerges)'.
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First, they argue that the respondents who enter into the hermeneutic process must be selected. As already discussed, the sample in this study was a purposive sample. The site was chosen because I believed it to be one out of the four in which I was working that would provide the most in-depth and honest responses. The facilitator and case study teachers were selected because I believed that they felt comfortable enough with me to trust me and to respond honestly rather than give me information they perceived that I wanted to hear. The sample could not be selected 'serially', as Guba and Lincoln suggest. That is, that the second element is chosen after the data collection from the first has been completed. The negotiations for the sample for this study needed to be carried out before the program began in the schools. Factors such as time, resources and school logistics had to be considered before the program began. I could only be in the school site on alternate weeks to observe the session being run between 4-6pm and then return the next morning to interview the facilitator and teachers before moving onto the next site to observe the same session being run there. Any other time I had was spent in analysing the interviews and typing up a reconstructed interview to be returned to the group before the next school visit.

The schools also needed to have some idea in advance of which teachers would be involved in the study. This was because the principals needed to organise relief staff for the teachers who would be off their classes for periods of time, to inform the parents of the classes involved and to budget for this cost.

The second element identified by Guba and Lincoln is the continuous interplay between data collection and data analysis. In this study there was an intensive period of data collection during which there was some data analysis occurring in the above figures.

The third element in the hermeneutic circle has to do with 'grounding the findings that emerge in the constructions of the respondents themselves' (Guba and Lincoln,
1989:179). Over time, a joint construction begins to emerge which differs from the individual constructions because it is grounded in all those constructions, having been derived from them through the hermeneutic dialectic process. It thus becomes the most 'sophisticated construction that is possible to develop in this context, at this time, with these respondents' (ibid). The 'grounded theory' which emerges must 'fit' and must 'work' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, cited Guba and Lincoln, 1989:179). Grounded theory becomes more and more refined and focused as the findings which emerge are grounded back into the data. In their earlier work, Lincoln and Guba (1985:206) define grounded theory as being 'pattern theory' as it is open ended and can be extended indefinitely. As such it serves a similar role to conventional theory in that it can be used to predict and to generate hypotheses for further testing.

In this study, findings were constantly being grounded back into the data. This occurred during Phase 1 in that the emerging themes and categories were put to the facilitator and teachers during subsequent interviews. These early themes and categories were used in Phase 2 in the more intensive data analysis phase. Finally, in Phase 3, an analysis of the four case studies to produce one overall construction forced the themes and categories to be grounded yet again in the data. This process further extended the 'grounded theory' which had begun to emerge.

The final element in the hermeneutic circle is that of 'the emergent design'. Guba and Lincoln advocate that the research design be continuously refined and extended as the need arises. This element has been discussed above, thus it suffices to say that in this study the design unfolded as time went on. For example, classroom observations emerged from the need for both myself and the teachers to have a shared meaning of their particular classroom contexts.

Thus 'as each sample element is selected, each datum recorded, and each element of the joint construction devised, the design itself can become more focused' (Guba and
Lincoln, 1989:180). As the design became more focused I became more aware of what was salient; I became more directed, the data analysis became more structured and the construction or findings became more definitive. I was constantly striving for consensus amongst the salient features within and across the data.

The first product of this process was a case report written for each of the teachers. These were written up within the framework of the themes and categories which emerged. A final report was the joint construction of the four case study teachers’ reports - a case report. The case report 'is characterised by a thick description that not only clarifies the all-important context but that makes it possible for the reader vicariously to experience it' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:181). It is hoped that this is what the reader will experience when reading the case report from this study found in the following chapter.

Before leaving this chapter, however, it is necessary to outline in detail Phase 2 of the data analysis of this study. Much of this has already been discussed in this chapter. What is left is to describe the process of the coding of the data using the 'constant comparative' method (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:339).

CODING THE DATA USING THE CONSTANT COMPARATIVE METHOD

During Phase 1 of the data collection and analysis (discussed above) interviews were reconstructed using my field notes and the audiotape. I tried to synthesise the half hour interview into a descriptive account. My intent was to recount rather than interpret what had been said during the interview. Figure 12 demonstrates an excerpt from such an interview.
We began the interview with a discussion of the confidentiality of the data. I also asked Lonnie if he would mind me sharing his journal at some time and coming into his classroom. Both these requests he agreed to and we will work these out as we move into the program further.

I asked Lonnie what he thought of Frameworks thus far and he felt that he was enjoying it. 'The time goes fast. That is always a judge that something is working.' Although time also was his greatest concern because he felt rushed in the sessions. The last part of Session 2 particularly was 'just like a whirlwind. I feel rushed.' But he also didn't know how the session could be shortened because he felt that everything in the session was useful. Time is at a premium for all teachers. (Lonnie, would sessions of 2 and a half hours be a problem if you knew this before you began the course, and if some of the time was given to you in school time?)

Before I could begin Phase 2 data analysis I had to list all the data I had collected and the purposes for collecting these data. This process helped me decide the things which needed to be done and the order in which to do them. I also catalogued the data clearly for storage and made decisions about how I could use technology to support me in my data analysis.

I decided to begin with the data collected from Lonnie in my data analysis. I then moved onto Denny's data and then Ginny's and Gail's. The reason for choosing Lonnie's data to examine first was quite deliberate. Lonnie had stated quite clearly that he was very much a traditional teacher who did not want to be involved in change for the sake of change. He was not a resistor to change but he did not appear to embrace the program as enthusiastically as the others. Denny's data were chosen next as I felt that Denny had been more enthusiastic about the program. Therefore there seemed to be a greater quantity of responses as well as more depth in responses from Denny. Thus I felt that if the themes and categories which began to emerge from Lonnie's data...
held as I worked through Denny’s data, then the categories and themes would appear to
be working, as they would be seen to be transferable.

For the purpose of explaining this analysis process I intend, in this section, to use
Lonnie’s data as an exemplar. Each of the steps described below were repeated with the
data from each of the other teachers. Throughout the process the emerging hypotheses
were continually being grounded back into the data simultaneously as the pattern of
themes and categories were being identified and checked against further data.

**STEP 1**

With the purpose and aims of the study clearly displayed on the wall in front of me I
began to read and reread the original reconstructed interviews with Lonnie. (See
Appendix A:2.)

As these were all on computer, I reformatted the pages so that I had a wide margin on
the left side in which I could jot any thoughts and descriptors which came into mind as
I read. The first set of categories which emerged were connected with the impact of
each of the sections of the program. I reconstructed each interview under the headings
(categories): connections being made, impact of workshop, impact of input, impact of
group reflection, impact of the between session activities and readings and so on. There
was also a category for 'overall comments' and one for 'concerns'.

This step was necessary as the interviews were more conversations (chats) than
structured interviews, thus the units of information were scattered throughout the
interviews and needed to be categorised and listed under a set of fairly basic organisers
in the first instance. (See Appendix B:1.)
This step was carried out with the data from each teacher. As I proceeded, other categories were beginning to emerge whilst some existing ones were extended, collapsed or even disappeared.

**STEP 2**

The next step was to read through these reconstructed descriptions of each interview with Lonnie with the purpose and aims of the study very clearly in my mind. As I read through each I jotted down in the wide margin the key points or 'units' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:344) or 'phenomena' (Strauss and Corbin, 1990:61 and 73) which seemed to be coming through. After doing this with all sessions I found I was not always sure if my interpretation was what Lonnie intended. It was at this point that I returned to the original interviews which had been transcribed and also were on computer. These served a major role in checking my interpretations and categories.

At this stage, I found I was identifying two broad categories or themes as described by Glaser and Strauss (1967:106, cited Lincoln and Guba, 1985:341). One broad category or theme which emerged was a focus of the teachers, namely their perceptions and descriptions of the impact the program had on them - the changes in thinking and practices. The other theme which was emerging was one which actually was more an explanation of those behaviours and processes which the teachers were explaining. This I labelled 'the change process'.

I followed Glaser and Strauss's first rule quite literally, namely, 'while coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967:106, cited Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 341). Using a card system as outlined by Lincoln and Guba, I identified some fourteen categories which seemed to both describe and explain what was going on. (See Appendix B:2.) At this stage it was clear that there was a pattern developing
between and among the categories, however at this point I did not attempt to make this pattern explicit.

I was able to then code the interviews of the other teachers using a computerised database system. As I did, I kept notes in my journal as to why I was placing certain incidents or units within certain categories. This process helped me begin to identify the 'properties of the categories' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:342). The more explicit I was with my intuitive judgements the clearer the 'rules' for the coding process became. Once all the interviews were coded into a database, I was able to sort all the units into their coded categories and print them off. I now had the data coded into categories with units of information from all the interviews. I could examine each category over the period of the program's duration.

It is also important to point out that this process was not always a smooth one, as it reads here, nor was it as linear as it appears. At various points in the process it felt like walking around in very muddy water and that 'all that work was useless and a waste of time' (my journal entry, October 11 1991). It was not useless (well not totally) even though I sometimes wondered. What was useful at these points was the opportunity to share my confusions with peers. This sharing process forced me to 'talk through' the categories and confusions and thus clarify further the mapping rules of the categories I had developed. It was during these occasions that existing categories were often extended, or relationships between categories were identified. Often some collapsed and were no longer perceived to be necessary. It was during this process that the water became clearer.

**STEP 3**

From these coded categories, I began to write Lonnie's 'story'. It was very much a draft with the units of information simply listed under the category heading. (See Appendix B:3.) The code at this point was holding for all teachers.
STEP 4

The next step in the process was to write Lonnie's story in prose form, drawing on the interview transcriptions for two purposes. One was to check my constructions of what was going on from Lonnie's construction. The other was to use direct quotes wherever possible so that Lonnie's voice was heard in his case report and that these quotes would thus support the construction I was creating.

This process was another layer of analysis and checking in itself. The hermeneutic process was in operation. I revisited every interview through the actual words of each of the teachers. I read and re-read their journals and revisited their classrooms through my field notes. During this period also I sent the four teachers and facilitator a survey asking several open-ended questions. (See Appendix A:6.) Their responses came in the form of a letter and were used as a form of checking my constructions.

About midway through the writing of the case reports, I struggled again with several of the categories. For instance, I had placed 'intellectual unrest' within the theme of Making Connections as this process seemed to occur when teachers were having difficulty in making connections. However, I was finding that it did not seem to 'fit' there comfortably any more. Again, after a long session with several of my peers, I decided that 'intellectual unrest' best fitted within the theme, 'the process of change'. I decided it explained the process of 'making connections' rather than explained the behaviour.

The code which finally emerged as a result of the analysis of all the case study teachers' data can be best demonstrated in the following figure.
Pre-existing Beliefs, Knowledge and Practices

Making Connections
  - new knowledge - covert change
    - nature of learning
    - nature of teaching
    - nature of language
  - new practice - overt change
    - strategies
    - evaluation
    - planning
    - resources
    - time
    - language used

Process of Change
  - intellectual unrest: the precursor to change
    - new knowledge
    - new practice
      - teaching
      - time
      - evaluation
  - enablers in the change process
    - understanding 'new' knowledge
      - content - readings
        - activities
        - input
      - process - group work
        - support
        - setting
        - time and timing
As can be seen from the above figure, the three broad themes which emerged from the case study teachers' data at this point in the analysis are Pre-existing Beliefs, Knowledge and Practices, Making Connections, and the Process of Change. Within these themes are categories and within each of the categories there are sub-categories. What follows is a description of these main themes and categories.
PRE-EXISTING BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

This theme refers to the beliefs which the teachers held and practices which were in place before they began to participate in Frameworks. It was relatively easy to identify information with respect to the practices that were in place as teachers described these, and they were evident from the classroom observations. Identifying their current beliefs was more difficult and had to be deduced from the interviews. For example, comments such as, 'I have a great big "why" on my desk and the kids get sick of me asking "why"' indicated that Ginny believed that it was important to challenge kids and ask them 'why' rather than simply give them the answer.

It was rare that the teachers clearly stated their current beliefs. Language such as 'I always', 'I think/feel/try to', 'I used to think/do', 'I already', triggered units of information which fell within this theme.

MAKING CONNECTIONS

This category refers to the connections teachers appeared to make as a result of being immersed in and introduced to the knowledge, concepts and theoretical principles and practices embedded within Frameworks. Sometimes these connections were concepts and ideas the teachers admitted to having not thought about before whereas other connections led to clarification and a deepening of understanding of concepts and ideas that they believed they already had.

In this instance, 'connections' are defined as 'concepts' and 'ideas' which the teachers could articulate and thought were interesting, made sense to them and could be used in their classrooms. The teachers readily shared these 'connections' during the interviews and in their journals, using language such as, 'that was new to me', 'I had never thought about that before', 'I like the idea of', 'that idea or activity confirms/clarifies/affirms/reaffirms/supports', 'I learned...', 'I tried...'.
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There are two main categories within the Making Connections theme. One focuses on the connections teachers indicated they made about the concepts and 'new knowledge' which were part of Frameworks. These connections are considered to be covert as they occur within the teachers' belief systems. Within this category there are several sub-categories. These are identified by the content the teachers talked about such as 'learning', 'language', 'evaluation' and 'teaching'.

The other category within this theme focuses on the teaching practices which the teachers indicated they were trying as a consequence of their participation in Frameworks. These connections are more covert as they can be seen as changes in the teachers' behaviours in the classrooms. They are identified in what the teachers said in the interviews and their journals but also could be readily seen in action in their classrooms.

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

The Process of Change is the third theme which emerged. Whereas the two other themes explain what is happening, this theme explains how and why things happened.

The first main category in this theme is 'intellectual unrest: a precursor to change'. Often the connections the teachers made led them to feel uncomfortable about other existing beliefs and practices. I judged these tensions in their understandings and knowledge base to be part of the process of change and thus were placed within the theme, 'the process of change'. These tensions, referred to as 'intellectual unrest', were signalled by language which tended to be negative, such as, 'I'm not sure about...', 'I found that confusing', 'felt overwhelmed', 'I don't know/understand...', 'I need to think about/read more...'.

The second and third main categories which emerged within this theme are strongly connected to 'intellectual unrest' and are labelled 'enablers and inhibitors in the change
process'. These categories form a dyad and actually can be seen as mirror images of each other. They refer to the structures and processes within the program and the setting which were seen to assist or hinder the 'connection-making' process with respect to 'new knowledge' and 'concepts' and 'practices'. Each category is consequently divided into sub-categories of 'new knowledge' and 'new practice'.

'Enablers in the change process' are structures and processes within the program which teachers identified as assisting them to understand, to make connections, or to clarify confusions which they had. For example in the case of 'new knowledge' the enablers which teachers identified were linked to the content itself such as useful readings, interesting input, the use of a video, or to the processes in which they were involved such as the workshops, the sharing with each other, the support from the facilitator and the school executive.

In the case of enablers which assisted the teachers to understand and use 'new practice' there are some common sub-categories, such as the importance of support, however there are also several different sub-categories such as 'focus on students' and 'focus on teaching'. These two sub-categories focused on factors which occurred more in the classroom itself. For instance, teachers indicated they were more likely to adopt a new teaching practice when students responded favourably to it.

The category 'inhibitors to the change process', as mentioned, is almost a mirror image to the category 'enablers in the change process'. Whereas 'enablers' refer to the structures and processes which support the learning process of teachers, 'inhibitors' refer to either the absence of such structures and processes or confusion around them and thus inhibit or create barriers for the learning process.

For example, Lonnie identified that the opportunity to share and work collaboratively in groups was an enabler in his learning, however the times when the directions for
workshops were not made clear and when he also did not really understand the purpose for doing the workshop were seen as 'inhibitors' in his learning.

The fourth category within the theme 'the process of change' is 'attitudes to change'. This category refers to how teachers felt about their involvement in the program. For instance, with respect to Lonnie, language such as 'I don't like...', 'I feel nervous about...', 'It's difficult to look inside yourself', 'I am feeling more comfortable about...' indicated his attitude to the change process.

The final category 'insights into the change process' refers to what the teachers found out about the change process with respect to themselves and their students. It involves more than how they felt about change. It is what the teachers came to understand and accept about change. For instance, Lonnie indicated that he had come to understand that change would always be a part of his professional life; that change takes time; that he was responsible for what he changed and how he changed as well as the time he took to change. These were all seen as being 'insights' into the change process.

THE FINAL CONSTRUCTION - CASE REPORT

As is shown in Figure 11, Phase 3 was the final phase of data analysis. Having developed four case reports from the teachers' data in response to the questions which guided the study, I turned next to 'pulling it altogether'. Another hermeneutic cycle was begun. There were three major parts within this particular phase of the data analysis.

Part one was to analyse the data from the principals and Superintendent in order to develop a construction of the setting in which this study was located. This part of the analysis identified the demographic details, the purposes for the District's involvement in such a program and the perceived impact of the program on the teachers' classroom practices. It was written up as a more descriptive rather than an interpretative account.
Part two analysed the program called *Frameworks* as it was run by the facilitator, Jackie. The process for analysing the observation notes of the sessions and Jackie's interviews was similar as discussed above. The categories which emerged from this analysis follow:

**THE PHYSICAL SETTING**

This is a description of the setting in which the program was run each week.

**PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE FACILITATOR**

This is a description of the academic and professional background of the facilitator. It is important background information in order to understand the learning culture in which the teachers worked each week.

**BELIEFS AND UNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER LEARNING**

This category refers to the stated beliefs that Jackie held about staff development and teacher learning. This included Jackie's beliefs about her role as a staff developer who had the responsibility to teach teachers.

**FACILITATOR CONCERNS DURING THE PROGRAM**

Throughout the interview data Jackie identified concerns about such issues as the effectiveness of herself as a facilitator, about teachers' perceptions of themselves as learners, the program itself and the continued support of the District. All these were considered concerns which needed to be identified as part of the overall construction of *Frameworks* at Marcus Whitman.

**FRAMEWORKS IN ACTION**

This category refers to the particular emphases which Jackie took in her running of *Frameworks*. Several sub-categories emerge from this analysis which together link to the general learning culture created by the facilitator.
Part three of this phase of the analysis involved me attempting to synthesise the four case study reports into one overall construction. The case study reports had been sent to the teachers for member checking purposes. Responses had been collected. I was ready to write. My intention when I began this process was to write a case report within the same framework (i.e. using the same categories) that all the individual case reports had been written.

I began by reading and re-reading the first theme, 'pre-existing beliefs, knowledge and practices' and looking for commonalities. I used the sentence starter, 'All four teachers...' to identify these commonalities. Once I found the commonalities, I began to write, still trying to be descriptive rather than interpretative. However, it became necessary to begin to write my interpretations, my construction of what the data were telling me, the human instrument, in light of the purpose of the study and the aims and questions which guided it. These constructions were written in language which was more tentative. Language such as, 'thus', 'it appeared', 'it seemed', 'there tended' were used as indicators of what was becoming the next level of analysis, the emergence of a grounded theory.

What soon began to happen as I proceeded was that it seemed necessary to collapse several of the categories, expand some and change some others. I was developing another code; one which reflected the level of analysis now being undertaken. One which reflected the emerging theory which had been grounded over and over in the data.
The code as it is now for the overall case report is:

**Impact of Frameworks**

- Pre-existing Beliefs, Knowledge and Practices
- Making Connections
  - New knowledge - covert teacher change
    - nature of learning
    - nature of language
    - nature of teaching
    - nature of evaluation
    - the role of language in learning
  - Implementation of new practice - overt teacher change
    - strategies
    - physical and social environment
    - planning

**Nature of Change**

- Intellectual unrest: precursor to change
- Enablers and inhibitors in the change
  - structures
  - processes
  - role of language
  - contexts and people
- Attitudes to change
- Insights in the change process

Figure 14: The Final Case Report Categories.

Two themes emerged from the four case study reports, 'the impact of Frameworks on teachers' beliefs, knowledge and practices' and 'the nature of change'. The first explains what happened when teachers participated in a staff development program called Frameworks; a program which was designed using a particular staff development
theory, one which was initially called a 'personal theory of staff development'. The second theme explains why this impact happened when teachers participated in the program.

The categories and sub-categories within the current code have not changed significantly from the first code. They simply have been tightened and refined.

The resulting case report can be read in the following chapter.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING THE ADEQUACY OF 'FOURTH GENERATION EVALUATION'

These are criteria which typically have been used to judge the 'trustworthiness' and 'validity' of the inquiry (Patton, 1990; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Eisner and Peshkin, 1990).

Guba and Lincoln (1989:233) point out that there are three differing approaches which can be used to judge the adequacy of a constructivist inquiry. The first they refer to as the 'parallel criteria' or 'foundational criteria'; named thus because 'they are intended to parallel the rigor criteria that have been used within the conventional paradigm for many years'. They argue that although useful, these criteria are not entirely satisfying as in the main they 'speak to methods that can ensure one has carried out the process correctly' (op. cit.: 245). Within the conventional positivist paradigm the methods used are critical for ensuring that the results are trustworthy. However, as they further point out, in a constructivist inquiry the quality of the methods used is only one consideration.

Outcome, product, and negotiation criteria are equally important in judging a given inquiry. Relying solely on criteria that speak to methods as do the parallel criteria, leaves an inquiry vulnerable to questions regarding whether the stakeholder rights were in fact honoured. (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:245)
In this study the parallel criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability were very much in place during the data collection and analysis processes.

The hermeneutic dialectic process is in itself a quality control mechanism. If the principles underlying this process are upheld, the possibility that 'the biases and prejudices of the evaluator can shape the results is virtually zero,' Guba and Lincoln (1989:244) claim. However, this approach focuses on the process and is not always explicit for those critical of the paradigm to 'see'. Thus Guba and Lincoln propose a set of criteria for judging the adequacy of the inquiry, which they argue grow out of the paradigm itself and therefore are more appropriate for use in a study of this kind. Furthermore they argue that these criteria can 'be explicitly confirmed and would be addressed in any case study emerging from a constructivist evaluation' (op. cit. :245).

'The authenticity criteria' as Guba and Lincoln called them are fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity and catalytic authenticity. These will be discussed briefly in light of this study.

FAIRNESS

The first criterion is reasonably straightforward. Basically it asks the question, 'Is the evaluator being "fair" to all stakeholders and reporting fairly their constructions of what is going on?'. A basic assumption underpinning constructivist inquiry is that it is value-bound and value-situated and thus within the setting there will be multiple realities or constructions which rest on the differing value systems. Processes need to be in place to ensure that these are all being treated fairly.

Two main techniques can be put in place to ensure that fairness is being achieved. The first is located within the purposive sampling process where potential stakeholders are
identified who will provide a range of constructions, particularly those which might be in conflict with others.

The second technique is centred within the open negotiations which occur between and among the stakeholders and evaluator. It is through this process that sophisticated level of consensus can be reached which all stakeholders have had some role in achieving. Inherent in this technique are the ethics of fair play and honesty between the evaluator and the stakeholders.

The criterion of fairness is maintained through constant use of the member checking process.

**Ontological Authenticity**

This criterion refers to the degree to which the individual stakeholders' own personal constructions are 'improved, matured, expanded and elaborated, in that they now possess new information and have become more sophisticated in its use' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:248). This will be demonstrated in what the stakeholders say in their interviews over the period of the inquiry and should be clearly evident in the case reports.

**Educative Authenticity**

Clearly related to the above criterion, the educative criterion refers to the degree to which the stakeholders have come to understand and appreciate (not necessarily agree with) others' constructions. This criterion is also evident in what the stakeholders report as having learned from being confronted with views which differ to their own.

**Catalytic Authenticity**

Having grown in their own view of the issues and concerns and having learned from others, this next criterion refers to the extent to which 'action is stimulated and facilitated ... The purpose of evaluation is some form of action and/or decision
making. Thus no fourth generation evaluation is complete without action being
prompted on the part of the participants' (Guba and Lincoln, 1989:249).

**TACTICAL AUTHENTICITY**

This criterion grows out of all of the above. Being stimulated into action is one thing
but having the power to actually carry out the action is another. Thus tactical
authenticity 'refers to the degree to which stakeholders and participants are empowered
to act' (Guba and Lincoln 1989:250). The judgement of the adequacy of the evaluation
therefore can be seen in what has happened and happens to the stakeholders as a result
of having participated in such an evaluation.

It should be evident from reading the methodology which was chosen for this inquiry
that these criteria were in place. Furthermore there are many examples in the case
study reports which give testimony that the authenticity criteria are a natural part of the
constructivist inquiry.

**A FINAL COMMENT: THE ISSUE OF SUBJECTIVITY**

As Peshkin (1988:17) points out 'one's subjectivity is like a garment that cannot be
removed. It is insistently present in both the research and nonresearch aspects of our
life'. This study focused on a personal theory which underpinned a staff development
program which I co-authored. I obviously have a strong commitment to the program
and the study. I obviously want to see it work. From the onset of this study I was very
aware of my subjectivity, or as Peshkin says, of 'my multiple "I's"'. To this end I kept a
journal throughout the study and the data analysis. The process of writing my personal
thoughts, concerns, excitements, depressions about what was going on allowed me to
systematically identify my subjectivity throughout the study. Once recognised, I was in
a better position to 'consciously attend to the orientations that will shape what I see and
what I make of what I see' (op. cit.:21).
Throughout the period of this study, a larger research project has continued to collect and analyse data which focuses on the questions which framed this study. So, although this study had to 'stop' and be analysed and written up, the larger research project from which it originated, has continued. The main data collection method is through survey, but also we have collected other artifacts such as teachers' journals.

Over 700 educators have now been trained as facilitators to run Frameworks since 1990 across both sides of the Pacific, United States, Canada, and Australia. Each of these facilitators is asked to respond after their training experiences. The survey (see Appendix C:1) has a series of open ended questions and has been refined over the years. Ten facilitators in Australia have also been asking the groups of teachers they train to respond. We now have two years of data from one thousand teachers. The analysis of all these surveys is being carried out by a team of researchers and it is sufficient to say here that the findings have been used as a major source of cross-checking and monitoring for this study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The thing finally written on paper ... is a collaborative document; a mutually constructed story created out of the lives of both the researcher and participants. (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990:12)

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the detailed analysis of the data collected from one of the eight case study sites in which Frameworks was evaluated, Marcus Whitman Central School District.

It is divided into four parts. Part One will describe the Frameworks learning culture at the case study site.

Part Two presents case studies of the four different teachers who participated in the program and volunteered to be case study teachers. These case studies are a description of the experiences of each of the teachers as a result of their participation in the program. These case studies emerged from the first aim of the study, namely to evaluate the impact that a staff development program called Frameworks had on each teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education.

Part Three is a synthesis of the four case studies into a joint construction which begins to examine the second aim of the study, namely, to evaluate the personal theory of staff development inherent in the design and delivery of the evaluand and, as a consequence,
begin to develop a staff development theory which has been formally grounded in the real world of classrooms and schools. In particular, Part Three reports on the impact that the staff development theory had on teachers' beliefs and practices, i.e. what happened.

Part Four is a continuation of this synthesis but focuses on the nature of change, i.e. how it happened.

PART ONE: THE LEARNING CULTURE OF FRAMEWORKS AT MARCUS WHITMAN CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT

The District

Marcus Whitman Central School District is a small rural district in upper New York comprising two elementary schools, one middle school and one secondary school. There are approximately 1700 students overall in the District, which in the words of the Superintendent at the time of the study, is 'typical when you take out the bigger city school districts ... New York itself is very rural so our district may seem small but ... for New York it's pretty typical'.

The District draws on a 'middle class to lower middle class rural population'. Part of the District borders Canandaigua Lake on which are built many 'vacation homes which the wealthy buy as their summer vacation homes'. However, the children of this group do not attend the schools in the District. In the main, the District serves a farming community, approximately 10% of whom actually work their farms as dairy farmers and vegetable growers. Other parents work in professional and semi-professional positions in nearby Geneva, Canandaigua and Rochester.
Forty percent of the District's finances come through the property tax of the farmers and property owners on the lake. The State Education Department finances the remaining sixty percent.

There are 114 teachers employed within the District.

The District belongs to a cooperative - the Wayne Finger Lakes Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) which includes 26 school districts which contribute a yearly amount in return for specific services for students and teachers. The services for students usually include special services for those with specific needs whereas the service provided for teachers is in the form of staff development.

The District appears to be very active in staff development having created a full-time position to initiate, organise and monitor the staff development for the District. A part-time position had also been allocated during 1988.

With respect to literacy, the District had been actively implementing a holistic or whole language approach since 1987. They had become involved in 1988 in the initial introduction into the USA of an Australian literacy staff development program for teachers of K-3, called the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC).

In 1990, the School Board, on recommendation from the Superintendent, agreed to join a consortia which was being set up by the Wayne Finger Lakes BOCES to finance the piloting and evaluation of *Frameworks*. Known as the *Frameworks* Consortia, thirty school districts from across New York state committed varying amounts over a three year period. Marcus Whitman's contribution for this period was $8420. In return, the districts received a trained facilitator in a secondary school literacy program for Grades 9-12, also developed in Australia, known as the Secondary Literacy Inservice Course (SLIC), a trained facilitator in *Frameworks* and participation in the piloting of the...
Frameworks program for Grades 3-8. Consortia schools obtained at cost all materials needed for the training of their teachers during this three years and beyond. Profit from the sale of Frameworks teachers' materials outside the consortia was returned to the consortia school districts for further staff development projects.

Thus it seemed that this District had been prepared to invest quite a deal of money over a period of time for the staff development of its teachers in holistic or whole language learning. It seemed quite a large financial commitment to literacy development.

The District's Involvement in Frameworks

The Superintendent's Perspective

The Superintendent commented that he believed, that whatever system was in place for teaching literacy, it was important that 'it's used properly and everyone believes in it'. The move towards a whole language system came 'from the staff', he indicated. The principals 'were in favour and the teachers believed it had merit ... so I would take very little if any credit for instituting change here'. His contribution, he indicated, was mainly to agree to financial support as well as supporting the appointment of Jackie as co-ordinator. He was proud that the adoption of this philosophy had been initiated by the principals and teachers - 'from the bottom up rather than top down, which is how it usually happens'. However, he also had read widely in the area and was influenced by his elementary school background, his current reading and by the beliefs in whole language philosophy of his wife who was a reading consultant and co-ordinator.

When asked what he hoped to achieve for the students in the District through adopting this philosophy, he demonstrated that he viewed whole language as a philosophy which encompassed the teaching of literacy skills. In putting the recommendations to the District's Board of Education, he proposed that he was seeking change in policy and

---

1 The Superintendent at the time of the study was Mr L Western.
practice in two key areas and that the adoption of whole language philosophy would result in these changes.

The first area related to repeating students. He no longer believed that simply repeating students until they had the skills was a worthwhile practice. In fact, he indicated that he believed that there was sufficient evidence that this practice actually worked against assisting the students as learners. The second area was that of 'tracking' students according to some perceived attainment level.

We need an approach ... where an environment was needed so pupils could be successful but also model successful people ... They [students] need modelling of successful people and the expectations of those students are that they are going to succeed. From what I was reading and hearing from my principals and Jackie, whole language would put more of our students in a situation where they would be successful. And instead of having a low group, we leave them with the mainstream youngsters and allow them to interact and learn from the models around them in a manner that would not only help them succeed academically but also help them with their self esteem which, in turn, would generate more success.' (Superintendent, 1991)

Although the Superintendent did not perceive the District as being highly 'innovative' because, as a district, they were 'unlikely to take a new concept or even generate a vastly new concept and go with it. We were more apt to take some research and improve our programs based on the success of others'. However, he did feel that it was important 'to be considered as being up to date and in tune with the best methods that are available'. He also believed that it was important 'to be considered to some degree a risk-taker' because he believed that 'unless you are prepared to take risks, you might not improve to the degree that you should'.

The Superintendent believed that taking the risk to be involved in Frameworks was worthwhile for the District. He indicated that ELIC had been very successful and that he had every reason to believe that Frameworks would be equally as successful for
Grades 4-8. With SLIC also in place in the secondary school, this meant that the teachers K-12 were being introduced to a holistic philosophy. And he added they had the person who was 'extremely capable in working with students and the staff ... Jackie'.

The evidence cited by the Superintendent as to the success of ELIC and Frameworks came from two sources. The principals indicated that library borrowing had tripled in a very short time. The other source were the parents. Parents were pleased with their children's enthusiasm about reading. They were reading for pleasure and for information.

There had also been a significant change at the elementary school level in moving from the 'testing' of students to 'portfolio assessment' and 'keeping running records of their reading, and more data on the books they read'. Teachers were given a half day 'to work on the report cards [i.e. write a narrative report] because if we're going to report accurately to parents then the kind of information that is most meaningful to them takes more time than just writing down an "A" or an "S" for satisfactory ... this has been a direct outgrowth of the change'.

The Superintendent indicated that the District was also moving towards integrating the language and content area curriculums, particularly at the middle school and high school levels. He wanted teachers to understand that when they are teaching Science or Social Studies they are also teaching language.

The Superintendent felt that there was a need for the colleges which trained young teachers to improve their teaching and standards. If young teachers came into the schools with an understanding of whole language this would be very useful to them and to the school, he indicated. The other major need he saw was more money for staff development. In 1991 there had been some drastic cuts in money for schools in New
York state and the one area which was hit the most was staff development. He felt that funds were presently so limited that no further support could be given to teachers once they had done a program like Frameworks. He lamented, 'We can't just put them [the teachers] through a training program like Frameworks and say "Well, they're trained. We have done our job - now you go to it!" They need constant reinforcement if they are to become true believers in whole language. It's a frame of mind'.

The principals also played a key role in the change process in the schools, the Superintendent indicated. They had initiated the change in the beginning, attended the courses and worked beside their teachers 'constantly trying to challenge their teachers in the right direction'.

*The Principals' Perspective*

Both elementary principals, Ralph and Eric, were very supportive of whole language philosophy and were instrumental in initiating the paradigm shift in the District from a traditional view to literacy to a holistic view. Both had participated in past inservice courses on whole language. For instance they both participated in ELIC with their primary teachers and attended the New York Whole Language Conference. They both also participated in Frameworks.

They both indicated that it had been a very successful program for them personally as it had provided them with insights about the nature of learning and language that they did not have before. Working through the program with their teachers also gave them insights into 'seeing things from the teachers' perspective'.

Both principals believed that it was important that administrators participate in the courses they expect teachers to participate in. One of the principals commented, 'The principal would do well to be a full participant ... this means that the principal does not just provide programs such as Frameworks but the principal also attends'. He indicated
that he believed that successful implementation of any innovation required that all levels of administration, including the superintendent, should participate.

Even though there are different roles, responsibilities, and even authority, the teachers and the administrators need to see themselves as a community of learners and co-workers for much of this journey. Teachers have little confidence in something that is put upon them from above. Change brings a natural distrust that is broken down when the administrator is willing to share his/her time to undergo the same process as the teachers.' (Ralph, 1991)

Both principals indicated that they learned a great deal from their involvement in 
*Frameworks* which helped them understand more clearly the reading-writing connections and what this meant for the teaching of literacy. They also found that the program gave them a new perspective on learning - learning as it applies to the teaching of literacy and learning as it applies to teachers. Eric indicated that he had gained 'insights that allowed me to see things from the teachers' perspective' and therefore he was better equipped to 'give direction and support'. The teachers, he felt, perceived him as 'a resource to help answer their questions'.

Ralph indicated that *Frameworks* helped him to 'bring together all [he] had learned in the past with an organised format and new material'. He commented that on completion of the program he realised 'for the first time it all came together, not as a collection of pieces, but as a system. I discovered I now had an educational practice that I could discuss which was based on a belief system which I could discuss, which in turn was based on research and the best in educational learning theory'.

Both principals indicated that they had noticed that there had been some changes in teachers' beliefs and practices as a result of their participation in *Frameworks*. However, it was the process that the teachers went through which they felt was so important to their overall professional growth. Ralph commented,

*Chapter 4 - Results of the Study*
The format of the course allowed for much small group work and discussion. This process brought the teachers focusing together on whole language and examining their beliefs and knowledge. This built rapport among teachers and let them know they were all in this together. They gain support from one another and more importantly they resolve to go forward with something they collectively believe is in the best interest of the students. (Ralph, 1991)

THE CONTEXT ESTABLISHED BY THE FACILITATOR

The Physical Setting

The program was run on Tuesday afternoons from 3.30-5.30pm in the library of Gorham Elementary School. There were twelve participants, one male and 11 females from Grades 4, 5 and 6 from the two elementary schools in the District. All teachers had a minimum of five years teaching experience.

One end of the library was set up each week for the session. Three tables were formed into a U-shape. At the open end of the U there was a table on which stood the overhead transparency projector and screen. On the left side of the U the video camera was set up on a tripod so that each session could be videoed. A flip chart was set up at the left hand side of the U and another set up at the back of the U. Coffee, tea and snacks were set up at the entrance of the library. Various charts were hung each week - some particularly made for that session, others were a result of workshops from previous sessions. This latter 'wall print' grew in quantity as the program progressed.
Each week, when participants arrived, they usually helped themselves to a snack before seating themselves at the tables. Jackie asked participants to move to different seats each week so that they had the chance to work in different groups.

**Professional Background of the Facilitator**

Jackie was employed in the District as a part-time staff developer and a part-time Reading Specialist teacher during this period. Jackie had been teaching for 20 years, the last 13 years in the position of Reading Specialist. In 1988 Jackie was invited by the District to be trained as an ELIC tutor. With this training she was officially launched into staff development. She ran several sessions in the District during after school hours for the Kindergarten - Grade 3 teachers. In 1990, Jackie was invited by the District to be trained as the *Frameworks* Facilitator and to participate in the piloting of the Program.
Beliefs and Understandings about Staff Development and Teacher Learning

The interview data indicated that Jackie held some very strong and clearly thought out beliefs about teachers as learners. These beliefs, it seemed, had developed as a result of her previous experiences in staff development as well as the facilitator training experience in which Jackie had participated with the authors of Frameworks. The observational field notes demonstrated that these beliefs were manifested in the weekly sessions.

Jackie indicated she believed that the concept of 'natural learning' not only applied to children as learners but also to their teachers. Therefore she felt it was important to create a learning environment for teachers in which the Conditions of Learning as outlined by Cambourne (1988) were in place. She indicated that for too long teachers had been told what they should be doing in their classrooms rather than being shown how they could be doing it. Thus Jackie believed that she should demonstrate as much as was possible that which she wanted the teachers to learn. This meant that she needed to demonstrate all classroom strategies which the teachers were asked to trial in their classrooms. But it also meant that each time the teachers were asked to carry out an activity in the session she should try to give a demonstration of what it was that they were expected to do. These demonstrations in themselves were demonstrations of a teaching approach which was more student centred and therefore gave the teachers the opportunity to experience that which they were being asked to try in their classrooms rather than being 'told how to do it'.

Jackie was aware that many teachers found it threatening to change their teaching practice from a transmission of information model to one which was more student centred. Thus she was cognisant that not only did the teachers need to see how various activities 'looked in practice', but that they also needed to believe that the activities were seen to be 'do-able' and clearly reflected the principles espoused in the philosophy which she was presenting to the group. She was aware that she could not assume that
teachers understood why they were being asked to carry out an activity, read an article, share with each other and so on. If teachers were to make connections between the theory and practice inherent within the program, she believed she needed to constantly make explicit the purposes of each of the structures within the program. As well as making the purposes explicit she also believed it important to constantly refocus the group as well as recap the key principles at the end of sections within the program. She felt doing this would help the teachers make the connections between their intuitive personal knowledge which they were beginning to make explicit and the concepts and knowledge that were being presented to them as 'theory of others'.

Jackie believed that the teachers, like their students, needed constant feedback and support from her as the facilitator but more importantly from each other. Thus it was important, Jackie indicated, that there were many opportunities for teachers to reflect and share their issues and concerns with each other. Social interaction was seen to be an important learning tool by Jackie and so she encouraged the teachers to share with each other during sessions as well as during the between session periods. She indicated that she tried to meet informally with each of the teachers during the week to discuss any concerns they may have had.

A major part of her role, Jackie believed, was to help the group begin to develop a shared meaning for the various terminology embedded within the program. Thus she tried to overlay the language of the program over the language they used in their discussions. She also encouraged the teachers to use the terminology.

Jackie believed that an important part of her role was to create a learning environment in which teachers felt they could trust each other so that they felt comfortable to share with each other, to work in groups collaboratively. She felt it was an advantage that she knew all the teachers and had worked closely with some of them in previous years.
Facilitator Concerns During the Program

Jackie realised early in the program that, just as the teachers struggled with giving responsibility for learning to their students, she experienced the same struggle with 'her students'. She indicated that she had to accept the fact that she could not do 'everything for them'. Teachers-as-learners needed to take responsibility for their own learning and sometimes they did not want to do this. There were times when she had to step back and say, 'What do you think? What can you do about this?' She found that she had to be patient with what appeared to her, at times, to be little or no change in the teachers' beliefs and practices. She commented that it was all too easy to blame them for not wanting to change, as well as blame herself for not doing enough. She often found that she had to remind herself of the small changes in their thinking and practices that had occurred over the time. Being able to read the teachers' learning journals was a great source of feedback for her as well as the learning journal which she herself kept.

An associated problem which arose was that Jackie often felt responsible for creating the 'intellectual unrest' and the associated tensions and anxiety this often caused in the teachers at various times in the program. This in turn created feelings of anxiety and tension in her. Jackie thus often found that she needed to talk with other Frameworks facilitators. This networking helped her see that she was not alone and facilitated her own learning as to how to best support the teachers in her group. Thus Jackie indicated that it was very important that all facilitators trained in the future should have access to each other so that they can set up their own support networks. This support helped Jackie accept that she could not be held responsible for the teachers' sense of frustration and anxiety. She realised that her practice of taking the time to seek each person out and talk to them privately was the most effective strategy she could use. Where this was difficult due to time constraints Jackie found that a short letter to the teachers helped.

Another concern Jackie identified was that the support given to the teachers at the District level may be short-lived. District support was obvious to her and the teachers at
the beginning of the program. However, she indicated that the administrators needed to understand that once teachers had completed the eight sessions they were not 'finished' and ready to move into some other program. The end of the program was really the beginning she felt and they all - from district level to class level - needed to examine what further support teachers would need as they continued on their learning paths.

Jackie indicated that she felt there were too many times in the program where she was supposed to 'read' a script to the teachers. She perceived this as demeaning to both herself and the group. Thus, where possible, Jackie indicated she tried to overcome this 'problem' by introducing various strategies such as creating the information in diagrammatic form on overhead, by providing the information in the form of a cloze passage for the teachers to work through collaboratively, or by adding information and/or diagrams by other authors.

Time was a constant concern for Jackie. Keeping the group activities to the advised time was difficult. Jackie indicated that she was constantly torn between knowing that she should stop the group work and move on, and letting the group work continue because she was aware of the 'great interaction' which was taking place. She indicated she 'loathed stopping them when they seemed to really be on a roll' but when she did not do this, she also found that she had to rush through the sections at the end of the sessions. This, she realised, often caused confusion with the group about what they were expected to do and read between sessions. She also worried that because she was so often rushed for time that she may have tended to follow the program rather than respond to the needs of the group. She found that she often left the sessions feeling disappointed that she had not had the time to demonstrate the instructional strategy in more depth (and sometimes not at all).

The focus on keeping to the advised times she felt often pushed her into 'telling the teachers' the connections they should be making, rather than providing them with the
opportunities to make the connections for themselves through interaction with her and each other. She indicated that this fact often left her feeling frustrated because she was unsure of just what connections the teachers were making. This was a danger she felt in the program and she indicated that she had begun to rely more heavily on the Group Reflection section in the first part of each session as a way of evaluating where the teachers were at. She also decided that the fifteen minutes allocated to this section was inadequate and allowed the teachers to take more time, sometimes up to 30 minutes. She also relied, as indicated earlier, on the opportunities she had for meeting with the teachers informally during the week. Having this time allocation permitted her to not only talk briefly with teachers but on request she could actually visit classrooms and work alongside the teachers or even demonstrate classroom practice with their children.

Another concern Jackie expressed was that 'knowing too much' about the concepts and understandings within the program could sometimes be a problem for her. For instance in the session on reading, she felt the need to add further information but then felt disappointed that several in the group did not seem to 'be there yet and [they] finish Frameworks in a few weeks'.

**Frameworks in Action**

From the analysis of the video and observational field note data it seemed clear that Jackie followed the program as it was designed to be delivered. Thus it can be said that the participants all experienced the structures and processes inherent within the program. Furthermore, it would appear that the concepts and understandings - the basic philosophy underpinning the program - were presented to the teachers in the manner in which the authors intended.

Teachers experienced various structures, such as workshops, in which they were expected to consider their own personal views on learning, on language in use, on reading, writing and spelling. They were immersed in the 'theory of others' via video
and audio input and set readings. They were given the opportunity to 'see' how this theory 'looked' in practice by being given a series of instructional strategies. These strategies were demonstrated for the teachers in the sessions and a reading was supplied which described the strategy and how it worked in classrooms as well as how they might extend its use. Teachers were asked to trial these strategies in their classrooms with their students between the sessions. They were also asked to reflect on how these strategies 'worked' in their own classroom settings.

Through the processes of reflection and self evaluation of their teaching practices teachers were expected to make explicit their practices and beliefs systems. They were also asked to reflect on the set readings which supported and extended the concepts and knowledge that were presented in that session. As a consequence of these reflections and sharing in groups it was expected that teachers would begin to not only understand the philosophy espoused within Frameworks but begin to make it their own, i.e. they would develop a cohesive and coherent personal theory of learning and language use which was realised in their classroom practice. It was anticipated that teacher involvement in these structures and processes would ultimately be an empowering experience.

However the evidence also indicated that there were some specific emphases in the program, as it was run by Jackie, which needed to be examined in more detail. These could be attributed to the personal biases or beliefs which Jackie held about the teacher-as-learner as identified above. These personal biases thus gave the program its own unique flavour at Marcus Whitman Central School District site.

Making Explicit

Jackie believed that the process of making one's thinking explicit, of justifying one's thinking with peers, was a valuable learning tool. Thus it was something that she did often during sessions and also expected the teachers to do. For example, at the end of
the sessions Jackie, in outlining the set readings which they were expected to read for the next session, also commented on what she thought were the key points in the reading for her.

Jackie often made explicit the key points that she thought had come out of activities and workshops. It was a form of recapping the salient features of the content. As time went on she also often asked the teachers to make explicit for their peers any points which were important for them.

In Reflection time Jackie moved about the three tables listening to the teachers' discussions about the readings and the trialling of the instructional strategies in their classrooms. During this time she often would ask questions such as, 'Why do you think so? Tell us why that might have happened.' These were questions which helped the teachers make explicit their intuitive knowledge and beliefs. As time went on, the teachers would tend to justify their thinking without the prompt questions.

Making Explicit the Purposes of Activities

This was a very important belief of Jackie's which was clearly evident in the sessions. Often she wrote the purposes of an activity on an overhead transparency which she shared with the group or she wrote them on chart paper so they could be hung up and referred to at a later time. This list of purposes could be used again as a form of recapping the key points in the activity.

The Power of Demonstrations

There were two main types of demonstrations which Jackie gave in the sessions. Both of these forms were also multi-leveled demonstrations.

Jackie demonstrated the practical classroom strategies which the teachers were being asked to trial in their classrooms, such as Modelled Writing. Jackie first set out the
purposes for why she was going to demonstrate this instructional strategy. She pointed out that there was a reading called Modelled Writing which they could read later. She then went on to explain that she believed that learners gain a great deal more information about how something 'happens' and 'works' when they 'see' someone else trying to do it. She also pointed out that what they were about to see was not only a demonstration of how she, as a proficient writer, goes about the process of writing, but also a demonstration of how a teacher goes about modelling that which she wants her students to learn. This was a typical example of how Jackie demonstrated not only the salient concepts and knowledge in which she wanted her students to engage but also to understand at a meta-level the power of demonstrations as a learning tool.

The other type of demonstration typically occurred when Jackie demonstrated procedures to the group. Having explained the procedures for a particular task they were to carry out, she would then give a brief demonstration of what they were expected to do. When provided with the purposes for the activity, followed by a demonstration of what was expected, teachers generally had little difficulty in carry out the activities as expected. On the several occasions when Jackie felt things 'didn't go as [she] would have liked', it could be seen that either the purposes were not evident or Jackie did not demonstrate what she expected from them; thus teachers had to rely on the procedures that were set out in their Course Notebooks. It was often on these occasions that confusion occurred within the group.

Another example of making purposes explicit and providing learners with demonstrations could be seen in the way Jackie often designed grids or listed questions on charts for the group to use as a frame for their collaboration and reporting. These frames helped focus the group towards the desired outcome so that they discovered the key points for themselves. For instance, in the session on Writing the teachers worked in small groups to write before responding to a list of some eight questions set out by the authors. These questions were long and could cause confusion, Jackie thought. So,
for each group, she organised these questions into a grid with four major focuses so that they could reflect on the processes they used as writers and quickly fill in the grid. Once they had completed the grid the groups were then in a position to share with each other. As they did this Jackie was quick to draw attention (i.e. to demonstrate) the similarities in the groups' processes and to link these similarities with the Walshe model provided on the writing process. In doing this she was also overlaying the language of the content over their more 'common sense language'.

**Expectations**

Jackie established a clear set of expectations for the teachers. She made it quite evident that they were expected to read the set reading(s); try the instructional strategies with their students and come prepared to share their reflections on these activities with their peers. There was an expectation that they would work together in groups, being prepared to be risk-takers as they shared their beliefs and knowledge and practices with each other.

However, she also made it quite clear that just what they 'took' from the program was their responsibility and that she did not expect that they would become 'child centred', 'holistic teachers' by the end of the eight week sessions.

**Feedback**

Jackie indicated she believed that teachers-as-learners needed constant feedback. This belief was clearly evident in the sessions as she responded to their issues and concerns. Feedback was generally given in terms of affirmation, additional information, clarification, and reminders of her expectations of them as learners.

Very early in the program, Jackie quite explicitly pointed out to the group that she understood that sharing with each other could feel quite threatening, however effective learning meant being prepared to be a risk-taker. Later in the session she complimented
the group for their involvement and thanked them for being 'risk-takers'. It was during this time that Jackie was also trying to reinforce the fact that there were no right or wrong answers; that everyone had the right to an opinion and that everyone's perspective should be valued. Jackie often came back to this theme.

At the beginning of each session Jackie spent some time sharing with the group the analysis of the 'feedback sheets' she had received from them at the end of the previous session. During this short period Jackie was very honest in her feedback to them. She shared her concerns, she praised them, she gave them additional information, she clarified general confusions and generally demonstrated to them that she understood their feelings of anxiety and that although this feeling may not feel very comfortable it was very normal. She always thanked them for their honest feedback as this information helped her to plan future learning experiences for them.

Often at the end of Group Reflection time, Jackie would recap the key concepts that she had heard coming from the groups' discussions. During this time in Session 6, for instance, Jackie spent some time reassuring the teachers that the expectations of the program were that they should consider their own beliefs in light of what they had been learning and trying; that it was up to them to choose which changes they would make and that they certainly could not 'change everything all at once'. She made a point of thanking the group for their honesty and their willingness to share 'warts and all with each other'.

Early in the program Jackie set up an Issues and Concerns chart so that various questions which came up but could not be resolved immediately were not ignored. The group often returned to this chart to check whether their issues and concerns had been resolved. They often found that during group discussion or a workshop, or in something that someone had read, an answer or explanation had been found to many of the listed
issues and concerns. This form of feedback demonstrated to the group that Jackie did not have all the answers but was a facilitator in their learning process.

**Responsibility for Learning**

Jackie's belief that learners are responsible for that which they choose to learn was evident in the general ethos of the sessions. There could have been many times when she could have responded to their questions with a long spiel. Instead she suggested they put the question on the chart, or she suggested they wait to 'see if [their] questions are answered later in the session'. Thus she tended to acknowledge their problems but avoided moving into the 'information giver' role and taking responsibility for their learning. A typical example was when the group became bogged down with the definitions of 'skills' and 'strategies'. It was clear that the group would not move on until they had clarified this issue. Rather than Jackie taking over and trying to offer definitions, she threw it back to the group. The interaction which then occurred amongst them was very lively until one member offered a distinction between the two terms which they all accepted. And so they moved on with a shared meaning of the terms.

**Adding Information**

There were many occasions when Jackie would add her own ideas to the sessions. This came in the form of diagrams, reconstruction of a long introductory piece into a cloze passage for the group to work through, different ways of presenting information, reorganising the questions for discussion sessions and many more. Whatever Jackie chose did not change the program in any major way, rather it seemed to help clarify and facilitate the smooth running of workshops, save time, make connections, clarify terminology and generally respond to the needs of her learners.
Role of Language

Jackie seemed to take every opportunity to help teachers make the connections between their intuitive 'common sense' use of language with the terminology used within the program. She did this by 'overlaying' the technical language over their 'common sense' language. For instance the terms used to describe the Conditions of Learning were used by her to support and extend comments made by the teachers in such a way that it was obvious what the terms meant. For example, a typical comment from a teacher when sharing her learning process was that she needs to 'see how other people do it'. Jackie responded with, 'Yes, we've all found that "demonstrations" are very important for our learning'.

The terms 'syntactic', 'semantic' and 'graphophonic' (the three cueing systems) were also used repeatedly by her but not just on their own as if everyone knew what they meant. Jackie used the terms along with the diagram of the three circles during the writing session as a form of recapping after they had considered their own writing processes; and also repeatedly as a form of recapping after each short workshop in the reading session. In this way Jackie helped the group connect their experiences in the workshops, their intuitive and implicit knowledge to the term and their meanings without having to give long explanations of what the terms meant. This process demonstrated what they meant.

Creating a Community of Learners

It was evident that Jackie worked hard to create a 'community of learners' - a community who felt comfortable to share with each other and therefore take risks in front of their peers. This occurred over the time of the program so that by the end of the eight sessions the group wanted to continue to meet. They had realised how much the group members could support each other as learners. These meetings became an official TAWL group (Teachers about Whole Language). These groups had begun to spring up across the United States and were officially networked.
SUMMARY

The evidence indicates that *Frameworks* - the evaluand - was run in the Marcus Whitman Central School District within the philosophical boundaries which the authors of the program espouse by a very competent facilitator. The District, through its financial support as well as the obvious support of the Superintendent and more particularly the principals, was very supportive and held high expectations that an innovation such as *Frameworks* would be useful for the teachers and the schools. It seemed evident that not only did the District want to support the concept of whole language as a philosophy for the teaching of literacy but also seemed to value teacher learning. Involvement in the piloting of *Frameworks* and involvement in this study were seen by the administrators as forms of teacher learning.

Jackie appeared to be a highly skilled facilitator who was able to demonstrate the principles of holistic learning and language which were inherent in the program and which she expected her 'students' - the teacher-learners - to take on board and put into practice in their classrooms with their students. She created a learning ethos which the teachers could 'feel' and, having thus experienced, were better equipped to begin to put into practice for themselves. It was an ethos which encouraged the learners to be risk-takers, to reflect, to share, to collaborate with and learn from each other. Jackie's expectations of the group were high and were constantly made explicit so that there was as little ambiguity as possible.

Such an ethos lead to an effective learning culture which could be called a community of learners. It was a culture in which teachers received many demonstrations of that which they were expected to learn; in which they were given many opportunities to share, question, reflect, try 'new' practices and read 'others' theories. It was a non-threatening and supportive learning culture in which there were no right or wrong answers and everyone's opinions and ideas were valued; it was a learning culture which
encouraged teachers to develop their own personal beliefs and theory; it was a learning culture which gave teachers the opportunities to become personally empowered.
PART TWO: THE FOUR CASE STUDY REPORTS

CASE STUDY 1 - LONNIE GUNZALUS, GORHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Pre-existing Beliefs, Knowledge and Practices
Lonnie stated in his first interview that he 'hate[s] to keep making changes, to invest the time and effort into making the change that might be just a waste of time and energy'. He further admitted to his program staying 'pretty much what it was last year. I'm trying to do a little bit more with the writing and reading. I'm still very, what I would consider, fragmented, very specific times with my subjects'.

This present view of learning and teaching was evident in his beliefs that he needed to teach the skills of written language and consequently test his students to see how much of what he had taught they had learned. This form of testing allowed him to grade students which he believed was an expectation of the parents.

There were other teaching practices which Lonnie adhered to which further indicated that he held a 'traditional, fragmentationist view of learning' at this point in time. Spelling was taught from text books and students were expected to rote memorise lists of words chosen by the authors of the text. Reading was also taught as a series of skills to be learned and memorised. Writing was graded each week.

Lonnie also indicated he believed that learning should be relevant, should be enjoyable and should be a challenge. He indicated that he was dissatisfied with his present teaching approach. Lonnie entered Frameworks with this awareness and these attitudes.
MAKING CONNECTIONS - NEW KNOWLEDGE

Nature of Learning

Lonnie readily made the connection that the view of natural learning proposed in *Frameworks* was in conflict with what drove his classroom practice, however, it was very much the view of learning which drove his teaching (coaching) of wrestling which he did outside school. He could link this 'natural' view of learning with various learning contexts outside his classroom including his own home and the conditions which operated in such a setting as his own children were learning to speak and now learning to read and write.

Natural learning, he believed, made 'so much sense'. However he was having trouble making the connections to his classroom practice. He wrote in his journal, 'How can anything so natural be so difficult to understand?'. This connection created intellectual unrest for him as he could not see a clear way to put natural learning into operation in his classroom.

He was becoming increasingly aware that there was another view of learning being put forward called 'whole language' which, he says, '... I kind of see it is as, there it is over there and I can see it. I know what it is, I'm not sure how to get there. I've got to build something so I can get over there. That's the way I'm seeing it right now. That's a start for me'.

As he proceeded through the program he also began to identify how he himself best learned. This in turn gave him further insights into how his students might learn. He indicated that *Frameworks* suited him because he knew he took responsibility for what he took from the program. He could try things out at his own pace; he could adapt the activities to suit himself and his class; he could revisit the readings in his own time. He also became aware that the seeking of guidance and opinions from others does not necessarily mean that he has to accept them.
Nature of Teaching

During the eight week program Lonnie began to move towards a more child centred approach to teaching, reflecting the beginnings of a paradigm shift in his thinking about the nature of language and learning. He was aware that he was focusing more on what students can do rather than making the assumption ‘that all 4th grade students are the same’. He was surprised that they often knew more than he expected and many of them could also articulate how they went about their learning. This connection led to the understanding that he, the teacher, was not responsible for all the learning that his students did; that the teaching process was not a simple ‘transmission of information’ for students to take on board and be able to reproduce on call at a given level.

I finally have come to realise that when I teach a ‘friendly letter’ this one way [the way the English text book outlines] ... my students are going to write a different friendly letter to me and to each other, and there is nothing wrong with that. (Interview, 10.10.90)

In Lonnie’s shift from a teacher centred approach to a child centred approach he became not only aware of, but accepted the fact that his role in the classroom had changed and that his ability to teach this way - 'to guide students' learning' - would improve over time.

Another connection he made in his shift to child centred teaching was that students already may have a great deal of knowledge about that which he was trying to teach.

The way I see it, because you take students who know how to do it and you see that they have that knowledge and maybe pick up a few more during the lesson, then you also find out [what they need to know]. So it's no-one's fault if they can't do it on the spot. It's not my fault and now I have something to go with [for future teaching]. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Lonnie was becoming aware that the teaching/learning responsibility was a joint one between himself and his students. He can guide their learning only if he learns from them.
in order to facilitate this learning. It would seem from his comments and his journal entries that he was beginning to understand the concept, ‘a community of learners’.

**Nature of Language**

Lonnie was only beginning to make connections about the nature of language. He had become aware of the reading/writing connections, the power of demonstration as a teaching/learning tool, and the role that purpose and audience plays in language.

[The article, 'What is good writing?] helps to point out the importance of purpose and audience. In the past I've been guilty of having the kids write for me and it shouldn't be like that. I also seemed to try and make them sound a certain way; make them sound more intelligent by using words they don't normally use.

*(Learning journal, 15.10.90)*

The concept of different genres of language was a new connection for him and he indicated that he would need to learn more about this before he felt comfortable to teach it well. What he was beginning to realise was that he could focus on different genres of language in different content areas and that students needed to be immersed in the genre that they needed to be able to use. This created an awareness of the paucity of resources in his classroom, and in the school, of relevant materials across a range of genres in which to immerse his students.

**MAKING CONNECTIONS - IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PRACTICE**

**Physical and Social Environment**

In trialling the many strategies and activities as part of his involvement in *Frameworks*, Lonnie began to change the classroom setting. He was more consciously trying to establish an ethos in which the conditions of learning as outlined in the program (what he saw demonstrated on the video) were operating. He introduced more group work and more collaborative work. In the first instance, he and the students found this change difficult as he was not sure what he was doing nor what the expected outcomes were. The
students were equally unsure. He also found that he did not know how to formulate the
questions he needed to ask in order to implement the 'new practice'.

That [our learning experience activity] was very difficult for me to explain it
without me telling them ... putting words in their mouths ... I didn't know how
to do that ... It seemed to come together in the whole group discussion at the
end. (Interview, 26.9.90)

He did, however, feel that this issue would improve over time. 'I need to be more
specific with directions.' 'I will get better at guiding things. When I guide sometimes
[now] I feel like I've supplied everything but the last syllable of the word I wanted them
to say and I don't want this.' (Interview, 26.9.90)

Strategies
Lonnie trialled all the strategies suggested in the program. He found that each gave him
insights into his students' learning and therefore they were worthy of being included in
his repertoire of teaching strategies. He indicated on several occasions that he was pleased
that he had been given a selection of strategies to trial but that he knew that over time he
would 'get better at using them' and would adapt them to suit both his teaching style and
his students' needs.

Modelled writing specifically, and the power of demonstrations generally, were highly
valuable teaching tools for him. He had begun to focus more on the process of writing,
rather than only the products, in order to know what he would be able to model.

Sharing with his peers validated for him the power of reflection and talking one's way to
meaning in learning and thus justified the introduction of 'sharing' in his classroom.
'Book talk' or 'readers' response' had been introduced as a key component in his reading
program. Students were given the opportunity to share their opinions about the books
which they read thus leading to a greater emphasis on reading a wide range of books
rather than indepth study of one story by all the students. He also was encouraging students to reflect on their learning in their learning journals.

**Evaluation**

He had found the learning journals, peer proofreading and retelling useful for assisting his evaluation of students. These strategies gave him insights into what his students knew and provided him with evidence that he could draw on in reporting student progress to parents during parent teacher interviews. Using this type of data was a new experience for him and he worried that parents would accept them. These reports were the first to be given to parents without grades on them.

**Planning**

Lonnie was just beginning to make connections about how students’ outcomes and understandings from one learning experience could provide directions for future learning experiences. For example, he found that what he learned about what the students could and could not do as a result of the text tapping activity gave him information to focus on during the next modelled writing activity.

He was also beginning to realise that students were learning to read and write during subjects such as Social Studies and Science and that he should consider ways of maximising language learning during these times.

**Resources**

Lonnie found that he needed to use different resources from those he had been using. The text book was no longer the ‘font of all knowledge’ for him and his students. He was aware that he needed to find a variety of text genres in which to immerse his students and to use as demonstrations of how the different genres were structured.
He understood that there was more to whole language philosophy than using a different set of strategies. He realised he needed to get

... materials together. It [whole language] is a way of thinking, but it is more than that too. You've got to be prepared. I can think whole language all I want but if I only have the fragmented materials then I am not a whole language teacher. (Interview, 7.11.90)

Time

Lonnie had begun to consider how he needed to change his schedule for the teaching of literacy. He had included more group work and more sharing time in his daily schedule.

Language Used

It was evident that Lonnie was beginning to change the language he was using as a teacher. He was aware that he was now asking his students questions which forced them to consider why they were doing something; which was forcing them to consider the processes involved in their learning. At times he had difficulty in explaining the activity he was asking the students to try and they had difficulties in responding to his questions. He was aware that this would improve over time as he became 'better at guiding them'.

PROCESS OF CHANGE: INTELLECTUAL UNREST: A PRECURSOR TO CHANGE

The 'new knowledge' and 'new practice' which Lonnie was being asked to consider and use often caused him 'intellectual unrest'. Such intellectual unrest seemed to precede the process of change in Lonnie's beliefs about language and learning which in turn created intellectual unrest about his teaching practice.

He indicated that his beliefs about learning and language learning appeared to have been challenged to such an extent that he no longer felt comfortable with his present teaching practice, however, he was not always able to find the answers.
Such unrest could lead to a challenge to be reflected upon and solved, or it could lead to a concern which appeared to be unsolvable at the time. Whether these factors became 'challenges' or 'concerns' or whether the 'concern' became a 'challenge' or the 'challenge' moved into a 'concern' appeared to have something to do with the features within the program which either enabled or inhibited Lonnie in being able to address the intellectual unrest being created in his thinking.

New Knowledge

Lonnie indicated that there were many times when he left sessions 'overwhelmed' with the amount of new knowledge presented to him. He declared that 'as far as any course I've ever taken, it's as much information and more than I've taken in a 15 weeks standard university semester' (Interview, 7.11.90).

Trying to come to grips with all that he had been presented with was overwhelming, so there was much that he chose to leave until he had time to reread and revisit. He indicated that the facilitator warned them that they could only change one or two things at any one time. By Session 6 Lonnie reminded himself of this in his journal,

I think, as a group, we are overwhelmed and it has finally caught up. We are trying to incorporate everything we find out from the sessions, activities and readings and it just isn't possible. I believe both Jan and Jackie reminded us to start slow; add a few ideas at a time. This really hit me in recent weeks. I have to do this - my day was - hurry up do this! now do this! now this! I believe I have the things I want to do this year. Now I need to concentrate on them and fine tune them. (Learning journal, 24.10.90)

His particular field/bias of intellectual unrest was the schism between what he was learning - the conditions needed for optimal learning; the reading and writing processes and the connections between them - and what was currently in practice in his classroom.
Implementing New Practice

Lonnie identified several concerns about implementing the new practice he was being asked to consider. His journal entry (27.9.90) sums up his own feelings to changing practice. 'Last paragraph [of article] really hit home. It describes me. I'm in the middle trying to be safe until I really know what I'm doing.' (His emphasis.)

Teaching

He was unsure how he should put the conditions of learning into practice in his classroom. He commented that 'the conditions of learning seem so simple' but how to put them into practice created quite a challenge to Lonnie.

Lonnie accepted the fact that students needed to learn a wide range of genres of writing but he was challenged by two factors: how could he be sure what good writing was, and how should he teach the different genres of writing.

Lonnie was trying to change the teaching of reading but was unsure how he should put 'readers response' into practice.

Time

Time was a concern for Lonnie. He particularly seemed to struggle with how he should organise his time across the day so he could fit everything in. He was aware that he needed to change his daily schedule but was unsure how he would do that.

Evaluation

Lonnie found assessing and evaluating his students a major concern. He was quite accepting of the philosophy being presented but he was unsure how he could respond to the needs of individual students, how he could organise himself to evaluate individual student needs and how he would find the time to organise himself to be able to observe, record and collect the information on students.
PROCESS OF CHANGE: ENABLERS IN THE PROCESS

Understanding 'New' Knowledge

There were two broad categories of 'enablers' which worked to support Lonnie as he came to understand and accept the 'new knowledge' that was being presented to him through the program. These enablers also helped him make connections between what he was learning and what he was doing in his classroom. The category of enablers seem to fall into two sub-categories: one which had a content focus and the other focused more on process. Within each of these there were even more specific categories which linked with what was inherent in the program itself.

Understanding 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content

Readings

The readings that worked as enablers in helping Lonnie make connections about the content of the program were those which were written in such a way as to present information - new knowledge - that made him think about not only what he was doing in his classroom but what he should be doing as a teacher in his classroom. They seemed to challenge his beliefs about learning and learning language by giving him insights into the concepts being presented in each of the sessions, by supporting what he already knew and believed, but also by extending this knowledge base and by helping to give him a framework for 'pulling things together'. He made several comments in his journal such as 'an article to put my writing program in some order, relates to text tapping as a teaching and evaluation tool'. 'The more I read and discuss the topic I realise my program is in need of help but there is no quick fix and it will take time' (Interview, 7.11.90).

Another enabling factor for Lonnie was actually having readings which he could read after each session and which gave him the opportunity to reflect on the new knowledge presented in that session and be immersed in the new language being presented. The fact that he knew that he could revisit the new knowledge and new language at his own pace
and leisure was a comforting factor to him. It was enabling for Lonnie to realise that if he was unsure of the concepts being presented during the session he would have the opportunity to revisit these in the subsequent readings. Thus the readings served as follow-up support. 'I learned a lot, but I haven't learned as much as I'm going to when I have a chance to go back and re-read and reflect' (Interview, 7.11.90).

Activities

The activities served as enablers for the understanding of 'new knowledge' and 'new language' when they forced Lonnie to examine his own experiences and beliefs as a learner and a language user. Such activities forced him to make explicit the processes that he as a learner and language user goes through - processes which operate mostly at the subconscious level. Having become aware of these processes he found that other enabling activities were those which forced him to make connections between his own learning experiences and those of his students. He became aware of the incongruence between the processes and strategies he used as a learner and language user and those that he often expected his students to use. In turn he began to question his teaching practice and how he could or should change it to create a more conducive learning environment for his students.

Lonnie also indicated that he found being given the opportunity to reflect on the concepts - the new knowledge - which was being presented in a session was an enabling factor in coming to grips with the new language and new knowledge being presented.

It's nice just to talk for a few minutes. You're a little less inhibited and you can talk more clearly about your successes and your failures. I didn't mind sharing with anyone, but I did feel better in that smaller group ... I read more carefully and came prepared to discuss that ... You like to think that you are driven from the inside all the time. I did enjoy mixing the groups up [in group reflection] all the time and getting everybody else's ideas also. I felt that was very worthwhile. (Interview, 7.11.90)
It seems that these opportunities gave Lonnie and his collaborating peers the chance to use the new language to begin to develop a shared meaning of what the new knowledge meant for them as a group. He was able to assess his own learning and learn from others to see what else he could be doing and why.

I’m learning that if I hear something that I like or don’t like; if it was a success or if it was not for others. And so I have some background knowledge to go by. I think, well, if it didn’t go well for this person if I make this change it might go well for me. (Interview, 7.11.90)

Input

It was important to Lonnie that the input - the new knowledge or the theory of others - was presented in such a way that it was interesting, that it made sense and yet was challenging for him.

Understanding ‘New’ Knowledge: Focus on Process

Group work

Lonnie identified several enabling features of working collaboratively in groups which helped him gain control over the new knowledge. The process of working in groups gave him the opportunity to reflect on his own beliefs and understandings of the concepts being presented.

I guess the one I remember best as far as learning something new is the text tapping activity. Doing those activities I made the connections. I saw it, and I said it for the first time. Although I had that knowledge but you [the activity] actually showed it for myself. (Interview, 7.11.90)

In discussing the concepts with others he was forced to use the new language and describe, explain and sometimes justify his present belief system about learning and language learning. He found it comforting to hear and discuss common concerns with his peers and to be given the time to collaborate on issues.
Support
Lonnie indicated on several occasions that a strong enabling factor was knowing that the facilitator was available during the week after each session to provide clarification of new knowledge which he found confusing. It was also important that he knew that the principal was supportive of the knowledge that he was being asked to consider. Both these forms of support were embedded deeply into the school context and impinged also on the type of learning setting that was created for Lonnie within the school.

Setting
The establishment of a non-threatening learning environment within the school was a vital enabler for Lonnie as he was coming to grips with the new knowledge that was being presented to him. He saw it as a setting in which he was constantly being immersed in the new knowledge in a variety of ways. It was a setting in which he was encouraged to take responsibility for his own learning; to take a particular focus that he chose to take and learn about; in which he felt comfortable to take risks and share his newly formed connections with his peers; and in which he received feedback, comments and questions from his peers and the facilitator.

The school setting and the setting created weekly in the program enabled Lonnie to choose that which he wanted to change in his classroom. He was able to take the responsibility for what he wanted to learn about and put into practice. Conversely knowledge which he was not ready to even consider, such as the teaching of spelling, he could choose not to engage in at this point in time. However, he knew he could return to these aspects of the program when he felt he was ready to do so.

Time and Timing
Lonnie indicated that the sessions were well paced and, although intense, there was sufficient time for the knowledge to be presented, discussed and reflected upon.
Spaced learning over the eight weeks also was an enabling factor. Although there was new knowledge presented in each successive week, the course curriculum spiralled back on itself as it moved forward through the sessions. Lonnie perceived this to be an enabling feature for his learning as it gave him and the group the opportunity to clarify the terminology and meanings of the new knowledge being presented, opportunity to develop shared meaning and through the interaction in the sessions and between sessions, to develop a shared language.

**Implementation of New Practices**

Throughout the program Lonnie was asked to try new practices in his classroom. These took the form of ‘Instructional Strategies, which he was asked to trial and then to reflect on the students’ response to these activities. A key to the success of an innovation such as Frameworks is the degree to which that innovation is implemented. The factors which act as enablers to this implementation fell into the following categories: factors which focus on the students’ behaviour and attitude, factors which focus on the teaching of the new practices; factors which focus on the the process of the activity/strategy and factors which focus on the support given to the teacher as he was trying new practices.

**Implementing ‘New’ Practices: Focus on Students**

An enabling factor for the implementation of new practice which Lonnie experienced on several occasions was the initial response of the students. Students' positive responses to the new practice demonstrated to Lonnie that the students liked the activity and appeared to be learning from it.

An aspect of this positive response was the students’ positive behaviour whilst involved in the activity. Students do not tend to misbehave when they are actively engaged in learning. ‘Things must be working’. This perception was reinforced when the students’ products were not only acceptable within his old standards but actually were of a better quality. Students also were making connections about their own learning which Lonnie
Lonnie found that many of the activities/strategies that he was being asked to try gave him insights into his students’ learning and knowledge base. This was very useful to him as he was able to also make connections between what he was seeing about student learning with what was being presented to him about student learning.

Lonnie could clearly see the benefits for the students’ learning from his implementation of these new practices.

**Implementing ‘New’ Practices: Focus on Teaching**

Lonnie indicated that he was more likely to implement new practice when he could see the links to the practice he already found successful. Lonnie believed that there was an expectation by the general community that skills of literacy be taught. When he could see that the new practice allowed for these skills to be taught he felt comfortable trying them with his students. When the actual teaching of them demonstrated that the skills were actually being covered then he felt even more willing to incorporate the new practice into his repertoire of teaching behaviours.

Lonnie found that many of the activities actually made his teaching more enjoyable for many reasons; he gained useful information about his students' learning; he felt his students were learning; and his students enjoyed the activities. He also found that many of the activities gave him insights into his current teaching practice. He became aware of what he was doing well and what he needed to examine with a view to change in his teaching.
Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Process

Having the opportunity to try the new practice with his students soon after hearing about it was an important enabler for Lonnie. Once having tried the new practice, he indicated that being given the chance to reflect on the practice and share how it went in his classroom and also to listen to others' trialling of the new practice clarified the practice for him. This process of reflection and sharing of new practice helped him make connections between the theory (new knowledge) and the practice and forced him to reflect on his own beliefs about language learning.

As the new knowledge and new practice became clearer and the links between the two became more obvious, the group moved towards a shared meaning, understanding a shared knowledge and using of a shared language. This process was recursive and gave Lonnie a sense of being in control of what he was doing.

He commented on several occasions that knowing that it was his choice as to whether and when he would incorporate the new practice into his teaching repertoire coupled with the knowledge that it was his responsibility to adapt the new practice according to the needs of his students and his classroom context meant that he was more likely to implement the new practice as part of his daily teaching approach.

Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Support

A clear enabling factor for Lonnie in being open to considering new practice in his classroom was knowing that he had the support of various key players in the educational setting. These key players fell into two groups, those to whom he felt accountable and those whom he respected for their collegial support. The latter included the facilitator, the interviewer (one of the authors of the program) and his colleagues. He could seek out this support during the actual session but also during the ensuing week. For Lonnie, this meant that he did not need to remain in a confused state about the new knowledge or the
new practice for very long. He knew he could seek clarification quickly thus enhancing the sense of a shared meaning.

Some players like the principal, fell into both groups. However, Lonnie viewed the principal foremost because of the accountability factor. He indicated in the first few weeks of his involvement in the program that he felt concern about how what he was learning and trying in his classroom would be perceived and accepted by the parents. Towards the end of the program he was able to explain to the parents of the students in his class what he was trying to do and why, and he sensed their support for the changes he wanted to put in place. This knowledge was a strong enabling factor which allowed him to continue to work through ways of implementing the new practice in his classroom.

It seems that in Lonnie’s context the parents were quite openly supportive of the changes he was putting into place in his classroom, particularly in the way he was evaluating the students. Parent support was there, he felt, because he was able to share with them what he was trying to do and why. The fact that he found he could speak to the parents so convincingly added to his confidence and this in turn enabled him to continue to try out new practices. It would seem that he was now able to use the shared knowledge and shared language that he was gaining from his involvement in the program with other groups, such as the parents. This was empowering in itself as his perception of himself was one of a highly professional person.

**PROCESS OF CHANGE: INHIBITORS OF THE PROCESS**

There were many factors identified in the data which could be called inhibitors to the successful implementation of an innovation like *Frameworks*. These inhibitors fell into two broad categories: Inhibitors of new knowledge and inhibitors of new practice. Although these have been identified as separate categories for the purpose of discussion it is important to note that boundaries between the two categories at times becomes quite fuzzy. It is also important to note that what at times appear to be inhibitors to the change
process in the first instance can become enablers in the sense that the participant would not allow certain factors inhibit them for long. What seemed to occur was that the inhibiting factor often became a challenge to be overcome and thus lead to enabling change.

Learning of 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content

Readings

Readings that were too academic and dense and in which the author was perceived to put teachers down were seen by Lonnie as not to be very useful. He perceived himself to be a reasonably scholarly person having recently completed his Masters degree, and he did not perceive authors who appeared to belittle, or pontificate on their topic to be of much use to him as a learner.

Activities

Activities in which the instructions were unclear and the purpose confusing made it difficult for him to engage in the new knowledge that he was being asked to consider. Equally as inhibiting were activities where the outcome for doing them was unclear. Such confusions made Lonnie and the others in his group feel inadequate as learners and thus not as prepared to take the risk of sharing their reflections and thoughts in case they be seen as being wrong. An interesting outcome of these inhibiting factors was that it gave Lonnie insights into how his students must feel when they are faced with learning experiences they find confusing and can see no reasons for doing.

Input

Input which was too wordy, was repetitious, lacked any logical flow and was generally unclear was also seen as an inhibitor to the understanding of new knowledge. This inhibitor was often clarified through the enabling factor of group discussions and reflections and from the support of the facilitator.
Learning of 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Process

Time and Timing

Insufficient time to get the readings and activities done between sessions was an inhibiting factor to the understanding of new knowledge. Lonnie indicated that he felt a sense of pressure to 'get things done' for the next week's session. He commented that he knew that he could revisit the readings in his own time after the program. This is one of the many examples where the initial inhibitor could be overcome by another factor that was inherent in the design of the program and thus in turn became an enabler.

Lonnie found that the time that it takes to get change going was often an inhibiting factor to the understanding of new knowledge. Often he had a general sense of what he should be doing but the time he saw that he needed to put into such change seemed overwhelming at times.

'It's hard to change the type of person you are and to make that environment fit into you.' (Interview, 26.9.90)

Support

In the early part of the program Lonnie felt inhibited about engaging in certain aspects of the new knowledge as he felt that the parents would not support him. Other enabling processes, such as the workshop activities and the interaction with others and knowing, slowly helped him develop a shared meaning with his colleagues which lead to a shared knowledge and an ability to use a shared language. It was then that he could use such language to discuss what he was learning with the parents and thus use it to his advantage. In turn he was assured of parent support.

Groups

Group activities were inhibiting to the understanding of new knowledge when the group members seemed to wander off task or when one member in particular became bogged down and couldn't be moved by the group. This, Lonnie felt, wasted time and created
confusion and stress. It is an example of when shared meaning within the group breaks down to such an extent that no shared knowledge or shared language can be developed.

**Implementation of 'New' Practice**

The inhibitors identified in this category were very similar to those identified in the above category. As stated in the beginning of this section, the boundaries between the two categories are indeed fuzzy, although they do exist.

**Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Teaching**

Lonnie found that it was often difficult to implement the new practice as the instructions on how to carry out the activity were unclear to him. This was often coupled with not fully understanding the purpose of the strategy, nor being able to clearly see what the expected outcomes might be. What seemed to be occurring was that because he did not fully understand the new knowledge which underpinned the new practice there was lack of a shared meaning and shared knowledge and therefore a shared language being used within the classroom. As a result, not only was the teacher confused as to the purpose and outcomes of the activity so were the students.

The learning theory [activity] was difficult for me to explain without just telling them. In my journal I wrote I was putting words into their mouths and I wasn't really comfortable with it, but we continued to just go with it and when we came back to the whole class discussion I was pleased that they were able to see some things that they had in common. They had a hard time with the idea of what was similar or maybe I had a hard time. That time I say it's my problem because I didn't do the job I had to do to get it across. I didn't know how to do it. It seemed to come together in the whole class discussion ... they picked out the things without me telling them. They brought the ideas out ... I was quite pleased with the activity. (Interview, 26.9.90)

The enabling factors for Lonnie which allowed him to not quit at this point was that he knew that he could choose to try the activity again ('I would do the activity again even if I wasn't doing it as a requirement'), he could adapt it to suit his and his students' needs ('I
Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Process
Lonnie felt the pressure of not having sufficient time to try out the new practices adequately in the between session periods. This factor was exacerbated by the difficulty of finding suitable resources to use within the activity.

Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Support
As mentioned in the above category, Lonnie felt inhibited about parents' perceived lack of support to changes in class practice. Lonnie had experienced this particularly in the areas of spelling and evaluation. He felt reluctant to change his practice in the teaching of spelling for fear of what the parents would say.

Lack of financial support to buy the appropriate resources that Lonnie perceived would be necessary to effectively implement the new practices could become a strong inhibitor to that implementation. Lonnie identified this as a concern but because he was aware that he had the support of the principal he also knew that he was likely to be able to have access to such resources once he himself was aware of what they were.

ATTITUDE TO THE CHANGE PROCESS
Lonnie stated clearly that he didn't like being involved in change for change's sake. 'I hate to keep making changes, to invest the time and effort into making the change that might be just a waste of time and energy' (Interview, 26.9.90). He further indicated that he became impatient with the time that it took to implement new innovations. He was anxious to get everything in place as quickly as possible. He further stated that it had been this attitude to change that kept him from having changed his language education practice.
in previous years. He indicated that he had been aware of the basic understandings underpinning whole language philosophy but did not feel comfortable putting this theory into practice.

With respect to Frameworks, Lonnie initially felt confused and quite nervous about the concepts and practices he was being asked to consider. Although this sense of confusion clarified for him as he moved through the sessions, he stated that he often felt overwhelmed by the amount of information that was coming his way. However, in spite of these feelings, he also felt challenged by the program and indicated that he enjoyed it.

Lonnie stated that he found it difficult 'to look inside' himself and reflect on his own learning and language use. He also found it difficult to articulate his personal beliefs and understandings of language and learning. He valued highly, however, the opportunity to be able to do this and the fact that he was given the responsibility of making the decision as to what he would take on board and what he would change in his classroom.

By the end of the program Lonnie was feeling far more confident with what he knew and did in his classroom. He claimed,

I'm starting to feel more comfortable with the whole philosophy and it's making more sense to me. We've heard this term [whole language] for three years now, and I have a much stronger feeling about what it is and I like the idea.

(Interview, 7.11.90)

INSIGHTS INTO THE CHANGE PROCESS

As Lonnie began to gain some insights into the change process during his involvement in Frameworks, his attitude towards it appeared to change. He began to realise that there was no right or wrong way to implement the innovation, and that he would 'get better at doing it the more he used it (the instructional strategy being tried)'.

Chapter 4 - Results of the Study
This notion was supported by the fact that he became aware that he could try the strategy (adopt it), adapt it and then was expected to create ways of teaching from it to suit the needs of his students and his beliefs; that it was expected that his practice would change as he became clearer about his own beliefs about language teaching.

Although Lonnie indicated that he hated changing for the sake of change and that he wanted to change everything at once, he began to accept the fact that change takes time and that he was not expected to change everything and in fact that it was his choice as to what he changed and why. He did not see the end of the program as a point in time that he should have known it all. He realised that it was his responsibility to develop a clear plan for his future professional development. He commented at the completion of the program,

I think it's time to step back and really sharpen and to find my beliefs, establish a program that may take a few years to develop. I'll probably always be changing and I guess I am having a hard time realising it's never going to be one set thing. I really feel that I have the knowledge now to put something together but it's going to take some time. (Interview, 7.11.90)
CASE STUDY 2 - DENNY CLARK, RUSHVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PRE-EXISTING BELIEFS, KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES

Beliefs and Knowledge

Denny had been moving towards more child centred teaching for several years. She indicated that she believed in the concept of 'natural learning' and had been trying to put such a concept into place in her classroom. She found that learning about natural learning in the program was reaffirming.

She indicated that group work was important because social interaction enhances learning and because students can then work collaboratively to solve problems and learn from each other. She also believed that it was important for her students to take responsibility for their own learning.

Denny had attended staff development programs in the teaching of reading and writing during the past two summer breaks and had been trying to implement the theory and practice she had learned from these. She appeared to accept the notion of students' being given the opportunity to go through a process of writing as they prepared pieces of writing for publication. She no longer followed a basal reading program. She indicated that she had experienced the sense of 'I don't know what I am doing. Somebody help me! I'm frustrated' (Interview, 7.11.90) during the implementation period after these workshops.

Denny indicated concern about the teaching of spelling being discrete from the reading/writing program. She indicated that she believed that spelling was part of the language arts program, thus she had begun to implement a more personalised spelling program which grew out of the students' writing rather than out of a text book.
Practices

Denny had implemented writer and readers workshop in her class. She did, however, teach these as discrete subject areas. She had group work operating particularly in the Social Studies areas where students were expected to take a topic and research it in a group. Denny indicated that she found it difficult to give up control and give responsibility to the students, even though she believed that she should. She indicated that 'she had been working on that'. She had used a range of collaborative and sharing type activities before including strategies such as modelled writing. However, she indicated that she still had much to learn as she felt she was teaching language arts as discrete subjects and she wanted to change that.

MAKING CONNECTIONS - NEW KNOWLEDGE

Nature of Learning

Denny was learning that she needed to focus more on the individual needs of the students so that she was better equipped to make informed decisions about what they needed to learn next. She indicated that the concept of natural learning emphasised for her that she needed 'to make it [learning] to be as real as possible so he feels that I'm being honest with him in my teaching and he can see the need [to learn]'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

The concept of being honest with her students was further highlighted for Denny as she became aware of the importance of making the purposes for learning explicit to her students.

The honesty in learning intrigues me. If the interest in learning is real for the child, he/she will try to emulate the modeler and practise until success enables him to seek recognition from peers or model. (Learning journal, 23.9.90)

Throughout the program Denny was developing a clearer understanding of the meaning of natural learning and the conditions of learning.
What also intrigues me about learning that I wish to share with my students is that (1) we all do it and (2) we all have important feelings or knowledge about learning. Every person's comment is worthy. Knowing this is a great self esteem builder. (Learning journal, 23.9.90)

In particular, Denny felt that she was gaining greater insights into the notion of engagement. In an early interview she commented that (after discussing how her group had felt confused about the term) she had thought about the term during the session and felt that 'it's like tuning in or saying "I want to be a part of this". It's making the decision to learn. It might be a physical getting into it or it might be just something mental'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Denny was learning through her own learning experiences that learning can be and should be fun. These insights into her own learning experience, the processes she went through as a learner and the language she used as she learned began to have strong implications for Denny about her students' learning. In sharing why the group in which she was working kept seeking the facilitator's advice, Denny commented, 'I think we were doing just what our kids do. "She's the teacher and she's got to take responsibility. We have no ownership with this and she's got to tell us if we're right or wrong" ... but she (the facilitator) didn't do that. She let us work it out for ourselves and that was great'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Denny found the collaborative learning tasks and the reflection process powerful learning tools, both for herself and for what it meant about her students' learning.

We don't ever have enough of that (reflection time), to go back and think 'Well, why did I do that? What became of that?' But even just to verbalise it kind of makes you think about it. You can just say, 'Well, I'm thinking about this right now', but to speak out what you've just thought helps you learn it. So I think it's good for all of us to practise if we're ever going to get better at it. It's not comfortable to do, because you think 'Oh am I reflecting correctly?' It's not a comfortable feeling to share your thoughts about processes or how I'm learning.

Chapter 4 - Results of the Study
But then I start pulling it together and say 'Well I did make a connection here'... or 'Am I doing the same things my kids are doing?'. In writing I'm finding, as I show the kids this stuff, I'm realising that I'm teaching myself. We are learning together. I find that exciting. (Interview, 10.10.90)

And later in the same interview,

I find it is this kind of thing [reflection] that we should be doing with our children, reflecting on 'How did you do that?'..

Another insight Denny made from her own learning experiences in the program was the fact that students' self esteem would be enhanced if they realised what they do as learners and why they use language the way they do. She was constantly being reminded of how important it was to her learning that the purposes and processes were made explicit and that she needed to do this with her students.

The concept of 'metacognition' was introduced to Denny during interview discussions with the researcher. In later interviews Denny adopted this term indicating that she believed that she had become more metacognitively aware of how she learns and the role that language play in this learning.

I guess the kind of growth I'm seeing in myself is summed up in that term metacognition. I'm able to start using what I used to call gut feelings - that knowledge that I've acquired through my experiences here and I'm starting to value it. My ability to think internally is coming more frequently, the more I use it, the more I step back and say 'Now, why did that happen?' or 'Why am I thinking this way?'. It's hard to talk about. We're being forced to step back and think each time about those steps and trying to think of what skills we used, what strategies and even now as I talk, I'm trying to think about what skills I'm talking about. (Interview, 6.11.90)

**Nature of Language**

Denny indicated that she had deepened her knowledge about writing and the writing process. She had become aware of the role that audience and purpose played in the
shaping of different genres of written texts. She had become more aware of her own criteria of what 'good' writing.

She also was becoming more aware of the connected nature of the four modes of language - reading, writing, talking and listening - and could understand how each was important in learning. She had become far more aware of the reading-writing connections and the importance of immersing her students in the written text she wanted them to learn to read and write. She was aware that these provided her students with demonstrations of text forms, the genres, that she wanted them to be able to use in the written form. She realised that if 'you can write it then you had read it. I just felt the two were connected. One was when you're reading it is running through the cells, in your head and when you write it, it's in your hands. But it's all part of the same thing. Language'. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Nature of Teaching

Denny was far more conscious of trying to create a classroom ethos in which the conditions of natural learning were operating. The insights into her own learning and growth as a learner, as mentioned above, gave her insights into how her students learn and therefore into how she should be teaching. She became very aware of the power of demonstration as a teaching tool. She also became aware of the need for her students to understand the purposes for what they were doing in the classroom. The notion of making explicit not only what she wanted them to do but also why she wanted them to do it was something that she therefore began to introduce into her daily classroom procedure. This was requiring her to give her students more responsibility for their learning. In this way they also become more aware of the consequences of their own behaviours.

We've always been in control and we've never given the student the right to have a responsibility and it's very difficult for the child to say 'I can do this for myself and its OK and for me to say 'Yes, go ahead. You have that opportunity'. They've been trained for so many years that you can only do it a certain way. Like editing a paper. The teacher has always been the one to proofread a paper
and now they have to take on that responsibility ... so to learn to take responsibility is threatening as they think, 'What happens to me if I am wrong' ... I have to work through it and be very calm. I'd like to take them by the ears sometimes! (Interview, 26.9.90)

She was prepared to be more child centred than teacher centred in her teaching approach and had begun to recognise that the student brought a great deal of knowledge to any learning situation and this existing knowledge should be recognised and valued.

I realised that they do the same kind of things that I'm doing [as a learner] and I'm finding it just as hard because I'm trying to do it with you [reflect and share one's thinking] and with myself and then I'm trying to expect them to do the same thing and I know they're having the same difficulties ... I don't have all the answers when I tell them ... And what I'm coming to find is that it's okay that the teacher doesn't have all the answers, that she can help the child and together they find the answer, they find the way. The amount of knowledge there is to learn in the world, you cannot store it all - you just need to be able to access it. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Role of Language in Learning

Denny was becoming increasingly more aware of the role that language plays in learning, her own and her students. This was particularly evident to Denny from her experiences in personal reflection and collaborating with others on a problem during the sessions. The opportunity to use language either in the spoken or written form to think through what one was trying to learn she recognised as being a powerful learning process. Denny indicated that there wasn't enough time for sharing in the sessions and would like to see the program change to provide this time. 'For me to tell someone else what I'm really thinking forces me to bring out what I'm thinking ... I don't realise what I'm thinking until I have the chance to tell someone.' (Interview, 24.10.90)

Denny suggested that there needed to be a time for each of them to write their personal reflections during the session rather than at the end of the session.
When she [the facilitator] wants us to write those forms [the evaluation sheets] at the end, that's another time I think when we need more time to write it down. You need to rehearse the thoughts before you put the words down on paper. To give yourself more confidence about what you know and really think, I think you need to use each other as sounding boards so that you get some alternative things to think about and try ... See, you'd have that record and I think that would be nice in our journals [not on a sheet which had been handed to the facilitator]. I'm not always starting from square one each session cause I know what I said before about what I was thinking about last week. I had it here in my journal. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Denny realised that the change in her teaching meant a change in the way she used language and encouraged her students to use language. 'You're required to be a risk taker in a small group ... because you're reflecting out loud and you're hoping that they [your friends] will be tolerant of what you're saying and respect it.' (Interview, 7.11.90)

Denny was not only aware that she was using language differently in her classroom but she knew why. She indicated that she was valuing the students more and trying to establish a relationship of trust with them which, in the end, gave her more information about the students which, in turn, informed her of their needs for future learning.

When I talk to my kids I try to talk to them as I would to you expecting that they will understand what I am saying to them. I am not talking down to them. If there is a problem, I am trying to come at the problem as though we were talking one on one, not talking down at them. And I think I am getting more information when I treat them as though they had something worthwhile to tell me and that there were two colleagues together. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Denny indicated that she was beginning to see how she could incorporate her language teaching into other curriculum areas. She could see how she could collapse her daily schedule rather than add to it as language was being taught and learned all day. In fact, the use of language for problem solving and discussion enhanced the concept-learning as well as the language learning. 'We've been doing that [problem solving activities in
Social Studies on various issues] and ... as I'm doing my Social Studies I'm thinking, "I'm doing this problem solving technique with the kids and they are becoming facilitators". I'm finding it's starting to fit my language program really well. And the kids have a structure for operating in a group ... it's all language.' (Interview, 7.11.90)

MAKING CONNECTIONS - IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PRACTICE

Physical and Social Environment

Denny's classroom was organised so that the students were seated in groups and could easily share. There was also a large open space area where they could sit in a circle on the floor. This was used for whole class sharing and discussions. Students could readily see each other, being able to make eye contact with the teacher as well as each other.

Group work was now an established part of the classroom practice with students taking responsibility for making sure everyone contributed and that work was completed. Denny indicated that she spent much of her time 'constantly going from group to group where I hear a little bit here and then I move onto another'. (Interview, 7.11.90)

Denny indicated that she was working at giving students more flexibility and choice and thus expecting them to take more responsibility. She admitted that it was difficult to do at times as it was easier for a teacher to say, '... "Do this." We've always been in control and we've never given the students the right to have a responsibility and even in my classroom for the child to say, "Oh I can do this myself and it's OK", and for me to say, "Yes, go ahead" is difficult at times'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Denny was also more conscious that she should make explicit for the students why she was asking them to do particular things. She wanted them to make the connections. She believed that this would also give them the chance to realise how they went about learning and why they did the things they did. She felt that student self esteem would be enhanced
if they understood that it was their decision to use the language they do in order to achieve the purposes they want to achieve; that they have some choice in the matter.

Strategies

Denny had introduced the learning journal and she found that both she and the students were enjoying using them. 'I think they are enjoying them because there is no right or wrong answer, that they have the freedom to speak out.' Denny indicated that she was enjoying the experience of being able to 'peek into their brains for a minute' and that 'I don't have to correct anything. I just can eavesdrop on their thinking'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

She had used modelled writing before but indicated that she was now more aware of the power of demonstrations and how thinking aloud the processes and strategies one uses was a powerful teaching strategy. She was also using examples from the students' learning journals to demonstrate to the class what her expectations of these journals were as well as having students demonstrate their learning strategies. 'I've been using them [the journals] for talking about whatever learning is going on so they can pick and choose from other.'

Denny had found the text-tapping strategy to be very successful as it had not only helped her make connections about the reading-writing connections, but it had also helped her students. She could see where such a strategy could be used in various ways in different subject areas. 'I would like to try it with the novel in reading and I'd like to try it with Social Studies.' (Interview, 10.10.90)

Denny had tried all the strategies outlined in the program. Some she found confusing, such as co-operative retelling, although she had used the retelling strategy at an individual level before. Her concern was that it seemed to take a long time to do and needed to be
carried out over a period of time. She did, however, see the usefulness of the strategy and had already begun to reflect on how she could incorporate it into her teaching repertoire.

She was aware that all these strategies could be changed to fit with her students' needs and her teaching style.

Denny had already begun to change her spelling program to an individualised approach. This process of change continued through the program.

Planning
Denny began to move towards integrating her language arts teaching into a seamless time period. This process was also occurring across subject areas. As she states in her journal,

I realise that I have been caught in the trap of segmenting my day into lessons for Math, Reading, Spelling etc. This year it seems harder to keep them separate and I've been feeling uncomfortable about the division between lessons not being clear. Now I'm seeing that perhaps this is a natural blending that is occurring and I shouldn't fight it. One thing I've kept separate is the sharing of reading and writing times. I see the sense in blending the two. My kids have said during writing workshop. 'Can I work on my retelling? It's still writing!'
(Learning journal, 4.11.90)

Denny's schedule for the day became a focus on four main discipline areas - Math, Language, Social Studies and Science. And even within these she felt there was overlap.

Process of Change Intellectual Unrest, a Precursor to Change
Intellectual unrest occurred for Denny as she began to gain insights into her own learning process; into the processes she went through and strategies she used as a learner, as a reader, writer and speller. She became aware of the power of reflection and the importance of becoming metacognitively aware. All this led to the challenge of how she could set up a learning climate - a community of learners - in which learners had the
opportunity to reflect on their own learning and the strategies they used for learning, in which they valued each other as learners, shared together and worked collaboratively. This, she realised, required a change of role in the classroom - from the teacher who must have all the answers to one who learns with her students; a teacher who is prepared to take risks in front of and beside the students as they learn together. This also meant that she needed to value the child as a learner and value what the child brings to a learning experience. Denny was also learning that language permeates all learning however this led to the challenge of how to integrate language in the curriculum areas.

This intellectual unrest became the bias which challenged Denny as a teacher.

PROCESS OF CHANGE: ENABLERS IN THE PROCESS

Understanding 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content

*Input.*

Denny indicated that input (new knowledge) was easier to understand when it was presented in such a way that it was interesting and made sense. She indicated that the video of the classroom in action gave her many ideas and helped her make connections with what she had read and discussed in class.

*Readings*

Denny indicated that the readings were very useful in helping her to make connections. Those readings which both supported and extended the concepts being presented in the sessions were very useful. She felt that it was important that the language used in the readings was not too academic as if written for a researcher; it should be language that was written for teachers. 'I felt he was talking to me and not writing for a panel of experts ... I felt so good about that.' (Interview, 10.10.90)

It was also important that the readings had been read by everyone as it allowed for the group to discuss the concepts and terminology being introduced.
Denny indicated that as she read the various readings, she made connections with her teaching, with other readings and, in fact, she often found herself questioning her teaching. For example she stated, 'While reading the "Doughnut and not the Hole" I realised that quizzing the kids after the shared newscollections about what they remember isn't really fair'. Denny went on to explain why this was unfair and then said, 'Now I don't remember if that's what the article was about or not but I had to write that down. I felt I was going after the "hole" information and not the "doughnut"'. (Interview, 7.11.90)

**Activities**

Denny indicated that the group work involved in the activities was vital in helping her clarify her thinking about the new knowledge being presented. And the workshops which forced her to 'look inside' herself gave her insights into her own learning which helped her make connections with what she read and saw her students do. 'Reflecting on what you are learning - it's not up front learning. It's that you are going through the process. It's like you're taking a step, two steps within yourself and looking at the process that is going on.' (Interview, 24.10.90)

**Understanding 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Process**

**Group Work**

A strong enabler for the understanding of new knowledge for Denny was the opportunity for social interaction to occur during the sessions. This time (Reflection Time) allowed her to give her opinion about what she believed, to share her concerns and issues, to hear the perspective of others and generally to be challenged by their perspective. In responding to the question 'Was reflection time useful or a waste of time?', Denny commented,

Yes [it was useful], because we don't ever have enough time to go back and think, 'Well, why did we do that? What became of that?'. But even to verbalise it
kind of makes you think about it. You can say 'I'm thinking this right now' but
to speak out what you have just thought about is useful. So it is good for us to
practise if we're going to get better at it [reflecting]. It's not comfortable to share
my thoughts about the process of how I'm learning. But once I start pulling it
together I can see 'I did make a connection here'. (Interview, 26.10.90)

Language

Denny seemed aware of the role that language was playing in her learning. She observed
that the opportunities to use language in this way were important enablers in her learning
growth. As mentioned in other categories, she realised that sharing her thoughts with
others, although a risk-taking experience for her, enabled her to think aloud, to listen in
on others' interpretations of the language, terms and concepts they were meeting in the
readings, in the activities and in the input sections of the program and to reflect and adjust
her own thinking accordingly. This process was also enhanced by knowing that there
were no right or wrong answers, that everyone's opinion would be valued and that the
expectation was really for the group to work through the concepts and come to a
consensus of meaning. It was also enhanced by her being forced to make explicit for her
peers the processes she went through as a learner and language user to achieve her
purposes for using language.

Collaborating with her peers in problem solving tasks also forced her to use the language
and terminology that she was being immersed in through the sessions and the readings.
This process enabled her to make connections with what the language she had read and
heard in the input sessions.

It [the term 'genre'] was an obvious thing. But once you realised the background
[from the reading] it's a simple word. It's like Brian's doing the definition of
reading [in the session input on audio]. It's such a simple wording and you say
'of course' but then you go back and understand [from the reading] what the real
meaning is behind all those simple words. It was good. (Interview, 24.10.90)
Support

Denny identifies many supporting factors which serve as enablers to her learning of new knowledge through the program. Aspects within the design of the program itself she indicated supported her as a learner. These included being able to write in a journal as she read the articles and reflected on the sessions and being able to read back over this journal and note her own growth. Denny indicated that the frameworks which were provided to guide discussions and reflections enabled her to clarify her thinking without her feeling there was a right or wrong answer. She enjoyed the scripted tape in Session 6 as she felt 'it allowed us to relax and listen and know there's nothing threatening. We could follow [the script] ... and if I wanted to jump ahead and see what he was going to mention I could do that. It was good'. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Denny also felt that having to formulate an action plan in the last session was an enabling factor as it helped her set her future agenda for her professional development and to see how her beliefs were driving this agenda. For example she listed in her journal that she needed to work on integrating her curriculum more as she 'provides connections for the kids'. (Learning journal, 6.11.90)

The role the facilitator played was a strong enabling factor for Denny. She indicated that the facilitator had guided them as a group through the weekly sessions, encouraging them to try things out, modelling to them how a teacher should give responsibility to the learners, how to model learning procedures to a class and supporting them when they were confused. She was available on site for further discussion, for advice about resources and strategies.

Denny identified the interviewer in the research as a strong enabling factor on the understanding of new knowledge. She was able to clarify confusions, seek support and input from the source. It was interesting to note how this relationship built up through the
interviews. In Denny's journal she refers to the interviewer as 'Miss Turbill', then later as Jan Turbill, and in final jottings refers to the interviewer as if talking with her.

The interview prospect was a little bit frightening but after talking with Jan Turbill after class I felt more comfortable. She’s after my impact as a colleague. However, I want to pick her brain. (Learning journal, 25.9.90)

I recognise, Jan, that what I’m pouring out here might not be clear to you … But the writing does make me take time to reflect. (Learning journal, 12.10.90)

Knowing that the principal was very supportive of the program and what she was trying to achieve in the classroom was a supportive enabler for Denny. The fact that the principal had set up a school staff development day on Alternate Evaluation and Assessment demonstrated support for what she and her colleagues had already been trying to put into practice, as well as showing that there was support in dealing with this issue when talking to parents.

Denny indicated that the readings were a great support and would continue to assist in her learning as she reread them after Frameworks was over.

Setting
Denny found that the non-threatening environment established by the facilitator during the sessions was an enabling factor in her learning of new knowledge. Within such settings she felt safe to take risks and share her newly formed connections and beliefs and seek response from her peers.

Denny also indicated that the flexibility to change groups was an enabling factor. It meant that she was working and sharing with people she may not have chosen to in the first instance but also it allowed her to move into a new group if she felt uncomfortable in a present one.
Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Students

Denny found that as she tried new practices with her students she was gaining insights into how her students think and learn. This was an enabling factor which she mentioned on several occasions. It is summed up in her comment on how learning journals gave her the chance to 'peek into their brain' and allow her 'to eavesdrop in on their thinking'. She constantly found herself making connections between what she was being asked to do as a learner in workshops and what this meant for her classroom practice.

Denny also found that seeing and hearing her students enjoying the new practice encouraged her to keep using and refining it to suit both her needs and her students. She was also excited that the students were able to make explicit their own learning strategies. These insights encouraged her to continue with the new practice; to reflect upon what she was doing and refine it for herself and her class.

Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Teaching

Denny was aware of the theoretical links underpinning the new practice she was asked to try each week. She commented on more than one occasion that it 'all seemed so simple'. The readings were an enabling factor in helping Denny make these connections and gave her further insights into how she might change her teaching and why.

The learning journal which Denny kept as part of the program demonstrated how her reflections on the readings and between session activities enabled her to focus on where and how she might change her teaching practice.

Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Process

Having the opportunity to be able to go through the process of sharing the new practice with her peers; to hear how they carried out the practice; what worked for them and her and what didn’t work enabled Denny to refine her practice as well as to see the links between theory and practice.
She felt comfortable with knowing that although she was expected to try each of the new practices demonstrated to them, she was not expected to 'get it right first go' and that she could reflect on the strategy and change it to suit herself and her students' needs.

**Implementing 'New' Practices: Focus on Support**

As Denny commented in her journal, she saw the chance to talk with the interviewer (the author) as a chance to gain further ideas about her classroom practice. She sought clarification about her spelling program, about integrating her language and social studies program and about organising herself to assess the students.

Denny indicated that having the strategies modelled for them was very helpful. Modelled writing, for instance, had been something she had been using; however observing and listening to the model provided for the facilitator for the group gave her many new ideas and support for what she was doing.

In a similar vein seeing the whole language class teacher in action on the video gave her a variety of demonstrations which she could call on for her own practice. The readings which supported the instructional strategies were also support which enabled her to put the new practice into action.

An additional supporting factor which Denny indicated would enable her to continue to implement the new practices she was beginning to try was the fact that she perceived that there was support at both the school and the District levels.

**PROCESS OF CHANGE: INHIBITORS IN THE PROCESS**

**The Learning of 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content**

*Readings*
Readings which were long-winded, repetitive and too academic tended to lack clarity and therefore were confusing. This inhibited Denny from getting meaning from them.

**Input**

Denny indicated that the length of the first video was an inhibiting factor as it was difficult to continue to engage in it for that length of time.

**Activities**

Denny indicated that the activities in the main were an enabling factor in her learning of the new knowledge presented in the program. However, this learning was inhibited when the members of the group acted 'like children in their classes' and when one member of a group tried to dominate and thus the other members of the group were unable to voice their opinions and the sense of the community of learners was thwarted.

**The Learning of 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Process**

**Time**

Denny stated that insufficient time to discuss issues in reflection time didn't always allow the group to clarify issues amongst themselves. She requested that in future courses the authors consider lengthening the time given to reflection time.

In trying to finish sessions within the prescribed time, the facilitator often had to rush through the final sections. Denny found this often left her confused and overwhelmed. She felt that there was need for the group to have time to reflect in writing on what they had learned in the session and to share this with their peers. This process, she believed, would lessen the sense of being overwhelmed.

**Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Teaching**

Denny indicated that implementing new practice was more likely to be inhibited when it was difficult to explain the practice to the students. Denny persevered until she and her
students were clear about what was required. She seemed to feel that this was a natural development in the teaching process when beginning something new or different with students. It was necessary, however, that the materials supplied as part of the program provided the necessary support so that these confusions were not allowed to last for very long.

Another inhibiting factor Denny identified was being asked to take risks in front of her students; to admit to them that she did not have all the answers and that that was okay. Denny found that taking such risks on her part enhanced the learning for her students, thus she was prepared to continue.

**Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Process**

She was also asked to voice her newly formed opinions in front of her colleagues. This process, too, she found threatening. She indicated on several occasions that, although such risk-taking was difficult, she realised that taking risks in front of her peers enhanced her learning and was acceptable as long as the group was supportive.

Denny indicated that there needed to be sufficient time within the sessions to discuss and reflect on the new practice they were being asked to consider. Without such time the new practice could become confusing and therefore not easily put into practice. Teachers were likely to feel 'overwhelmed' and this feeling inhibited future trialling of new practice.

**ATTITUDE TO THE CHANGE PROCESS**

Denny indicated that she was 'seeing a way of adjusting things better so that I feel a little more comfortable in trying things'. She stated that she had been involved in changing her thinking and practice about the teaching of reading and writing for several years and thus 'had that in place when I started doing whole language' (Interview, 7.11.90). Thus she no longer felt the frustration of feeling overwhelmed by change. She admitted, however, that 'I'm floundering a lot too but I think that is what all people feel when they start
because "whole language" is such a nebulous term. There is nothing specific that you can pinpoint.

Denny enjoyed the experience of being involved in the program and carrying out the between session readings and activities. She indicated that 'it's the materials that I'm reading and the things that we've been doing in class, trying those strategies that helped [make the connections] after having gone through the session' (Interview, 6.11.90).

Denny particularly enjoyed the reflection and collaboration with her peers, with the facilitator and with the interviewer although initially she found such activities threatening.

**INSIGHTS INTO THE CHANGE PROCESS**

Denny seemed to have many insights into the process of change. She was both aware and accepting of such a process to such a degree that she believed that not only should teachers be aware of the process of change but also her students. 'It [changing one's teaching] is different and the kids feel that too' (Interview, 7.11.90). She believed that if her students were aware why they did what they did and why they chose the language they did in order to achieve a given purpose, it would enhance their self esteem as learners. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Denny indicated that she was aware that the instructional strategies they were asked to try in class each week had two purposes. They could be used as language strategies in class but they were also used to give the teachers opportunities to understand the processes their students go through as learners and make connections to the new knowledge about language and learning being presented each week.

Although she initially felt uncomfortable in sharing in groups, she discovered that the insights gained from this process helped her understand the change process that she and
the others as learners went through. This in turn gave her insights into the learning of her students and her teaching process.

Denny was also aware of how her involvement in workshops in which she was collaborating on a given task with her peers, forced her to reflect on and justify her beliefs. This in turn would lead to considering how she might change her practice.

Denny's comments about the workshops, the reflection time in which she shared her thoughts with her peers, reading the articles and trialling the classroom activities followed by writing her reflections on these in her journal indicate that she was aware of the connections among these features of the program. She understood that their purpose was not only to inform her but to also support her as a learner and that this in itself was a demonstration of how she might teach. Just as she and her facilitator formed a community of learners, she in turn was part of a community of learners with her students.

I realised that they're doing the same kind of thing that I'm doing and I'm finding it just as hard because I'm trying to do it with you and with myself and then I'm trying to expect them to do the same thing and I know they're having a difficult time because I'm having the same difficulties. I'm having a hard time telling Brian 'What things did you use to get there?' I don't know the answer. 'Did you have to look it up? Did you have to write down some of the dimensions?' What were the strategies he used is what I need to know and what I want him to know. I don't have the answers when I tell him. Help me Brian so I know what you do. (Learning journal, 7.11.90)

Her own evaluation of Frameworks as a program also indicates her awareness of the process of change that she has gone through as a teacher. Commenting on what the impact of Frameworks might be on teachers she said,

I think it's going to make teachers better because they're going to rely on their own judgement and not rely on the publishing company for the next step ... They're going to value their own judgement when they assess what the child needs ... I can read the child better for instance in the proofreading, I can look at Justin's and see some of his special need areas and now I can go back and work.
off those things with him. Whereas before I wasn't able to do those things as well. (Interview, 7.11.90)

I've enjoyed learning about how to think about what the kids are doing and knowing better the direction I need to take with my lessons so as I teach to suit these needs. I feel a little more confident and a whole lot better having taken this course. We've been doing novels and we've let the kids read and tried to give lessons all these different things to get the skills taught but not really thinking about where the kids are coming from or getting to know them better. So I feel I will not be teaching my lessons in the same way at all as I was before. (Interview, 6.11.90)

And this doesn't really matter because I'm not locked in. It's changing old habits in the way I've been teaching. That's the overwhelming part. Changing and getting into something new, especially if you don't know what to change the old habit with and you're still experimenting and adjusting so you get it right. That's the insecure feeling that you have with it. (Interview, 6.11.90)

So that's what I've got out of this. It's not that I'm going to continue text-tapping or any of the other strategies that were in the course, it's that I'm going to feel more comfortable trying something new. Everyone in the class is different and next year they'll be different again and so I have to keep finding things that work. This is what this course has done for me, it says, 'It's OK to keep changing and trying new things. You don't have to follow a set format'. (Interview, 7.11.90)

Her perception of the change process that she had been involved in during Frameworks was summed up in a final statement made by Denny in the last interview.

It [change] just creeps in. It [the whole language philosophy] is gradually coming together. It's not something startling new. (Interview, 7.11.90)
CASE STUDY 3 - GINNY GRIDLEY, GORHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PRE-EXISTING BELIEFS, KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES

Beliefs and Knowledge

Ginny indicated that she believed children will learn to read more effectively reading literature rather than going through the basal reading program. Thus she had volunteered to be part of a piloting of a new 'whole language reading program' which focused on children's literature. This had led her to begin trying to get her students reading around a theme such as folk tales from different countries.

Ginny perceived herself to be 'more of a copier ... not an ingenious person'. However, she did believe that she 'likes going her own way'.

The conditions of learning were not new to Ginny as she had heard about them through a Rigby video workshop the year before. She felt that she was familiar with them although she also admitted that she had not fully understood or accepted them.

Ginny indicated that she had 'been doing a lot with the literature and the whole language over the last year and I spent the summer before reading everything that I had to read, so I guess I have a head start on a lot'. However she admits that she felt confused about

... how it all comes together. It's all chunks right now and that's what I want to find out ... I want to be putting the chunks together from all subject areas.
Right now I feel that I have chunks [of knowledge] bits here and bits there and I wanted them to get together. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Ginny believed that being involved in projects like the Mifflin Project and Frameworks Pilot were good professional development for her and would be useful for her resume as she indicated, 'I am not going to stay here forever'. (Interview, 9.11.90)
Ginny believed that learning should be enjoyable and fun for her students. She perceived herself as being 'one who will try something out of the ordinary. Not just for my own interest but I think the kids seem to like what we did'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

She worked at being child centred, believing that it was important to stimulate her students thinking by asking them why as often as she could.

I have this big wooden 'why' on my desk that a kid gave me last year. They get tired of me asking 'why, why, why'. But that's the big question. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Ginny perceived herself to be a 'withdrawn learner, who was very shy and not thinking that I knew the right answers' and thus she felt she 'needs a lot of guidance' (Interview, 10.10.90). She felt that she could empathise with her students who were quiet and she worried about these students who in a group situation could sit back and not participate.

Practices

From classroom observations and her interviews it was evident that Ginny had scheduled writers' workshop and readers' workshop into her weekly plan. She ran writing and reading conferences with the students and jotted down notes on the students after each conference. The students' desks were organised into a horseshoe shape so that they could talk to each other and to her easily. This also left space for students to sit on the floor in a group near her when she read to them.

Ginny indicated that she had been using retelling as a strategy as part of the literature program and often shared her writing drafts with the students.
Making Connections - New Knowledge

Nature of Learning

Ginny indicated that, through her revisiting the conditions of learning, she was beginning to develop a deeper understanding of what they meant. She became aware of the need for 'constant demonstration and modelling' and that she should encourage and accept more the notion of approximations from her students. She felt she 'had to be more accepting of whatever the child does ... and not be such a picky person'. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Ginny also made the connection that these conditions overlapped and were not discrete stages or steps. This was particularly obvious when considering how they operate in the classroom.

Ginny began to get some insights into her own learning processes and she began to reflect on what this meant for her students. She indicated on many occasions that she felt the need for more feedback and more guidance as to what she should be doing; what was expected of her.

For myself and my learning I need to practise myself too. It makes you think 'maybe I do something wrong' or 'maybe I could try this', so it's a sharing of learning from others. That is why I'd hate to do this course in the summer because you wouldn't get that out of it because you don't have the kids [to try things with]. Teaching to your own peers is not the same as teaching to your fourth grade kids. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Ginny became aware of the importance of making the purpose for learning explicit to her students. She wrote in her journal that 'all learning should have a purpose and we need to show them more the purpose and meaning for learning'. (Learning journal, 20.9.90)
Nature of Language

Very early in the program Ginny began to make the connections she had been wanting to make about 'putting the chunks together'. She stated,

I'm seeing more clearly why things are happening and why things aren't happening and how you can probably get these things to happen. I guess I've always as a teacher felt you had to do reading, you had to do writing. Each thing was separate. I guess I'm getting over that hump, that way of thinking ... I did do reading today but reading is writing too ... it's all one. I don't have to chunk my lesson plan book into this is reading, this is writing. (Interview, 10.10.90)

She was also seeing the connections between written and spoken language more clearly. She stated she was 'making the connection between why we don't write as easily as we speak ... I guess I always believed the saying that "writing is just talk written down". Well, writing is more than talk written down. I'm seeing a lot more than I realised before.' (10.10.90)

Ginny indicated that group writing made her consider the language she used and why she used it. She became aware of her own writing process and that she seemed to go through a similar process to others. She realised that her students 'probably do the same'. She also found that it was fun working with her peers to write.

The writing we did in the group was fun ... it doesn't put pressure on just one person and that's nice. Everyone can give their ideas and then you try to make it [the written product] into one thing ... There's a tie into your language and what you know or what you've seen in the past and want to put together. All that happens before you start and you really don't think about it. It's so simple. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Ginny particularly found the session on Reading illuminating as she became more aware of the importance of the reader's background knowledge in gaining meaning from text.
and that reading was more than decoding letters. In considering the question 'What is reading?', Ginny stated,

[It] was an eye-opener to me ... You do want to read for comprehension. That made me think. I see where everything is one. It's like now I'm dropping my shield because if someone comes into my room and the kids are writing, I can still say that this is reading. I don't have to justify why I think that this is reading. (Interview, 6.11.90)

**Nature of Teaching**

Ginny became far more conscious of the need to model various learning experiences in front of her students. This focus was mentioned many times throughout the interviews and her journal.

Having made the connection as to how 'the chunks' came together, Ginny now indicated that she understood the relationship between reading, writing, talking and listening. Towards the end of the program she was also beginning to integrate this understanding into the teaching of the content areas such as Social Studies.

I'm going to model [using their Social Studies text books] reading a heading and then go through and pick out the facts and then reporting to the kids what I have found and then having them start in small groups and give the group a heading to do and report back to the class. (Interview, 9.11.90)

Another area of her teaching that Ginny was trying to develop was 'to get them to the higher level thinking; to think deeper' (Interview, 6.11.90). She was also connecting this to her evaluation.

I think it is good for the kids to evaluate each other because at times it may have more of an effect. Discovering similarities and differences are higher level thinking skills which make them look critically at what they have done. Hopefully, by doing this, they will be better prepared to follow through with such thinking skills. Discussing also makes the kids responsible especially
when they read the retelling together. It lets them decide what is important and what is not. (Learning journal, 29.10.90)

Nature of Evaluation

Ginny indicated that she had been struggling with her evaluation of her students. She was still expected to grade her students and this had caused her to do something which conflicted with her beliefs about whole language. She had been using a checklist but no longer felt she could use it as she 'had to convert the checklist into a numerical grade due to district policy, and this is absurd'. (Learning journal, 29.10.90)

Ginny was very aware that there was a need to change the evaluation system when one accepted a whole language philosophy. 'I think converting to a whole language system not only takes time but the evaluation isn't cut and dry.' (Learning journal, 29.10.90). However, she was also aware of the difficulty in making this transition.

The biggest problem I have in evaluation is finding the correct or best ways of recording results on what I observe. I need to be able to record quickly and easily but yet make sure the necessary information is taken and recorded. (Learning journal, 29.10.90)

Ginny began to understand the concept of 'markers' and the importance of knowing what to look for when evaluating students' work. She commented in her journal, 'it [evaluation] becomes objective once your markers are in place! You have to know what you are looking for'. This was an important connection for Ginny as it not only helped her understand how she can evaluate her students within a whole language philosophy, but this understanding seemed to help her clarify her beliefs overall.

I think the bits and pieces are tying together or maybe because I'm learning more and more, things are starting to make more sense, especially evaluation and the activities you use in class. As long as you know what you are looking for, it was an eye-opener to see what you can do ... I mean, the kids wouldn't know that that [the strategies introduced in the course] was an evaluation.
Basically it's as long as you have in mind what you're looking for. I think one of the things bringing it all together is organising yourself so that you can do this easily. I guess it's just getting over that and working through it and starting to go that way. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Evaluation for the parents' needs was another issue for Ginny. She felt that the District had let her down in this area as it encouraged her to adopt a whole language philosophy but was still expecting her and the other fourth grade teachers to grade their students. She felt that she would not be doing her students' justice to grade them this way.

I know what we need to be evaluating but the means of reporting to parents doesn't yet take one best form. I think evaluation is going to take a lot of trial and error just as whole language classrooms do. We need to find the best methods for each teacher and their classroom but yet to be consistent within the school. (Learning journal, 28.10.90)

MAKING CONNECTIONS - IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PRACTICE

Strategies

Ginny tried all the strategies which were introduced in the program. She had been using many of them prior to her involvement in the program. She particularly found those strategies which clearly allowed her to assess the students as she was teaching very useful. For example, she found retelling and the peer proofreading 'certainly give you a clear picture of what a child presently knows about language and the strategies he or she still needs to acquire' (Learning journal, 5.11.90).

Her personal experience in writing collaboratively gave her insights into how she could do this with her students. She was very pleased with the writing which grew out of this activity.
Modelled writing was another strategy which she found very powerful; she could see many ways of adapting it to suit her and her students' needs. She realised she could use it to help her students understand how to read and write in different genres of writing.

Integration

Ginny was beginning to integrate her reading and writing teaching in the language arts area and was also planning to teach reading and writing in Social Studies.

Physical and Social Environment

Ginny was beginning to create more wall print from student work and displaying it around the room. She was encouraging her students to use this wall print in their writing as a demonstration of how texts 'work' and as a resource for spelling.

PROCESS OF CHANGE: INTELLECTUAL UNREST, A PRECURSOR TO CHANGE

Ginny indicated that she was struggling with the idea that all students were learning when they were sent off to work in groups. She indicated that she believed that group work allowed for collaboration and sharing, both activities she valued, but she constantly questioned if all students were actively engaged in the task at hand and not 'sitting back and letting the others do it for them'.

When asked about her experience in collaborative writing, which she found very insightful, she responded,

Well, it's easy with adults getting into groups and writing but my biggest concern with children is, are they doing what they are supposed to be doing? With adults we don't have the problems, but I fear that, although I want to give them [my students] that opportunity, I just don't know how productive it would be.
Later in the same interview, she expressed this concern again adding an additional dimension.

What I see is the draw-back student not really participating and those are the ones you really want to start to bring around. And then you have the opposite type of students where they're very dominant and they just sort of overtake everything. (Interview, 10.10.90)

This unrest was still evident in the final interview and was highlighted after reference was made to the revisiting of the video on the whole language classroom.

In groups you can't really know exactly what each group is doing and you guess that if someone gets off task in the group, then you are going to lose the whole group and you try to avoid that type of conflict. (Interview, 9.11.90)

Yet Ginny was setting up learning experiences which called for her students to work in groups and she was feeling very pleased with how the students worked in this situation. 'I was impressed with how the group writing fell into place.' (Interview, 9.11.90)

Another area of intellectual unrest, which Ginny identified in the first interview, was that she was struggling with the need for more guidance and feedback. She felt that she was a risk-taker but on the other hand wanted to feel that she was doing the right thing. She wanted to know exactly what was expected of her and what the criteria of being successful were.

Being the learner here, I feel I still need a little more feedback as to exactly what is the purpose of this, and why did we do this. Maybe I ask too many questions ... When I do it with my class I know what I am looking for but I'm not quite sure what Jackie is looking for. (Interview, 29.9.90)

She also felt that she had spent a great deal of time already over the past year or so reading and trying things out in her classroom in the name of whole language teaching; she was using literature as the basis for her reading program. However she was
concerned how 'it all comes together. It's just sort of like chunks right now ... I want to put the chunks together from all the subject areas'. (Interview, 29.9.90)

A final area of intellectual unrest which was created for Ginny by the District was the emphasis on standardised tests. This created a pressure on her which she was unsure how she should handle. She felt let down by the District which, she indicated, supported whole language but then expected her to test and grade her students using an assessment mode which was incongruent with whole language philosophy. ‘The District may say they are committed to whole language but they sure have let me down when it comes to grading.’ (Learning journal, 28.10.90)

Thus the biases which challenged Ginny's learning throughout this program were to understand how students learnt through group interaction and collaboration so she could feel that she could trust that the classroom activities she set up would be effective. This meant understanding how the components of language were integrated (how they fed into and off each other) and how this understanding translated itself into effective classroom practice; classroom practice which used as its basis children's literature rather than basal readers and text books. She also needed to feel that she was in control of her evaluation procedures; that she knew what her students could do and she could justify this to others. This knowledge would in turn help her feel more comfortable with the students working in groups.

**PROCESS OF CHANGE: ENABLERS IN THE PROCESS**

**Understanding New Knowledge: Focus on Content**

*Input*

Ginny indicated that the input about the conditions of learning on the video was clear cut and useful. She felt that it was useful to revisit concepts that she had heard about before as these now supported and extended her existing beliefs about learning. Ginny felt that
new concepts were introduced and reiterated in many different ways throughout the sessions so that she was able to come to understand and use the terminology in discussions with her peers.

She felt that it was useful being given working definitions of such concepts as 'What is Reading?' as this allowed the group to discuss the issues more easily with a shared working definition. They had a shared meaning of the terms.

Readings
Ginny found the readings useful, particularly those which supported and extended the concepts made in the session and which helped her make links to classroom practice. She also found that she gained more from those readings which were clear and easy to read; when she could identify with what the author was saying. It was important, she felt, that they all read the same reading so they could share their insights 'because I know everyone has their own way of reading and get different things out of them' (Interview, 6.11.90). She did wonder, however, 'if the readings should have been done before the session ... as they give you some background then'. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Activities
Ginny felt that the opportunity to share and collaborate with her peers was vital to her learning.

I guess for my learning I need to practise myself, talk to other people and get their feedback. It certainly makes me think of new ideas or 'maybe I did something wrong' and 'maybe I should try this' so it's a learning from others. (Interview, 6.11.90)

She believed, however, that she was shy and tended to listen rather than talk because 'I've been one of those withdrawn students all my life, not thinking that I know the right
answer. But I have learned that usually what I do have to offer is good. But I am not a very brave person. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Ginny found that a key element in her learning was to be able to take ideas from the activities she had tried in the sessions and use them in her classroom that very week. This process enabled her to try the activity, consider the theory base and make the connections between theory and practice.

Frameworks is the idea that you have your students and you can go to them and try these things out and see the result of doing it rather than just sitting there in class and someone telling you 'this is what you could do'. That's the attitude I have lots of times. It sounds good but prove it to me! And this proves it within the week. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Understanding New Knowledge: Focus on Process

*Time*

Ginny indicated that having time during sessions to read through the readings and activities would have enabled her to clarify some of the points with the facilitator. She also indicated that the timing of the sessions - the order in which they came - helped her understand the terminology.

*Group Work*

Ginny enjoyed working collaboratively with her peers in the writing workshop. The process of doing this gave her insights into how she went about the writing task and therefore what this meant for her students' learning. She also found the process of reflecting, both in her journal and with her peers, enabled her to make connections about how all the 'chunks tie-in'.
Support
Ginny found that having the facilitator on site was very useful for her learning. She was able to seek out the facilitator between sessions and ask for clarification and advice. Ginny also sought clarification and support from the interviewer.

Implementing New Practices: Focus on Teaching
Ginny found that the ideas and strategies presented throughout the program supported and extended her current teaching practice. This factor enabled her to take what she was doing and explore her practice further. For instance, she had used the retelling strategy before but had not realised that it could be used to teach her students how to write in different genres and that it could be used to assess and evaluate what her students knew and needed to know.

Retelling certainly tells you about a student's ability to predict and their knowledge of certain genre - vocabulary and usage in certain genre. This lets you know what the student knows and has acquired and not acquired and if more information is needed. Proofreading definitely pinpoints strengths and weaknesses in grammar and knowledge of genre. (Learning journal, 5.11.90)

Ginny also found that the demonstration of exemplary teaching practice on the video was useful for her. Seeing someone else's classroom gave her ideas about practices like using wall print and organising students in groups.

Once Ginny made the connection about how the 'chunks' came together, she began to change her practice and feel comfortable about these changes. This understanding enabled Ginny to feel comfortable with not having separate teaching segments for reading and writing.

Another enabling factor for Ginny was being able to use the same strategies for teaching and evaluating literacy.
Implementing New Practices: Focus on Students

Getting a positive response from students to new teaching practice was an enabler in continuing to use and improvise on the new practice. When students demonstrated that they were enjoying the activity and that the quality of the work emanating from the activity was as good or even better than was usual, Ginny felt the practice was worth keeping as part of her teaching repertoire.

'I think the kids really enjoyed doing this and will enjoy the challenge of doing better next time.' (Learning journal, 29.10.90)

Implementing New Practices: Focus on Process

Ginny indicated that hearing what others did in their classrooms and being able to listen and reflect on her own teaching practice was an enabling factor for continued growth and implementation. Ginny had found that the text tapping strategy did not work for her as well as it had for others. She had reflected on this in her learning journal. This process of reflecting and sharing with others enabled Ginny to solve her problems and consider her options for future practice.

'Text tapping. What a failure. I really don't know what went wrong but I have some ideas.' Ginny then listed some six points, all of which were key points for the process of teaching overall, not just for using a strategy such as text tapping. For instance, she identified that: '(4) There was not enough time to immerse the students in the genre of recipe. That was probably the biggest factor. (5) The recipe idea was so out of context of what we were doing in class that it had no chance to succeed'. (Learning journal, 5.10.90)
Implementing New Practices: Focus on Support

Ginny willingly shared what she was doing in her classroom and what she would like to do, hereby seeking advice and ideas as to how she should best go about doing it.

We want to do a couple of stories but write them as a class, and I guess I don't know how to really go about doing that as a class. I need guidance there.

Then later in the same interview,

I would like a little more information as to how would you go about trying these kids in group writing. What should I do? How should I group them?

(Interview, 10.10.90)

Being able to seek such support was a strong enabling factor for Ginny. She also sought such support from the facilitator during the week between sessions. Listening to her peers sharing also gave her ideas and she found this very worthwhile.

Ginny found that having the strategies modelled for her by the facilitator was also very useful. In fact she suggested that there should have been more time in sessions for this type of support. Often she felt that this part of the session was rushed and it didn't give her the chance to clarify what was expected of her.

PROCESS OF CHANGE: INHIBITORS OF PROCESS

Learning 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content

Input

Ginny found the length of the second video inhibiting. She indicated that the message was interesting but boring due to the length of the video. She had found that the video she had seen on the same topic by Andrea Butler was more interesting as it showed classrooms as the message was being given.
Activities

Ginny commented in several interviews that she found that some of the activities were difficult to do because she was unclear about the instructions. This lack of clarity occurred in activities in the sessions as well as with some of the between session activities. Such lack of clarity confused her and she found herself focusing on what she should be doing and trying to get it right.

I guess we panicked a little bit here because we're trying to understand all these things that we're doing ... I need more guidance ... that I have the right idea.

And later in the same interview,

Maybe I didn't understand what she [the facilitator] was trying to get us to do.

(Interview, 26.9.90)

Readings

Ginny found that some of the readings were difficult to read. These made her feel unsure about herself as a learner. She indicated that it helped when she found, during the reflection segment of the sessions, that others had found the reading difficult to read.

Ginny also felt that it may have been more useful to have read some of the readings before the session as background knowledge rather than after the session as support.

Learning 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Process

Time

Finding the time to read between sessions was a major inhibiting factor for Ginny. She indicated that she spent a great deal of her summer vacation reading professional material but it was difficult to read all that was expected of her each week. The only time she had for the readings was weekends which was often too late as she needed to try the activities before the weekend in time for the next Tuesday night class. This factor was exacerbated
by the fact that her husband 'gets angry with me when I spend so much time on schoolwork'.

Activities
In the first few sessions Ginny indicated that she was often confused about what she was expected to do and achieve. Furthermore, she indicated that she 'was someone who needed more guidance' and 'like the children I need to feel successful' (Learning journal, 5.10.90)

Just how much this inhibited Ginny's learning is not clear in the data and as the sessions went by Ginny seemed to be less confused by what was asked of her and what the expectations were.

Support
Ginny indicated that lack of support from the District and the State Education Department was an inhibiting factor. It was particularly difficult to be moving towards changing one's beliefs about learning and literacy development when the District and State tests seemed to conflict with this theory.

Another important inhibiting factor was the balance Ginny perceived she needed to establish between her professional life and her personal life. This factor impinged on the amount of time Ginny felt she could spend on her professional life at home.

Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Teaching
Ginny indicated that there were many aspects of the program which inhibited her implementation of the new practice she was being asked to try. However, it was interesting to note that, although Ginny pointed these out very clearly, she also seemed to solve the problem through her sharing with the facilitator, the interviewer and her peers.
Ginny was unsure how she should present the learning journal to her students. She already asked her students to write in a reading journal.

It was hard to present to the kids because I wasn't sure I was doing it right so I did it the way I thought I was supposed to do it. It seemed a little strange and the kids were mixed up at first, but then I hit on the idea in a Science lesson when we were talking about mass and volume and I said to the kids, 'Take out your learning journal and tell me what you learned'. And that was a good thing because as a closure and a check it is going to be excellent. So I see the good points of them but just getting it going I guess I wasn't sure. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Ginny identified timing as an inhibiting factor to successful implementation of new practice. When reflecting on the strategies and on those which she had felt were successful and those which were not, she claimed that a major difficulty with all of them was that 'we all like to do something within the context of what we are presently doing in the classroom and some of the activities we've had to do were thrown at the kids. I really don't feel I do a good job as a teacher when I have to do it and don't have a place to do it in the program'. (Interview, 6.11.90)

Ginny perceived State tests as inhibitors to implementing new practice. She cited the State Science test as an example.

You've got to cover this and this and you can't spend your time on one thing even if there was a lot of extra literature and it would be interesting. We have a text book and if you go off on a tangent you feel really guilty. (Interview, 9.11.90)

**Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Students**

An inhibiting factor in implementing new practice for Ginny was her difficulty in trusting that her students were learning when they were placed in group activities. She indicated
she was unsure how she could get the same degree of independence from her students that she saw Dianne (on the video) have with her Grade 6 students. This was a conflict which she began to slowly work through but as she states in the last interview (9.11.90), 'It is frustrating because you put them in groups and when they haven't had the experiences they start talking about something else and this is frustrating for me ... When some kids get off track they begin to create problems with other students.'

Implementation of 'New' Practice: Focus on Process

Time

Ginny saw lack of time as a major inhibitor in getting things done both in the sessions and in the classroom. She realised that 'we need to make time' but time and timing were issues throughout the program which needed to be constantly considered.

Group Activities

Ginny found activities that had unclear instructions caused the group to get bogged down and they often did not finish before the time limit was up. This meant that she left the session unsure and confused, having not had the time to seek clarification either.

Attitude to the Change Process

Ginny viewed change as being part of the normal process of her professional life. She indicated that she usually spent her summer vacation reading professional material and seeking new ideas and, as a result, had begun to use literature in the classroom rather than a basal reading program. She requested, 'Any new things and new ideas, let me know'.

Ginny was aware of what she knew and what she needed to know, as she so clearly pointed out in the first interview. 'I am looking for how I can get all this [reading/writing integration] to come together', she said. She appeared to be aware of the process she went through in her learning. 'I'm more of a copier than I am a creator. I'm not an
ingenious person. I have ideas and I like to have a base to start with and then work from there. I like to go my own way.' (Interview, 26.9.90)

However, it seemed that until she had a clear picture of what she could do (or could 'copy') Ginny tended to feel insecure and lacking in confidence. She indicated a strong need to be seen to be doing things the 'right way'.

She indicated that she felt the need for more guidance and feedback and these needs may have contributed to her sense of panic by all the work she was being asked to do each week. She stated, 'I am understanding all the things I hear and I am trying to do all the things that we are asked to do but it is a little bit difficult keeping up'.

She enjoyed the collaboration with her peers and the facilitator. She also enjoyed the interaction she had with the interviewer, sharing what she was learning and doing in her classroom whilst feeling quite comfortable asking for further advice.

INSIGHTS INTO THE CHANGE PROCESS

Ginny used her learning journal to reflect deeply on what she was reading and trying in her classroom. She often seemed to use this medium as a way of clarifying her thinking, although it also appeared that she was writing for the interviewer as the main audience. Much of what she wrote in her journal she shared later during her interviews. A typical example read,

You know, things are really beginning to make sense ... I am beginning to feel not so anxious about not doing English, writing, reading as separate subjects. I know they are all combined and used in all situations so what does it matter if you spend most of your day on what is called 'reading' when you bring all the other skills into it! (Learning journal, 24.10.90)
Ginny was aware that the assessment policy which the school district had in place was incongruent with whole language philosophy and was searching for ways to change this. Through her reading, sharing and reflecting in her journal she gained some useful insights into how she could begin to change her assessment practice. Ginny was very aware of the change process in this area.

I think converting to a whole language system not only takes time but the evaluation isn't cut and dry. I know what we need to be evaluating but the means of best reporting to parents doesn't yet take one best form. I think evaluation is going to take a lot of trial and error just as whole language classrooms do. We need to find the best methods for each teacher and their classroom but yet try to be consistent within the school. (Learning Journal, 28.10.90)

Ginny was aware that the change process not only impacted on her but on her students also. Changes in routines and classroom practice created uncertainty for them as it did for her. Her concern was how could she best manage this change process so that it was best for her students.
CASE STUDY 4 - GAIL BURR, RUSHVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PRE-EXISTING BELIEFS, KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES

Beliefs and Knowledge

Gail indicated that she had moved away from teacher centred learning having implemented writers’ and readers’ workshops in her class a year before. This followed her reading of *In the Middle* by Nancy Atwell. She indicated that she understood the philosophy underpinning ‘writing as a process’ and used literature as the basis of her reading program, having put aside the basal reading program.

> I set up writing workshop and reading workshop in my room and I really went from day to day because I did not know enough to plan but I could see the enthusiasm. I could see it working. And using the literature was so exciting for me as well as for the children and I could see how meaningful learning was taking place. It had replaced the ditto sheets, the work sheets, the work book, it was just exciting. It was a lot of work because we had to develop all the teacher resources, it was an exhausting but a very gratifying year. So this year now I feel like I’m that much wiser. I feel like I know more where I’m going. (Interview, 26.9.90)

She indicated that she believed in the whole language philosophy although she was still coming to grips with understanding many of the principles involved. She believed strongly in creating ‘meaningful learning experiences’ for her students within a non-threatening context. Such a context should allow for students to begin to take responsibility for their own learning and for students to enjoy their learning. Such learning environments, she believed, would encourage the students in their learning attempts.

This belief that learning was the responsibility of the learner was evident in Gail’s own professional learning. She actively sought out information from peers, read books, attended conferences and courses, visited other teachers' classrooms and highly valued
sharing ideas with her colleagues. In response to the question, 'Where did you get your information about “whole language” from?', Gail responded,

Inservice, workshops, picking people’s brains, sharing with other teachers.
We had a TAWL group, ‘teaching attempting whole language’, that was us asking questions like ‘What do you do about this?’ (Interview, 29.9.90)

Gail indicated that she believed that students also learnt a great deal from sharing with each other. Sharing, she believed, was a ‘powerful learning tool’. She felt it was important that her students learnt about the process of learning as well as focusing on the product. She indicated that they would learn this from ‘the models of writing we present to children which is why we read to them so much, but they also need models of teacher’s writing so they can see the process of the writer’. (Interview, 26.9.90)

**Practices**

It was evident from the interviews and classroom observations that Gail was putting into practice the beliefs that she articulated about learning and in particular about the teaching of reading and writing. There were many books in the room, from dictionaries and other reference materials to children’s literature. There were wall charts created by Gail, informing students about the steps they should go through in their writing process. The tables were organised so students could work in small groups. There were areas, or work stations, where students went to ‘conference’ with the teacher and other students, where they went to publish their finished drafts.

There was also a space in front of the chalkboard where all the students could sit in a circle and share their writing and their reading with each other.

Gail used strategies such as modelled writing and retelling. She often used the overhead projector as a resource to demonstrate writing to her students.
Sustained silent reading was a daily activity and students kept reading logs about what they were reading which Gail responded to each week. The following quote from the first interview basically demonstrated much of Gail’s teaching practice before she began *Frameworks*.

[Students] keep their reading logs and so on Friday they have to write me a literary letter and then we have a dialogue. I collect them on Friday and take them home over the weekend and I read them and write back to them about what they’re reading and (about) authors. They have to do two cards, called Reading for Concepts. It’s reading this nonfiction passage and answering eight questions about it and then I check those. Then we have the SSR time, that’s every day but we end on Friday with a booktalk/sharing time. So we come together and they’re reading all these terrific books but nobody knows except me if we don’t talk about it. So Friday I don’t have to plan a mini lesson so it’s not the usual reading workshop, it’s a little bit different. (Interview, 26.9.90)

**MAKING CONNECTIONS - NEW KNOWLEDGE**

**Nature of Learning**

Gail indicated that she gained a deeper understanding of what ‘the conditions of learning’ mean and how they can be applied to her classroom. She became more aware of the power of demonstrations. ‘We model all the time without thinking of the importance of what we are doing.’

A major connection for Gail was identified in her learning journal. She wrote,

Cambourne wrote you should not fragment learning ... This is contrary to what I have believed all my life - working from smaller parts to the whole. My previous teaching has reflected this belief ... Jackie helped - said that as long as the learner sees the whole picture first, it’s OK to demonstrate and model the whole picture of tying shoe laces or playing tennis - as long as one can see where the learning is going then it is OK to teach the bits. (Learning journal 3.10.90)
Gail believed that the importance of making explicit the learning processes which she herself goes through was an important connection to make.

We have a lot of knowledge but we don't realise that we do know it, or how we got to know it. And that would help us as learners to begin to understand how we learned these things and why we need to learn them. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail also realised that sharing what one was learning was a powerful learning tool for herself and thus would be for her students as well.

Sharing with colleagues is so important (for our learning). Because we're all trying this for the first time. We all really don't know how things are going to turn out and that we're all seeing many of the same things happening. This makes you feel good that you are on the right track. (Interview, 10.10.90)

*Frameworks* was confirming for Gail some beliefs that she had held for some time. ‘Learning should be fun. That’s one thing I’ve always been very sure of in my own philosophy but now I feel like it’s been legitimatised.’ (Interview, 26.9.90.) The program was also extending these beliefs as was evident in her notes written later in her journal.

I'm thinking more and more about my own philosophy of learning. I know that I feel learning should be enjoyable - it should be fun. During learning, the learner should also be active as opposed to passive. Learners need to be actively involved or engaged to maximise the degree of learning that takes place. Also learning needs to be meaningful and students need to see where what they are learning fits into the 'big picture'. Need to understand the reasons for their learning and of what value it is to them. RELEVANT!!! (Learning journal, 11.10.90)

Gail indicated that she had begun to realise that ‘learning is functional and it depends on the interaction with people, which makes a case for collaborative learning'. (Interview, 10.10.90)
Nature of Language

Gail made many connections about the nature of language, about writing and reading, during her involvement in the program even though she claimed she had been learning about writing and the writing process from her students, from her reading and sharing with her peers over the past year.

The concept of ‘genre’ was a new connection for Gail, particularly as to what this meant for the language choices language users make. Gail indicated this connection led to a deeper understanding of the writing process and its relationship to the concept of genre.

I learned that when you write different genre you do use different language, you do make different choices about what you're going to say. And yet there are many things that you do the same too. The writing process is really a continuous thread that goes through all the writing no matter what genre you're writing in. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail further admitted making the connection that the writing process was not a linear process but rather it was a recursive process. This fact she realised had important implications for her students.

The other thing that I think was so important for me to come away from, which to me had implications in my room, is that the writing process is not linear. It's recursive. And I thought, 'Oh my gosh, that chart in my room on the steps in the writing process needed to be explained'. Because I've been so concerned about teaching, about the process of writing, brainstorm and plan, and first draft, and I wanted them to understand the steps. But I have not made sure that I let them know that, yes, you can go back to the beginning; it is not linear. I plan to make sure they understand that. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Her journal entry demonstrated further clarification of this concept. She claimed, ‘The writing process is a continuous process that goes through the writing no matter what genre you are writing in. The writing process is not linear but recursive'.
Gail began to understand the importance of the group developing a shared meaning of the ‘new knowledge’ being presented to them in the program through developing an understanding of the terminology. Gail realised that this understanding developed through the activities; the sharing and collaborating she did with the group. This she indicated had not occurred for her in other courses she had participated in.

We get so many other programs - Elements of Instruction on Effective Teaching and so forth - and there are all these buzz words that go with each like, closure. You know I never knew what closure was. But as you become more conscious of what you’re doing it’s like you are able to label it. And all this knowledge that we do have is a data pool. That’s a good name for it, it’s just knowledge, background knowledge. It’s just a name to something which then helps as you are conversing about it. Audience, that’s a word. We always knew that you really needed to have a purpose for writing. I mean that was kind of assumed. But you never came out and said that and you certainly never told the kids. They always knew that each writing had to be specific to whoever was going to read your letter. It’s always kind of there, but it was never labelled ... And so what helps, then, is that it’s always nice to be able to name and label things that you are doing and talking about, I think. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail also made several connections about reading and the reading process. She indicated that the session on the reading process helped her understand the importance of knowing the skills we use to read, ‘because then we have a better understanding of what skills the kids are using’. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Gail indicated that she began to understand the concept of the three cueing systems of language and how they operated simultaneously as she began to understand the terminology. This terminology was introduced early in the program and was revisited in many ways in each session with many opportunities for the group to also use the terms.

[When we first started using those words, graphophonic and syntactic and semantic, they were like a foreign language to me. And I looked at the diagram and I guess I got a better understanding of what was meant by each, but I had never used it before. So I was just learning new vocabulary at that...]
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point. And taking it at face value that this is what it means. But then as we progressed and I could see how you rely on each, and use each of these systems, and then finally yesterday was when I really felt like I have made the systems my own. They're more than just vocabulary words for me now. I understand not only what they mean but understand how I use them when I read. And this has become clearer through yesterday's session. So it kind of brought it together for me in that way. Before I probably could have passed the vocabulary test, you know, definitions. But I didn't understand really how they applied. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Gail indicated that her involvement in the workshops in the reading session helped her make some important connections about the concept of the term 'literacy'. After finding that she had difficulty understanding a text on cricket although she could recognise all the words, she realised that she could be considered 'illiterate' on reading this text.

An interesting point, does that make us literate in some areas and then illiterate in others, I think yes. If you're operational definition is 'reading is understanding print' then I'm illiterate about cricket. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Gail indicated that she had become aware of the difference between the spoken and written language. She also had become aware of the structure of the genres in written language. This, she believed, had implications for her teaching. 'A narrative’, she wrote in her journal, ‘has an orientation, a complication and a resolution. I never thought about it this way before. I just thought it was a “story”'.

**Nature of Teaching**

Gail made many connections from what she was learning about language, about reading, writing and spelling processes, and what this meant about the nature of her teaching practice. She was also beginning to see the connections between the language components and what this meant for her teaching. She was viewing the nature of her teaching, within her newly formed philosophy about language and learning, as ‘more meaningful and not just busy work’ (Interview, 10.10.90). Yet she believed that she was
still expected to ‘teach’; that her role as a teacher was vital and that ‘there has to be some kind of directive from time to time where you pull them all together and tell them, “I want you to know this”’.

Gail found that many of the workshops and activities she experienced in the program gave her insights into her teaching. She recognised that the strategies she was being asked to participate in were ones that she could also use in her own teaching. ‘You gave me two mini lessons in writing, one on purpose and one on audience, because last night I got to thinking I need to let them [the students] know that language has a purpose, I need to make that clear. I need to share that with them … these words need to become part of their vocabulary.’ (Interview, 10.10.90)

Conversely, such activities seemed to highlight some of her teaching practice that she realised she should now change, given her beliefs. ‘I immediately thought, “Oh my goodness, I have given them that implication.” I’m not going to take the [writing process] chart down, but I need to help them understand that it is a recursive flowing chart, not “you finish one step and you go to the other and that you never go back”.’ (Interview, 10.10.90)

Although she was feeling overwhelmed by the teaching of spelling, Gail was beginning to focus on this area of teaching and feeling the pressure to change.

I’m reluctant to give up my ‘spelling lists’ even though I am becoming more and more convinced that I should. It seems like I’m already up to my neck in new ideas. I need to hang on to a bit of the old school for my stability - the spelling list is my security blanket. (Learning journal, 16.10.90)

As Gail began to understand more about language and learning she became more cognisant that ‘spelling is for writing’ and that her current practice was now in conflict with her philosophy. ‘It confirmed for me that the words they should have [in a spelling list] should come out of their writing.’ (Interview, 24.10.90.) Entries in Gail’s journal
indicate the struggle she was having with 'hanging onto her security blanket'. On 25.10.90 she wrote, 'Thinking about spelling, I am becoming convinced that spelling words for each child need to be individualised and come from their writing'.

Gail had been to visit a New Zealand teacher teaching nearby and had talked to her about her spelling. This interaction had led Gail to feel that she was 'closer to the time when I can let go of my spelling book. I'm still forming my plan of attack' (Learning journal, 24.10.90). An integral aspect of this change in her teaching of spelling was connected to her overall teaching focus. 'Peer and collaborative learning will be an integral part of the picture' (Learning journal, 24.10.90).

In a final entry in her journal Gail shared how uncomfortable she felt explaining whole language philosophy to parents during parent conferences while she still taught spelling in a sub-skill approach. 'I'm having a harder and harder time', she wrote, 'justifying my current spelling program (text-book based). More than that, I am having a harder and harder time living with it! I can tell by the way I am feeling a change is going to take place soon in the way I teach spelling.' (Learning journal, 1.11.90).

**Nature of Evaluation**

Gail found that the model for Responsive Evaluation put forward in *Frameworks* 'fitted' with her beliefs about language and learning and how it should be reported to parents in particular.

I have sensed ever since I started attempting whole language that the report card we currently use does not reflect the kinds of learning and strategies that are taking place and being used or our goals. The idea of responsive evaluation (kid-watching) is the direction we knew we were headed toward but never knew the name for this kind of evaluation. It is so satisfying for me to have a label for the kind of assessment that was emerging ... we were groping for something tangible ... this kind of assessment not only exists but it has a name! (Learning journal, 28.10.90)
Gail indicated that being forced to consider the 'markers' she personally used to 'mark' or 'indicate' a child's progression was something that she had not considered before. She realised that once she began to identify these she would be in a better position to justify students' progress to their parents. As she considered this issue she also became aware that her inability to use someone's checklist for evaluation resulted because she was using someone else's 'markers' or 'indicators' of growth.

We were looking for a model to 'plug into' - realise now why we were not successful. Our checklist must reflect where we are with whole language. It must evolve from within. You cannot superimpose another district's 'checklist' on us and call it our own. Ours must emerge from our our whole language experiences and goals. (Learning journal, 28.10.90)

Role of Language in Learning

As the program proceeded, Gail began to make connections about the role that language played in learning. She made connections as to why collaborative learning is such a powerful tool when she understood that language was social and functional. She also was beginning to understand the concept of integration of language and integration of language in the 'content' areas. She was aware that this was a critical factor in the process of making connections for herself and her students. 'They [the students] are making connections. They are integrating language in their heads.' (Learning journal, 24.10.90)

After trying to focus the students' attention on a model writing activity in which Gail was modelling how she would write a science report, she stated that, 'I was getting so caught up in the information I was writing that at one point I caught myself thinking, "Heh, isn't this supposed to be a writing lesson - not a science lesson!" But the more I think about it, isn't that what whole language is - the integration of language in all areas?' (Learning journal, 15.10.90)

MAKING CONNECTIONS - IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PRACTICE

Strategies
Gail tried all the instructional strategies that she was asked to try as part of the program. Many of them she was already using in some way. However, she indicated that she learned more about the ranges of ways of using the strategies and was far clearer on why they were ‘good’ strategies to use.

Some strategies and class practices suggested in the program were new to her but she quickly saw how these could ‘fit’ within her present practice and indeed extend and deepen her current teaching practice.

I can see the value in learning journals and I’m really excited about continuing them. It is going to work beautifully with the closure and recap (of the lesson). I think that type of sharing is very important. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Gail’s reflections in her learning journal highlighted how she used the strategies and how she needed to adapt them to suit her class and her teaching practice. She also identified why she thought the strategies worked and what she learnt from the students’ responses about the effectiveness of the strategies, about her teaching, and about language and learning in general.

Learning logs can be used effectively for closure. Good idea - tried it in Social Studies and it worked beautifully. (Learning journal, 26.9.90)

Possible sentences modified for introducing a Science unit. Next day ... went well. Kids seem to enjoy and learn! (Learning journal, 28.9.90)

Tried text-tapping as a mini lesson. I got excited! ... Exciting part was when they could see proof that there is a connection between reading and writing. Stressed to them that no one had taught them how to write fairy tales, so how did they know? They knew ... through reading, listening to them being read to them ... We are beginning to make the connections. Me too! (Learning journal, 4.10 90)

Gail found that the instructional strategy, ‘modelled writing’ (with a focus on spelling) pushed her to think about her current teaching practice as well as helped her make the connections discussed previously about her beliefs about the teaching of spelling. As she
began to understand more clearly the role that spelling played in the learning of reading and writing she was pushing herself closer to making the changes in her practice.

**Role of Language in Learning**

There were several other major changes Gail made in her teaching practice as she herself became more cognisant of the reading and writing processes and the connectedness of the two. Interconnecting this understanding was the realisation that collaboration was a powerful learning tool.

Gail also became aware that she needed to help her students understand the role that audience and purpose played in the shaping of their writing. She saw the need to not only teach this but in doing so realised that she and her students would develop a language that they could use to discuss the writing pieces.

I'm finally convinced that I need two kinds of conferences with each child ... content and editing ... I'm finding it a monumental task to do all this with 25 kids ... Tried collaboration with groups of three and felt the groups worked better. (Learning journal, 16.10.90)

Did a mini lesson on 'purpose' yesterday and on 'audience' today. I've known about these terms and how important they are (in writing) but never communicated this to the students. They need to realise the importance of both and how they effect their writing ... now they are able to use the labels and correct terminology ... I was surprised that they could identify clearly the purposes of their writing - like 'to inform', 'to entertain'. (Learning journal, 11.10.90)

There are many examples in the interviews and her journal that indicate that Gail found that once she and the students began to explore the processes of language learning and began to share a common language for this sharing, there was a great deal more explicit reflection occurring in class and in their journals. Gail was often surprised at the insights her students were making and this seemed to lead her to encourage further this type of discussion and reflection.
Physical and Social Environment

Gail began to change how she functioned in her room rather than change the physical nature of it. She became aware that the chart on the writing process on the wall simply needed further explanation so the students understood the recursive nature of the process. She organised her conferences with the students differently and focused on specific parts of the process. In doing this she also focused the students on the purpose and audience of their writing. Thus the change in the classroom was a subtle one that was reflected more in how Gail used language with her students and how they began to use language with each other, rather than in a major change in the physical appearance of the room.

They know 'plurals'. I mean they have the rules but now I want them to verbalise what they know. I want them to see it working ... I can put this on charts and this will be helpful when we talk about it later. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Evaluation

Gail had already begun to make some changes in her evaluation practices. However, once she began to understand the concept of Responsive Evaluation she also became more aware of the various ways she could collect information on her students' progress from the general classroom strategies. A particular focus for her was how she would evaluate students' progress in spelling if she were to change her teaching practice in this area. Once she read some articles in this area particularly the article on proofreading she began to put a plan of action in place which facilitated the change for her.

Proofreading activity is a way of finding out what the child knows about language and how he uses it. (Learning journal, 3.11.90)

PROCESS OF CHANGE: INTELLECTUAL UNREST, A PRECURSOR TO CHANGE

Gail began Frameworks, by her own admission, feeling that she was 'much wiser' and knowing 'where I’m going.' Yet from the very first session there were aspects of the
program which created intellectual unrest in Gail. Much of this was answered for her as she worked her way through the program. This was particularly evident in writing. In the first interview she indicated, ‘I'm really struggling with the conference in writers workshop. Asking those important questions to give the kids a direction that they need is the problem’. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Gail had been focusing on the curriculum areas of writing and readers workshop and how she could bring these together more into an integrated curriculum approach. She commented in the first interview, ‘An area we are really working on this year is integration of the content areas … I know it's possible but I'm not sure I have found the way’. (Interview, 26.9.90)

Another major concern for Gail was what she labelled, ‘the warm body syndrome’. Although she organised her class into groups so that much of their work was done in small collaborative groups she worried that this form of organisation did not ‘push’ all students; that there were always some in the group who were prepared to let the others do their thinking for them. She commented, ‘I can't help but think that collaborative learning makes it easy for the lazy thinker. He is not pushed. He is allowed to be a passive participant … I feel it is so important that children learn best when they are made to be active thinkers, when they are pushed’. (Interview, 10.10.90)

By the end of the program, Gail had begun to solve her concerns about group activities. She had organised her students into groups of three and found this more successful. Much of the issues around writers workshop were also being clarified for her as she became more informed about the nature of writing and reading.

Towards the end of the program there were several concerns that were still causing Gail intellectual unrest and challenging her thinking. One area was in changing the way she taught spelling. She was convinced philosophically that she should change from using
lists of words from a text book to using the words that came from the student’s writing. She had become aware also that spelling meant more than learning words, that there was a wide range of strategies students need to know to be effective spellers. Bit by bit she was moving towards this change in practice, however it was a struggle for her and at times she felt very threatened that she had not ‘let go’.

How to organise the ‘nitty gritty of how do you do this’ in evaluation was also still causing Gail intellectual unrest. She commented in the final interview (7.11.90) that she ‘hadn’t got clear how all the record keeping goes’. Much of this concern was also linked to running an integrated unit in which students were involved in a variety of different activities at the same time.

You’ve got one student started on Spiders two days ago and his work is due today and this one started today on his topic and he is due three days from now. How do I manage all that? ... This is something I have to work out. I have a conference here with a student, I have retelling and proof reading and all this paper which I put in a folder. But all this has come to the fore because I have parent conference today and I’m running here and there to get all this together and I thought there’s got to be a better way. (Interview, 7.11.90)

There was a section in Session 6 which caused intellectual unrest for Gail. This was the issue of what was the difference between ‘skills’ and ‘strategies’. In the session, a member of the group put up a definition for each which the group at that point accepted and therefore were able to move on. Gail continued to debate the point in her journal. ‘I’m still thinking about “skills” and “strategies”’, she wrote. Gail defined these for herself in her learning journal (24.10. 90), ‘... there is a fine line between the two but I think there is a distinction’, she wrote. Then on 29.10.90 she wrote, ‘Still battling with “skills” and “strategies” back and forth in my head. Maybe Bloom can help me differentiate - “skills” would be at the knowledge level, i.e. acquired understandings - “strategies” would be at the application level - applying those skills to text in order to extract meaning’. The intellectual unrest caused by this lack of clarification of terminology
seemed to force Gail into a process of personal debating and reflecting over time on the issue whilst also forcing her to draw on the knowledge or 'theory of others' (Bloom) that she had gained at other times. The process seemed to push Gail to articulate her own beliefs and thinking in the area.

Spelling, integration of language in the content areas and evaluation were the major biases which seemed to challenge and drive Gail to further thinking throughout the program and beyond.

**PROCESS OF CHANGE: ENABLERS IN THE PROCESS**

**Understanding 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Content**

*Input*

Gail indicated that the video of an exemplary teacher of whole language was an effective medium for introducing new knowledge and for recapping the key concepts at the end of the program.

*Activities*

Gail found activities or workshops which reinforced and consolidated the content being introduced were very useful in helping her understand the new knowledge. These workshops forced her to consider the implications of this new knowledge in her classrooms and to also use the new language in her classroom with her students.

The group discussion in these workshops and activities forced her to reflect on what she was already doing in her classroom and why she was doing it. This in turn helped her begin to identify what changes she could/should make in her classroom.

I found it [the workshop] very valuable. We had to think of the role of the teacher and the role of the student. This brought those conditions right into the classroom ... It made me think about what I actually would do in my own classroom to ensure that these conditions of learning are present... You get another perspective from working groups. I always have the danger of seeing
things one way - my way. I think you need to hear another perspective. It makes you rethink what you thought you already had all figured out.

(Interview, 26.9.90)

Readings

Gail indicated that the readings generally enabled her to access new knowledge which extended, supported and sometimes challenged her existing knowledge base. She agreed that those readings which were most useful to her were readings where she could relate to the author’s message and could make the link to her classroom practice. Some readings also gave her a language to ‘map over’ things that she was already beginning to think about, believe and do in her classroom.

A narrative has an orientation, a complication and a resolution. Never thought of it that way before. I just thought it was a ‘story’ with a beginning, middle and end. (Learning journal, 8.10.90)

The idea of responsive evaluation is the direction we knew we were headed but never knew the name for this kind of evaluation. It is so satisfying for me to have a label for the kind of assessment that was emerging - confirms the fact that we were on the right track since there is indeed such a thing! We were groping for something tangible and this is it. (Learning journal, 28.10.90)

Understanding 'New' Knowledge: Focus on Process

Gail indicated often that the various processes she experienced throughout the sessions enabled her to take on board new knowledge and begin to make it her own. These occurred through the following processes.
Group Work

Group work enabled Gail to get another perspective on her thinking, as well as have her thinking extended and supported. She indicated that ‘sharing with colleagues was most valuable’.

Sharing with colleagues is so important because we are all trying this out for the first time. We all really don't know how things are going to turn out and we are all seeing many of the same things happening. (And when things don't go the same way) it's food for thought. You're getting another perspective. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail indicated that some of the workshops enabled her to make connections about learning for herself. After completing the workshops in the reading session, she commented, ‘...it became very evident that unless you take meaning from what you are reading then it is not reading’. (Interview, 24.10.90)

The activities and workshops appeared to force Gail to make explicit her beliefs about things she was doing intuitively as she shared her thinking with others and reflected on the thinking of her peers. She commented after the first session, ‘Reflection is very useful. The sharing is in hearing others' experiences. For instance, I was concerned about "time". We have so many things we are accountable for and I found I wasn't the only one who felt this way, and that helps’. (Interview, 24.9.90)

Support

Gail indicated that the support she gained enabled her to make connections with the new knowledge. First, the group supported each other. She was encouraged to know that other members in the group were having problems clarifying some of the points. She felt inadequate for the few weeks because she was having difficulty trying to get everything done. But during Reflection time each session Gail began to realise that she was not the only one who felt this way. The opportunity to share and support each other was an important enabler for Gail."
Another major support came from the facilitator and the interviewer. Gail commented on this point in several interviews and in her learning journal.

Jackie came over and we talked some more about what our task was about.
She straightened us out. (Learning journal, 10.10.90)

Gail also found the action plan in Session 8 very useful as it forced her to think about that which she needed to learn and clarify for herself, by reflecting over what she had done and learned throughout the session.

Using the learning journal for her own reflection was a useful support for Gail's learning. She indicated early in the program that she needed to find the time that night after the session to reflect in her journal. She used her journal to not only reflect on the sessions but to reflect on the readings, the trialling of the between session activities (the instructional strategies) and her own struggles.

Session 6. I have learned that unless one extracts meaning from what is being read, reading has not occurred. Also, in order for meaning to be received from the text, we use our semantic, syntactic and graphophonic cues. Interesting point - a proficient reader may not always be an effective reader depending on how well all three systems are working together. I would say yes, makes literate in some areas and illiterate in others. I am completely illiterate in cricket. (Learning journal, 23.10.90)

Timing

Gail indicated that the sequence of the sessions enabled her to gain control over the terminology and concepts more easily.

When we first began using those words, 'graphophonic', 'syntactic', 'semantic', they were like a foreign language to me ... So I was just learning new vocabulary then. And taking at face value what it means. But then as we progressed I could see how you rely on each (system) and use each of these systems, and then finally yesterday was when I really felt like I made the
systems my own. They are more than just vocabulary now. I understand not only what they mean but how I use them when I read. And this became clearer through yesterday’s sessions. (Interview, 24.10.90)

**Focus on Language**

Gail indicated that developing a shared meaning with the group enabled her to clarify areas which were confusing or had the potential of becoming confusing.

We couldn’t go on until we got that sorted out (the definitions for ‘skills’ and ‘strategies’). But once Pam came up with a definition, once we all had that, we seemed to say, ‘Oh, that’s all we needed, so now let’s go.’ (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail found the opportunity to clarify and develop a shared meaning for the terminology such as ‘semantic’, ‘syntactic’, ‘graphophonic’ as well as ‘genre’, ‘purpose’ and ‘audience’ through workshops, reflection time, readings very supportive for her learning. ‘Reflection time is so important’, she commented, ‘because when people understand the same language then that certainly makes for more effective communication’ (Interview, 10.10.90).

**Implementing ‘New Practices’: Focus on Teaching**

Gail perceived herself to be a successful teacher before she commenced Frameworks. She found her colleagues’ comments after they had tried the classroom activities both supportive and challenging. Supportive because they demonstrated to her that she ‘was on the right track’ and that ‘it was nice to know that other people are doing the same kind of things’. Challenging because often the group spent time sharing what didn't work and trying to establish why this might have been. ‘We’d try to figure out why hers didn’t go well and mine did and we talked about the different kinds of words we used to explain it. You just find yourself having a dialogue about these strategies that you are trying.’ (Interview, 10.10.90)
Gail also found that it was very supporting having her intuitive or tacit knowledge confirmed. This was evident when she was presented with a model of evaluation, responsive evaluation. Much of what she was already doing and thinking in this area fitted directly within this model.

Gail also found that having the opportunity to examine her current practice, to consolidate and extend it, was an enabling factor in her learning. She had used strategies such as modelled writing and retelling previously in her classroom, however she found the opportunity to read about them (*Theory Into Practice*), try them and to reflect and share what went on with peers a valuable learning experience.

**Implementing 'New' Practice: Focus on Students**

Getting a positive response from the students was a strong enabling factor in Gail’s learning and her willingness to continue to try new practice with her class. The instructional strategy, text-tapping, was one such example. Whilst doing the activity she found,

> They were telling me how they knew what they knew. They knew how [to write fairy tales] because they have read them. And to me this is the connection I wanted them to understand and that was so exciting. I have made a big board in my classroom - Make the reading-writing connection. I haven't taught them that I haven't set that up. They were making the connections themselves and all I did was point that out to them. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail also saw positive outcomes from these strategies in her students' learning. They were learning what she wanted them to learn but going beyond her expectations and surprising her with what they already knew and could learn.

> Aaron made a good connection (about spelling strategies) and I hadn't even thought of that. He needed to know how to spell the word by the way it is used. (Interview, 24.10.90)
Implementing 'New' Practice: Focus on Process

Gail found the opportunity to share her practice, both current and what she was trying as part of the program, very useful. The process of writing her reflections on her trialling of the instructional strategies readings (*Theory into Practice*) and the consequent trialling of these in her learning journal was in itself a learning experience for Gail. She indicated that the sessions often left her feeling 'overwhelmed' and she needed to 'reflect that evening. I lost a lot if I put it off and so I really thought it was important to find the time'. (Interview, 7.11.90). There were often comments in her journal which indicated where she pulled on her reading of an article, what she had heard in the session and the implications this all might have for her teaching.

I find the sample of these kinds of 'kid watching', evaluation strategies invaluable. Have collected a variety of sample checklists but have nothing as comprehensible as these.

She continues later,

Interesting point - article stated 'Teachers find they cannot use checklists devised by someone else'. Found that to be true already. We were looking for a model to 'plug into' - realise now why we weren't successful. Our checklist must reflect where we are at. (Learning journal, 28.11.90)

Implementing 'New' Practice: Focus on Support/Personnel

Gail indicated in several interviews that the instructional strategy readings (*Theory into Practice*) were very supportive. 'The readings helped me so much with the strategies. I was really glad I had read them before I did the strategy.' (Interview, 7.11.90)

Gail sought support from her peers during sharing time, from the facilitator both during the session and during the ensuing week, and sought clarification from the interviewer.

Spelling was bothering me. I had a couple of questions to ask of Jackie. And that helped. (Interview, 10.10.90)
Gail often sought advice and clarification from the interviewer. Areas of discussion included group organisation, conference questioning, evaluation organisation, teaching spelling, the teaching of different genres of writing. Gail appeared to find this form of support and knowing that she could seek it very useful. An entry in her journal (10.10.90):

During interview with JT I mentioned concern about ‘warm body syndrome’ - passive thinkers who let others do all the real thinking. She suggested smaller groups - no more than 3. I previously had 4-5 per group - am anxious to try it to see if I observe a difference.

On the 16.10.90, Gail noted in her journal,

Tried collaboration with 3 in a group. Felt groups worked better.

**PROCESS OF CHANGE: INHIBITORS OF THE LEARNING OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION**

Gail indicated there were various aspects of the program that could have been inhibitors to her learning of the new knowledge and how this was best implemented. These fell into the following categories.

**Focus on Content**

*Readings*

Gail indicated that readings were difficult to read when they were too academic and not aimed at the audience of the class teacher.

*Activities*

Gail indicated that activities were confusing when they had unclear instructions. She claimed, as she was reflecting on the activity in Session 4,

---

2 In this case study, the Inhibitors of 'New' Knowledge and Inhibitors of Implementation categories were combined.
I wasn't sure of the task when we started. Maybe I just didn't listen. I'm a visual learner. (Interview, 10.10.90)

Gail felt the need for a clearer purpose for some of the activities, so that she and her peers knew what was expected of them and why.

Time was lost because we really didn't finish the activity the way we would have liked to, because we were sitting there and thinking 'What is it we are supposed to be doing here?' (Interview, 10.10.90)

Another inhibiting factor which Gail identified was lack of closure in an activity.

I guess that is why I was feeling so unsettled because I didn't feel closure and then Jackie was still talking and I had to leave. (Interview, 24.10.90)

The above factors were inhibiting in the sense that they made it more difficult for Gail to carry out the task and get the sense that she was achieving what was expected of her.

Input

Gail indicated that after Session 3 there was too much input coming too fast. Gail's strategy for overcoming this factor was to spend time reflecting on the sessions that same night. The 'not enough time' factor came up several times for Gail. It impacted not only on the input of the sessions but the process that the group were expected to go through including the between session activities.

Overwhelmed! Connections are crucial and I don't think I'm making them!

Too much! Not enough time to study so that all of this is internalised - need time to reflect and think it through. (Learning journal, 3.10.90)

This same sense occurred again after Session 5 on Spelling.

Why do I come out of these sessions feeling like I've been run over by a truck? I am completely and utterly wrung out. So much is going on in my
head - leaving me feeling confused and overwhelmed. I'm reluctant to give up my 'spelling lists'. (Learning journal, 16.10.90)

In the final interview, Gail reiterated her concern about too much input coming in too short a time.

We needed more reflection time ... to think about what you've just learned. That's what I have felt was missing. When an assignment (the between session reading and activities) is given in a hurry, it's all swimming around in your head ... it's all important but it is just a lot to absorb and reflect on. The part that I found difficulty with [in the course] is finding time to reflect. (Interview, 7.11.90)

Focus on Process

The above factors inhibited the process of reflection which in turn inhibited the process of connection making. Insufficient time to reflect, to carry out activities so that the learner had a sense of closure and the opportunity to make the connections that the program was aiming for, caused frustration and a sense of being overwhelmed. In Gail's situation, she identified strategies for herself to cope with these inhibiting factors, these included taking the time at night to reflect on the session and reading the session readings very carefully.

Focus on External Pressures

Gail indicated that parents can be an inhibiting factor when trying to implement a new theory and its teaching practice. Gail particularly felt this in the area of spelling and the assessment of students. After her reading of the article by Bean and Bouffler on spelling, Gail commented,

Language is learned through use and therefore so is the spelling of words; through reading language and writing language not through memorisation of tests. Major problem -- how to educate parents that children are still learning spelling strategy without lists. (Learning journal, 22.10.90)
It was during a discussion with parents about how she was teaching reading and writing and how she was assessing these language components that she became even more aware of the conflict in her philosophy in how she still taught spelling and therefore the need to change her teaching practice in this area.

ATTITUDE TO THE CHANGE PROCESS

Gail demonstrated excitement at being involved in whole language. She was very much a self directed learner having spent many hours already of her summer breaks attending courses and continuing this professional development by attending various other courses and meetings through the school year.

She felt that her intuitive learning and teaching philosophy had always been child centred and was excited that this was now being confirmed for her; she was learning labels or terms that she could map over what she already believed.

Gail was excited not only by what she was learning but also by her students' response to the approach now being put into place in the classroom.

That's the stimulation that makes you want to keep continuing. It's exciting.
It's fun. I've never had classes say, 'Hurray' when I said it was time for writing. They can't wait to get their little noses in and start and this is really exciting to be a part of it. (Interview, 26.9.90)

At times she felt overwhelmed with all the new knowledge coming her way. However, she seemed to find ways of coping with this sense by reading, reflecting in her journal, trying activities with her students and sharing with her peers. She noted in her journal on the 4.10.90 after having written how overwhelmed she felt after Session 3, 'I'm feeling better. I tried text-tapping ... I got excited!'.
Gail was very excited about the students’ responses to the new strategies she was using in her class. She was equally excited about the connections they were making about language and learning.

Overall Gail seemed to enjoy her participation in the program. She was feeling confident about herself as a learner and about her teaching.

**INSIGHTS INTO THE CHANGE PROCESS**

Gail seemed to be aware of the change process in which she was involved. The following quotes demonstrated this awareness.

> There’s so much information and it takes me time to filter and sort it all through and I can’t do it when I’m sitting there in the session. All I can do in the session is listen and be bombarded by all of this, this heavy stuff ... So I need time to reflect. I need reflection time and usually I like to do it in the evening right after the session when it’s all fresh and swimming around my head. Then I go back and I read through again what I have underlined and then I start making connections. I can’t do it when I am rushed and tired. (Interview, 24.10.90)

> The more I am learning and the more I hear and see, the more connections I make, the more I realise this is the way it is going for me. I can see that I’m not happy hanging onto that [spelling] book and those lists too much longer because I know they’re not meaningful words. So I’ll take another plunge like we did when we started writer’s workshop. (Interview, 24.10.90)

Gail appeared to be aware of not only the excitement and challenges of being involved in a program such as *Frameworks* but she also aware of her own learning and how she could use a program such as *Frameworks* to support her in her learning. She indicated that the teaching of spelling was an issue with her, something she needed to consider but was not ready to change. As she considered her own beliefs about language and learning she was ‘pushed’ closer and closer to ‘let go’ and ‘take the big step’ of change. Her
awareness and acceptance of this change process, it would seem, supported her through this change.

Gail summed up her insights into this process thus,

Well, it's because we keep going back to it [the issue or problem at hand; spelling in her case]. It is not just - 'There it is, now put it away'. Every time we make a connection then we bring it out again and we see it again. I need to see things more than once and then it [comes together]. (Interview, 24.10.90)
PART THREE: THE IMPACT OF A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CALLED FRAMEWORKS ON TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND PRACTICES IN LITERACY EDUCATION

Two broad themes emerged from the analysis of the synthesis of the four case studies described in Part Two. These themes were the Impact of Frameworks and the Nature of Change. Whereas the former examines the impact or change that the program called Frameworks had on the teachers' beliefs and practices and is the focus of Part Three, the latter focuses on the nature of that impact or change and is the focus of Part Four. (See p. 140 for a diagrammatic view of the themes and categories.)

Within the theme, Impact of Frameworks, several categories emerged. The teachers' Pre-existing Beliefs and Practices was one important and clear category. This category became base line data which emerged from the interviews as the teachers talked about the changes in their thinking and practices as a result of their participation in the program.

Making Connections was the other major category. Within this category fell the connections the teachers identified as having made in their beliefs and practices as a result of their participation in the program. Two sub-categories clearly emerged, namely, New Knowledge - Covert Teacher Change and Implementation of New Practice - Overt Teacher Change. Connections with respect to the new knowledge being presented to them in the program were categorised as covert teacher change as it could not be clearly seen in operation whereas the implementation of new practices was viewed as overt teacher change as this was reflected in the change in teaching behaviours in the classrooms.

This Part will describe the theme Impact of Frameworks whereas Part Four will explore the Nature of this Change.
PRE-EXISTING BELIEFS, KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES

All four teachers indicated they had heard of and were implementing the approach called 'whole language' in their classrooms. Just what this term meant to each of them varied and was a reflection of the experiences each had had as far as their previous staff development.

Lonnie admitted still being a fairly traditional teacher who did not see the point of making changes in his teaching unless he could see that it was going to be useful to him and his students. His class practice reflected that he held a 'fragmentationist sub-skill view' of learning and teaching. However he indicated that he was dissatisfied with his present teaching approach. He liked the idea of whole language philosophy although he was unsure how he might put it in place in his classroom.

Denny, Ginny and Gail had all indicated that they had begun to move towards a child centred curriculum. They indicated that they had heard of natural learning theory through previous staff development learning experiences. These experiences included attending summer schools on reading and writing workshops, reading books and being involved in the piloting of a literature based reading program. All three admitted that they had experienced not knowing what they were doing and the sense of frustration that this brings, although all three also felt they were a little wiser and felt a little more comfortable with what they were doing.

Thus it can be argued that each teacher came into the Frameworks program at different entry points. They appeared to have all begun to make the paradigm shift between traditional sub-skill teaching to holistic teaching. As a result of this shift they all appeared to have begun to experience a sense of feeling dissatisfied and therefore unhappy with aspects of what they were doing as well as being unsure of and anxious about what they should or could do next.
This uncertainty seemed to be associated with an inability to articulate clearly why they did what they did. For example, they could identify in broad terms, what they wanted to know and learn. They knew they taught 'in a sort of way' and whilst they could give labels to this 'way', they were not always able to clearly articulate why they taught 'this way'. All of them appeared to be more focused on their practices (i.e. what they were doing) than their beliefs (i.e. why they were doing it). This suggests that, in the early stages of the paradigm shift and the apparent intellectual unrest it creates, teachers are more likely to reflect on something tangible like their classroom practices before they begin to consciously examine something far less tangible like their beliefs. This is not to say however, that the teachers are not questioning their beliefs and knowledge. In fact, it seems that these teachers began to focus on certain practices because what they are doing in the classroom did not 'sit right' with them. There was an uneasiness in their belief systems, which although intuitive at this point, seemed to initiate a particular focus on practice.

There was often a lack of congruence between those beliefs which they could articulate and their classroom practices. For example, Ginny, Gail and Denny all indicated the importance of group work as an activity which allowed students to 'be responsible for their own learning'; 'to work collaboratively'; 'to problem solve'. However, in practice, all indicated difficulties in actually giving responsibility to the learner. There was a concern that some students in group work would sit back and let the others do all the work. To police this, it seemed, the teacher needed to be constantly on guard and in control. Yet they appeared to be aware of this and other inconsistencies indicating that they needed to work through them.

These inconsistencies, therefore, seemed to appear as personally identified needs in their own learning. For example, even though Denny, Ginny and Gail had begun to teach reading and writing in a more 'process oriented approach' they too were looking for how they could integrate the teaching of these literacy components.
Ginny summed it up thus, ‘It’s all chunks right now. I want to put the chunks together’.

Denny indicated that she was teaching reading and writing and spelling as separate and discrete subjects and although she had begun to work towards changing that, she needed more help in the area.

Gail was aware that whilst she was running ‘writers workshop’ and ‘readers workshop’, there seemed to be little connection in what she was doing in these sections of her curriculum to what she was doing in the area of teaching spelling.

Thus these teachers could identify what it was that they wanted to ‘work on’ and learn more about. This particular focus, it could be argued, became their own personal 'subjectivity' or 'bias'. Thus the bent or disposition which they held seemed to emanate from the recognition of their own personal needs and beliefs and seemed to not only frame the way they viewed the whole program but determined that which they chose to focus on with respect to their learning throughout Frameworks.

All four teachers believed that learning should be relevant, meaningful, enjoyable and a challenge. Thus the the learning environment which they as teachers created needed to be non-threatening and supportive of the learners.

All were self motivated and active learners themselves, having volunteered to be part of the Frameworks pilot. Ginny, Gail and Denny indicated that they had actively sought staff development in the teaching of literacy in previous years, attending summer schools, reading professional books, attending TAWL meetings at other schools; Lonnie had been completing his Masters degree in reading.
All were aware of their own perceived learning processes and could articulate this process. For example, Ginny declared that she 'was more a copier', 'a withdrawn learner' who was very shy and worried about getting the right answers. However, she also admitted that she 'was someone who would try something out of the ordinary'.

Even though Lonnie had stated that he 'hated investing time and energy into making changes that might be just a waste of time', he, like the others, entered into the Frameworks program dissatisfied with aspects of his teaching.

In sum, all four seemed to enter Frameworks looking for particular answers to their teaching problems and some support in changing their practices appropriately. This could be likened to a personal bias that each brought to Frameworks and used to frame his or her thinking, reading, listening. What each took from the sessions was also framed by this personal bias. It would seem that the design of Frameworks (i.e. the staff development model embedded within Frameworks) not only gave them the opportunity to identify their personal biases but also gave them the opportunities to pursue them.

MAKING CONNECTIONS: NEW KNOWLEDGE, COVERT TEACHER CHANGE
A major component of the Frameworks program was the introduction of knowledge about the nature of language and literacy and the implications of this for the teaching and learning of language and literacy. Each session focused on a different aspect of language and literacy, however the key concepts, understandings and corresponding terminology were introduced early in the program and revisited in each session. These concepts and understandings were presented through two distinct methods. One method was a series of workshops which forced participants to reflect on that which they already knew and understood in the field of knowledge thus making this knowledge more conscious. The other method was more in the form of input through a transmission of information model. This was presented to participants in the form of
notes to be read in sessions and consequently discussed, articles to be read between sessions and discussed in the following sessions, and audio and video input.

These two methods were often interspersed. For example, a workshop might be followed with sharing and reflection which in turn might be followed by notes to be read.

The new connections that teachers made about the nature of language and literacy as a result of their involvement in the workshops and the input were identified through what they said in their interviews and from what they wrote in their journals. These were the covert changes in teachers' learning. These covert changes fell into the following categories, explained in detail in Chapter 3, Methodology.

Nature of Learning

Insights into Their Own Learning (Personal Theory)

All began to focus more on how they themselves learn and the ramifications this had for what they believed about the learning of their students. For example, Lonnie indicated that *Frameworks* suited his learning as it allowed him the flexibility and responsibility to choose what he needed from *Frameworks*. He could try things out at his own pace and adapt the activities to suit his and his students' needs. He began to realise that he needed to provide his students with the same opportunities so they could take the responsibility for their learning as he could.

Denny found that, through her own learning experiences in *Frameworks*, learning can be enjoyable. She also became aware that the processes through which she was going as a learner were ones her students should also have opportunities to be involved in. These included sharing her thinking with others, collaborating on writing a topic or reading through a text, reflecting with her peers on what she had read and reflecting on the processes she used as a writer, as a reader as a speller, and reflecting in her learning
Denny found these processes to be ‘powerful learning tools’ for her and they therefore had strong ramifications for her beliefs about the effective learning of her students.

The insights Ginny gained through examining her own learning processes led her to realise the importance of the feedback and support given to a learner. Ginny indicated that she was a learner who needed a clear purpose and an authentic response. ‘All learning should have a purpose and we need to show them (the students) the purpose and meaning for learning.’

For Gail, examining her own learning led her to value the sharing of what one is learning as a powerful learning tool. ‘Sharing with colleagues is so important’, she claimed. She was also becoming aware of the need to articulate the purposes for learning as indicated in the following, ‘Learning is functional and it depends on the interaction with people - which makes a case for collaborative learning’.

Denny also identified the need for learners to understand the purposes for the learning which they were being asked to do. She went so far as seeing the need for students (herself included) to understand what processes they use as learners and the language they use to achieve what they need to achieve. Thus it was important, she believed, to make explicit for learners the purposes and processes of learning.

Thus, it would seem that the processes these teachers went through during their participation in Frameworks forced them to consider themselves as learners; to consider the processes they as learners go through whether it be to read, to write, to spell or to learn anything. They realised that knowing the purposes for their learning was clearly an asset in the learning process and being able to use language activities such as reflection and collaboration were powerful learning tools.
It would appear that they were developing a meta-awareness of learning, learning processes and the roles that language played in these processes. Significantly, as they became more meta-aware they were able to see the implications of this understanding for the learning of their students and their teaching practices. Denny summed this up when she said, 'I guess the kind of growth I am seeing in myself is summed up in that term "metacognition". I'm able to start using what I used to call "gut-feelings" - that knowledge that I've acquired through my experiences here - and I'm starting to value it'.

It seemed that all four teachers were beginning to develop a coherent personal theory of learning, which they were also beginning to be able to articulate clearly. This theory seemed to be emerging from the insights they were gaining as they reflected on their own learning experiences and what worked for them as learners and the realisation that if this was what worked for them, should not their students be given the same opportunities.

_Natural Learning Theory (Theory of Others)_

All but Lonnie indicated that they had heard of natural learning theory before and believed in that philosophy as a powerful classroom philosophy. Through their participation in _Frameworks_ this theory was revisited and clarified for Denny, Ginny and Gail. All four teachers indicated they accepted natural learning theory as the most appropriate learning philosophy for the learning of literacy as they stated it made 'so much sense'. The difficulty arose when trying to implement it in the classroom. This was a huge barrier for Lonnie to negotiate his way through, whereas it forced the others to make various connections with what they were already doing, and to be able to clarify and articulate their beliefs about learning. Thus the theory of others (i.e. natural learning theory) in which they were immersed impacted on each of them but in differing ways.
Lonnie realised that there was conflict in the philosophy he used to drive the instruction in his classroom and what he put in place in other settings. He indicated that the conditions he had in place in his home for his own children's learning and when he was coaching the high school wrestling team were very much natural learning conditions. The practices in his classroom however did not reflect this philosophy. They reflected a traditional skills based approach which was teacher controlled.

Denny was able to 'dig deeper' into what natural learning theory meant for her. She focused on the need to 'make it [learning] as real as possible so he [sic] feels that I'm being honest with him in my teaching and he can see the need to learn'. This focus on honesty and the caring relationships which need to be in place was something that Denny continued to make connections about throughout the Frameworks program as it was something the facilitator had constantly modelled. Her beliefs were best summed up by an entry in her learning journal.

What also intrigues me about learning that I wish to share with my students is that (1) we all do it and (2) we all have important feelings or knowledge about learning. Every person's comment is worthy. Knowing this is a great self esteem builder. (Learning Journal, 23.9.90)

Ginny made the connection that the conditions of learning were not discrete elements but that they overlapped. This was particularly evident to her when she began to consider how they operated in the classroom setting. Her focus became the 'constant need for demonstrations and modelling' and the need to make explicit the purpose for such demonstrations.

As Gail began to understand natural learning theory she made the connection as to why she should not fragment learning without giving her students the 'big picture' first. This connection linked with the need to make explicit to her students the purposes for learning and the learning processes themselves. She herself was gaining the 'big picture'.
It was evident that Frameworks had a major impact on these four teachers’ understandings about learning and the processes learners go through. Each teacher was immersed in the same program and was asked to read the same material but each took from it that which he/she found supportive at the time for his/her learning needs. All appeared to be beginning to develop a personal theory of learning. This personal theory seemed to develop out of their own tacit knowledge of their own learning which they had been forced to examine through the various workshops in Frameworks. It was further developed, challenged, strengthened and articulated through the input of a theory known as ‘natural learning theory’. By the end of Frameworks all four were beginning to articulate their own personal theory of learning.

Nature of Language

All teachers began to make connections about the nature of language. Again these connections differed for each according to their personal bias and the background experiences they brought to Frameworks. However, all became aware of the connections between reading and writing. Once they understood this connection they also began to realise the power of demonstrating written texts to learners as models of how written language works.

For Ginny this connection was what she had been looking for to help her ‘put the chunks together’. She began to understand that ‘reading is writing too’ and that she did not have ‘to chunk my lesson plan book into “this is reading” and “this is writing”’ (Interview, 10.10.90).

Denny and Gail commented that Frameworks had ‘deepened’ their knowledge of the writing process. They both had been implementing ‘writers’ workshop’ in their classrooms but Frameworks gave them a deeper understanding of the writing process and the ‘connectedness’ of the four language modes. Denny commented, ‘If you can
write it then you can read it. I just felt the two were connected. One was when you're reading, it is running through the cells in your head and when you write it's in your hands but it is all part of the same thing. Language.’ (Interview, 24.10.90)

Gail and Ginny both commented that, as a result of examining their own writing processes and the linguistic choices they made when writing the two pieces of different texts, they had greater insights into how writing worked for themselves. Gail made the connection that the process of writing was a recursive process not a linear one. Ginny made the connection that she seemed to go through a similar process to everyone else and that her students probably do the same thing.

The role that purpose and audience plays in composing written text was another major connection that all four made. This led to an understanding of the concept of genre and what ‘good’ writing was. This understanding was further enhanced by the understanding that ‘writing is more than talk written down’ (Ginny, 10.10.90).

The notion of the four language modes being connected was further supported through the connections made about the reading process and how reading works. They all found that this understanding further supported the reading-writing connections and that ‘when kids are writing, I can still say that is reading’ (Ginny, 6.11.90).

Gail indicated that she not only now understood how the four language modes were connected but also was now able to understand the terminology for explaining this. Coming to understand the terminology, developing a shared meaning for these terms, added to her overall understanding of language as she not only ‘understood what they [the three cueing systems] mean but also how I use them as I read. I could see how you rely on them (as a language user) but finally yesterday I felt it was when I really felt like I have made the systems my own’ (Gail, 24.10.90). This terminology was introduced
early in *Frameworks* and revisited in each of the sessions which focused on language processes (namely Sessions 3, 4, 5 and 6).

Thus, as a result of the teachers' participation in *Frameworks*, it is evident that the key concepts as outlined in the program about language and the 'connectedness' of the four language modes became very much part of the teachers' new knowledge and beliefs. They all began to view language as a set of connecting skills and strategies which grew out of the same overall knowledge base of language (i.e. semantic, syntactic and graphophonic knowledge) and that learning in one area such as writing would support learning language in other areas such as reading or listening. Reading and writing were not discrete subjects or skills to be taught in readers' workshop, or writers' workshop. If the skills and strategies were connected then this impacted on how they should organise their teaching and the way they distributed time to the teaching of reading and writing.

The understanding that the written text was structured differently to oral text and that both were shaped by the purpose, audience and subject into a particular genre was also a key connection for them all. It was a connection however which then changed the way they viewed the teaching of reading and writing in content areas. They all began to understand that much of the written texts which they wanted their students to learn would be best dealt with within content areas such as Science, Social Studies. *Frameworks* seemed to have a major impact on the teachers' beliefs and understandings with respect to understanding the teaching of reading, writing and spelling (literacy processes).
Nature of Teaching

All four began to view their roles as teachers differently. They began to understand the importance of the students taking more responsibility for their learning. They began to realise the vital role of giving explicit demonstrations to their students of that which is to be learnt. An implication of understanding these factors was that they, as teachers, needed to know why they were teaching what they were teaching and furthermore they needed to constantly make these purposes explicit to their students.

They all began to understand that these roles changed during the course of a day’s teaching. Sometimes they guided student learning, sometimes they instructed. However, they recognised that they as teachers no longer should perceive themselves as the person who ‘had all the answers’. Students also bring a great deal of knowledge and expertise to a learning experience. Thus they all began to realise that, ‘It’s OK for the teacher not to have all the answers, that she can help the child and together they find the answer’ (Denny, 6.11.90).

The shift from teacher centred to child centred learning was a key connection for Lonnie who realised that ‘it is no one’s fault if they [the students] can’t do it [that which is being taught] on the spot. It is not my fault either and I have something to go with [in future teaching]’.

Their participation in the various activities and workshops in Frameworks gave them insight into the nature of the teaching of the facilitator. This was a form of modelling which they themselves could draw on as they began to change their teaching styles.

This participation also focused them on what they as learners needed, valued, and found useful with respect to the teacher and the activities and general ethos which she created. Such introspection led them to consider what this all meant for their own teaching practice and the classroom ethos they created for their students. Gail and
Denny found, for example, that their beliefs about language and learning were in conflict with the way they had been teaching spelling. Denny began to change this early in the program, introducing a spelling program which was more congruent with her beliefs, but Gail struggled with this all the way through the program. She identified all the reasons as to why she should change but the need to ‘hang on to her security blanket’ until all the pieces were in place was strong. However, she was aware of the mixed messages that she was giving her students. A key factor here was that there were many aspects of the program which kept reinforcing for Gail the need to change her spelling program, however it was always her responsibility to make the decision. She did not indicate that she felt pressured by the facilitator or the program itself. In fact it would seem that Frameworks actually gave her the support which she needed to begin to remove her ‘security blanket’ and thus begin to change her practice. It is important to note here that Gail’s beliefs about the teaching of spelling had begun to change long before she had the confidence to begin to change her practices.

Thus it would seem that there was a strong impact on all four teachers with respect to the nature of teaching as a result of their participation in Frameworks. They all admitted that they were changing or attempting to change not only many of their teaching procedures but the whole classroom ethos. There was, in all cases, evidence of a paradigm shift occurring in their beliefs and practices about learning and language learning.

This impact seemed to result from two major sources. First, as the teachers began to experience the type of teaching which Frameworks was actually espousing through the workshops and other activities, and they began to reflect on what this meant for themselves as learners and language users, they began to realise the implications for their own teaching. This can be likened to viewing learning and language learning from an 'inside out' perspective.
Second, the experience of the program's processes and the ethos which permeated all sessions were strongly supported by the new understandings about learning and language, about reading, writing and spelling. These new understandings and experiences of the processes involved were readily accommodated and transformed into their own personal beliefs about language and learning. This can be likened to viewing learning and language learning from an 'outside in' perspective. What followed seemed to be a constant interaction with ‘what I know, understand and do as a learner and language user’ with ‘what I am learning about learning and language’ with ‘what others say they do in their classrooms’ with ‘what I do and/or, need to do, in my classroom for my students’ (i.e. the interactive and integrative staff development model in action).

This process seemed to lead all teachers to have a clearer picture of what they were doing and why. It also helped them clearly identify what they needed to know, or to change, and why. It was an empowering process.

The Nature of Evaluation

Although all of the teachers could discuss the changes needed in the practical aspects of evaluating their students' needs, only two of them indicated that they had begun to make connections about the learning theory they had begun to accept and make explicit, and the process of evaluating such learning. This is not to say that the other two had not begun to think similarly, however if they did, it was not evident in the data.

Gail and Ginny both indicated that the evaluation issue had been a contentious one for them for some time. Gail stated, 'I have sensed ever since I started attempting whole language that the report card we currently use does not reflect the kinds of learning and strategies that are taking place' (Learning Journal, 28.10.90). Ginny had experienced similar conflict but had been unsure what she could do about it until she began to understand the notion of responsive evaluation introduced to her during Frameworks. Once she had made the connection that the markers she used in the evaluation of her
students were a reflection of what she believed in language education overall, she
seemed to feel confident about the whole evaluation process. It was as if this
understanding was the final piece in the jigsaw for Ginny. She indicated that she now
clearly saw the ‘big picture’ and realised that evaluation and teaching were much the
same process; that she was evaluating her students during her teaching and they were
rarely aware that they were being evaluated.

There was a lack of congruence between the beliefs and practices at the District level,
Ginny believed, and this she felt needed to be addressed if teachers were to feel
confident to try new philosophy. The District supported the whole language
philosophy, she felt, but had not considered changing its evaluation policy accordingly.
She thought that this was unfair and called for the District to support teachers as they
tried to implement new philosophy. Without such support teachers would constantly
bow to the pressure of parents and the students ultimately would be the ones who
suffered from such conflict.

Thus, it seemed that it was vital that the evaluation process reflected the teachers’
changing beliefs about language and learning. Once this became a conscious process
the teachers felt more comfortable with what they were doing in their classrooms and
more confident about justifying their students’ progress to the parents. It appeared
evident that Frameworks had the capacity to provide teachers with the knowledge base
and thus the support which they needed to be able to match their beliefs and practices in
evaluation of language and learning. However, it was also apparent that this issue went
beyond the classroom. Teachers needed to know that they had the full support of the
District in order for them to be able to communicate their changing philosophy and
practices in teaching and evaluation with the parents. This support seems to be an
important link in the change process.
The Role of Language in Learning

All teachers became more aware of their own language processes and how they went about reading, writing, spelling due to their involvement in the workshops in Frameworks. However, Gail and Denny appeared to become more conscious of how they used language in their own learning. These insights had ramifications for their teaching.

Both indicated that they had begun to understand the social and functional nature of language. For example, group work had been very much part of their classroom settings previous to their involvement in Frameworks. However, once they themselves had been involved in collaborative group work during the Frameworks program, they indicated that they realised not only that collaborative learning was a ‘good’ classroom activity but could articulate why it was a ‘powerful learning tool’ for themselves and their students.

This more conscious awareness of the social and functional nature of language was evident also in their understandings of how the language modes were integrated. Gail’s statement, ‘Isn’t that what whole language is - the integration of language in all areas?’ seemed to sum up the connections being made.

Such an understanding of language and its role in learning seemed to be followed by a change in the actual language the teacher and students used in the classroom. This language reflected the need to value and respect each other as learners and thus set up trusting relationships between teacher and students and among students.

Denny indicated that this understanding and consequent change in language and its use resulted from her involvement in the various workshop activities in which ‘[y]ou’re required to be a risk-taker in a small group ... because you’re reflecting out loud and
you're hoping that they [your friends] will be tolerant with what you are saying and respect it’ (7.11.90).

Thus, it seemed that participation in Frameworks gave teachers the opportunity to understand the role that language played in their own learning. They began to understand why activities such as collaborative group work, reflective learning and sharing time were ‘powerful learning tools’ for them. Such insights led them to consider what this meant for their classrooms and, in particular, their role in the learning of their students. They were aware that they became facilitators and guides in the classroom rather than the person with all the knowledge. This role change meant a change in the relationship they established with their students and expected to operate among their students. A change in the relationships meant a change in the way language was used. These changes did not occur in any linear process, rather they co-occurred, one impacting on the other in a symbiotic process.

**Making Connections: Implementation of New Practice, Overt Teacher Change**

A major component of the Frameworks program was a focus on classroom practice. Teachers were asked to try a particular strategy in their classroom between each session. The trialling of this strategy and the consequent reflection and sharing on its implementation were integral to the following session’s processes and content.

The teachers also experienced teaching strategies as part of the program. What teachers did in their classrooms as a result of this involvement and trialling was identified as overt teacher change. Not only could the changes in practices be described by the teachers but the overt changes were more readily seen in operation in their classrooms. These overt changes fell into the following categories.
Strategies

All teachers trialled the instructional strategies which were introduced during sessions. Although they claimed that many of the strategies were not new to them they all agreed that they gained new insights into how the strategies could be used as part of their repertoire of classroom strategies. All could see how they could adapt the strategies to suit their particular foci and needs.

The two instructional strategies which appeared to have the greatest impact were the learning journals and Modelled Writing. They could see value in the former as an evaluation tool whereas the latter was a powerful teaching tool.

The instructional strategies which were trialled appeared to give the teachers new insights into, and understandings of, their students' learning. Denny found the learning journal allowed her to 'eavesdrop on their thinking'. Lonnie found that his students often knew more than he had assumed. Gail and Denny found the strategies gave their students insights into their own learning processes. Ginny found strategies such as retelling and peer proofreading gave her a 'clear picture of what a child knows about language'.

The teachers became aware that these strategies (and others) could be used to evaluate students' needs as well as in teaching students. This focus, and the information gleaned, seemed to support the move which the teachers were making from a more teacher centred to a child centred learning culture.

The teachers also experienced many strategies which were intrinsic to the sessions themselves. All teachers identified that they were using these strategies in their classrooms also. Ginny was allowing her students to write collaboratively after her positive experience writing with her peers. Lonnie became aware of the power of
sharing through his own experiences and felt justified in introducing 'sharing time' as part of the reading program he was putting in place.

All indicated that the strategies were both flexible and adaptable and so it was their responsibility to adapt them to suit their teaching styles and their students' needs.

It seemed that being asked to try a given number of generic strategies in their classrooms gave the teachers the opportunity to make connections between what they were experiencing and learning through their own participation in the program and what this all meant for their own teaching practice. The response from their students coupled with the insights the teachers were gaining into their students' own learning further pushed the teachers to consider what they were doing in their classrooms and why they did it.

Physical and Social Environment

Although the teachers indicated that they made some changes to the physical environment of their classrooms, these were minor compared to the changes that seemed to occur in the social environment. The one major change in the physical environment was the appearance of wall print around the room; this had been either created by students or as a result of a collaborative learning experience with the teachers and students.

All teachers indicated that they were consciously trying to implement a classroom setting in which the conditions of learning were in place. Also, as a result of trying the between session strategies, the teachers found that they were beginning to change the way they operated in their classrooms. As they became more aware of the nature of language and learning and the processes involved, these also impacted on what the teachers were doing in their classrooms. An outcome of these conscious changes in
teaching practices and behaviours seemed to be changes in the social environments of their classrooms.

These changes were more subtle and thus not as clearly visible as 'a new teaching practice'. Rather, they resulted in changes in the ethos of the classroom or the learning culture. This was reflected in the way the teachers used language with their students, in the way they worked with their students in groups, the changed expectations of their students as learners, the shifting of responsibility of learning to the learner and the making explicit of purposes for learning. In short the relationships between teachers and students appeared to begin to change, resulting also in the way language was used.

This change process was not always a smooth one, as Lonnie found. He stated that it was often difficult to explain new activities to the students and that they, in turn, found it difficult to respond to him. He stated, 'It was difficult to explain it without me telling them', but ultimately he found that, 'it seemed to come together in the whole group discussion at the end'. He realised that this confusion and lack of clarity would improve over time. 'I need to be more specific with directions. I will get better at guiding things.'

It would seem that the process of changing the teaching practices and classroom routines resulted in a change in the language that was used by teachers to explain the new practices to students and consequently to respond to students during and after the activity. Such changes resulted in changes to the teacher's and students' existing shared meaning of what was expected in the classroom. Such a change seemed to lead to confusion and a sense of insecurity about what was expected as far as classroom procedures and outcomes were concerned for both students and teachers. Through the process of social interaction within the classroom, a new shared language began to evolve resulting in a new shared meaning. This new shared meaning seemed to culminate in a changed ethos of the classroom. And so the process continued.
Planning

As a consequence of trying new classroom strategies and observing their students during this process, including the connections they were making with regard to new knowledge about language and learning, all teachers indicated that they had begun to plan changes in their curriculum. Lonnie indicated he was more aware of how students' outcomes and understandings gleaned from one learning experience could inform him about the future learning and teaching needs he could take up in another learning experience. Denny began to move more towards planning an integrated curriculum in which the language arts were being taught in a seamless time period. Ginny was also planning her language teaching within content areas such as Science and Social Studies. Whereas Gail was planning a major change in her spelling curriculum so it fitted within the reading/writing philosophy already in place.

These planned changes in the curriculum and the content the teachers would teach appeared to further impact on the already changing physical and social environment. As a result, the ethos they were experiencing as a community of learners within their learning culture was beginning to be put in place in their classrooms.

Concluding Comments for Part Three

Overall it can be seen that there was a profound impact on the teachers' beliefs, understandings and practices as a consequence of their participation in Frameworks. Each teacher entered the program at a different point and was driven by his/her own personal bias or bent towards learning that which he/she wanted to learn. Each teacher appeared to develop, or at least began to develop, a personal theory of learning, and language learning, which he/she could articulate and use to justify the changes which he/she was making in his/her teaching practice.
The changes which could be seen to be happening in the classrooms were many. Whilst it could be argued that these changes were a direct result of the teachers' participation in the program, it is important to point out that none of these changes occurred in isolation from each other. Nor should the changes in overt behaviour be viewed as occurring separately from the changes which were seen to be taking place more covertly in the teachers' beliefs and understandings about language and learning. The connections between and among all these variables seemed to be linked in such a way that a change in one impacted in some way on another, and so it went on. Thus, it seemed that the relationships between and among these variables were symbiotic in nature and any movement/change in one was contingent upon, yet influenced by, a change in another. What might seem a small change here and a minor change there tended to culminate and snowball into quite a significant change in the overall learning cultures these teachers created in their own classrooms.

What seemed to occur for each teacher can be likened to a 'paradigm shift' in thinking about learning and language. That is, there appeared to be a profound change (or the beginnings of a profound change) in the thoughts, perceptions and values that formed their particular 'vision of reality'. They all began to view learning and language learning from quite a different perspective. This view or vision manifested itself in changes in the learning cultures for which they were responsible.

It can be argued, therefore, that the staff development theory which is inherent in the design and delivery of Frameworks is an effective agent of change in teachers' learning. The structures and processes which are a manifestation of this theory give teachers the opportunities to learn that which they want to learn, or perceive they need to learn. These opportunities culminate into a learning culture which is in itself empowering for those who take part in it.

3 Capra (1983:11) defines a 'paradigm shift' as a 'profound change in the thoughts, perceptions and values that form a particular vision of reality, a vision that is the basis of the way that a society organises itself'.
This staff development theory focuses on four domains of knowledge as outlined on p33. The evidence cited above from these case study teachers demonstrates that through workshops, personal evaluation and reflection, learners focus on 'my personal theory' by being coerced to make explicit their intuitive tacit knowledge and understandings about learning and language learning. They begin to make conscious the knowledge and understandings they already hold and thus they turn intuitive knowledge into propositional knowledge. They are then in a position to examine and evaluate, and thus to identify the lack of congruence between, what they believe and what they actually do in their teaching practice. The process of examining one's own learning processes and language in use leads learners to a new level of thinking and knowing. This meta-awareness gives them the opportunities to examine learning and language in use from the 'inside-out' view and to begin to seek further knowledge and understandings. Furthermore, making conscious the range of strategies and skills which they as learners and language users have and use is an empowering process as it provides them with the basis for a personal theory which has been grounded in their own experiences.

This personal theory is challenged and thus further developed through the constant interaction with the 'theory of others'. The theory of others is presented to the learners from an 'outside-in view' through the reading of articles, through viewing videoed information, through short input sections. Reading and reflecting on this information, sharing their thinking, their confusions, and views with each other gives learners the opportunity to engage in that part of the theory of others which they perceive they need to learn; thus, ultimately, they transform those aspects of the information which they need into their own 'personal theory'.

Providing learners with the opportunity to see how the theory of others is translated into classroom practice is another domain of knowledge. The connections between theory of others and practice are made explicit to the learners through the many
demonstrations which they receive as participants in the learning culture, particularly through the instructional strategy presented to them in each session.

Trialling the instructional strategies in their classrooms with their students is a key link in the learning process. The learners have the opportunity to adopt the strategy as it was demonstrated to them in the first instance. However, they are asked to reflect on the usefulness of the strategy for their students' learning. This process of reflecting, and sharing their experiences with their co-learners in the following session, coerces the learners to not only reflect on and evaluate the strategy, but to also evaluate their teaching methods overall. Furthermore this constant social interaction coerces learners to justify in front of their co-learners why the strategy did or did not work in their classrooms and how they might change it to suit the needs of their students, themselves as teachers, and the curriculum. As teachers discuss their own classroom practices they continue to make explicit the connections between 'their practice' and 'their personal theory'. Their personal theory becomes more and more cohesive and coherent and can be more clearly articulate.

It can be argued from the evidence cited thus far that the structures and processes inherent in the program are operationalised by these four domains of knowledge. Together they form a staff development theory which is both interactive and integrative. An important outcome of this staff development theory it would seem is the creation of a highly successful learning culture. It is a non-threatening and supportive culture in which learners feel valued and prepared to take risks in front of their peers. A strong sense of trust and honesty is seen to exist amongst those in the culture which lead to co-learning relationships. Learners expect and are given honest and worthwhile feedback to their attempts by their co-learners in the culture which includes the facilitator. For these teachers it seemed to be a culture which empowered them as learners who in turn could become empowered teachers of learners.
This staff development theory would be best now viewed as four interactive and integrative circles rather than as four concentric circles as was first used on page 33. The following model, it is believed, more clearly represents the theory as it has now begun to emerge.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 16: An Interactive, Integrative View of Staff Development**

Just how this theory works in creating change or a shift in teachers' beliefs and practices, i.e. in helping them to develop their own personal theory, is the focus of the next part of this chapter.
PART FOUR: THE NATURE OF CHANGE - HOW THE THEORY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKS

Part Three of the analysis responded to the first aim of this study, namely, to evaluate the impact of a staff development program called *Frameworks* as an agent of change in the teachers' beliefs, understandings and practices in literacy education. As a result of this analysis, as discussed previously, there appeared to be a profound shift in teachers' beliefs, understandings and practices with respect to teaching their students within a holistic or whole language philosophy. This shift, it was argued, could be likened to a paradigm shift in that the teachers began to view the teaching of literacy from quite a different perspective to that which they had previously held. Just how and why this paradigm shift occurred is the focus of another set of questions: How does the staff development theory inherent within *Frameworks* work? In other words, there was evidence of change taking place but what was the nature of this change process. This section reports the analysis of the data which emerged to demonstrate the nature of that change.

Four main categories which contributed towards the change process emerged from the data when examined from this perspective. These were Intellectual Unrest: the precursor of the change process; Enablers and Inhibitors of the Change Process; Awareness of and Attitudes towards the Change Process and Insights into the Change Process.

Although it was possible to identify these categories within the data, it is important to point out that the categories are highly integrated and interactive in practice. At this point, therefore, before discussing these in detail the grounded theory that has begun to emerge will be described. This discussion takes the form of a recap of the key principles which have emerged thus far and speculation as to how these work in
practice. The following discussion, it is hoped, will provide an explanation as to how the categories identified in the data worked before each is discussed in its own right.

**AN OVERVIEW OF HOW THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT THEORY WORKED: TOWARDS A GROUNDED THEORY**

Teachers make decisions about their teaching and their students' learning constantly during normal day in the classroom. These decisions are made on the basis of 'tacit' or intuitive knowledge which could be likened to a 'data pool' of teacher knowledge gathered over a period of time from a multitude of background experiences such as previous studies, attendance at courses, reading professional books and articles, interacting with peers, students and others. As a result, teachers develop a particular focus or bent on their teaching and students' learning which, although mostly subconscious, 'biases' the frame through which they view this world.

Thus teachers enter into learning enterprises such as *Frameworks* with their particular personal bias which, although it is likely to be intuitive and unconscious, provides the framework for their future learning.

Once teachers begin to participate in *Frameworks* the interactive and integrative nature of the 'structures', 'processes', 'people' and 'language in use' inherent in the program begins a chain of events. These events do not occur in a linear fashion and, in fact, it is difficult to say just what happens first and second and so on. So much happens simultaneously and in a symbiotic fashion rather than in a linear or parallel way. However, to explain the process, one must begin somewhere.

And so teachers enter *Frameworks* at various entry points equipped with a (usually) subconscious personal bias. Early in the program participation in the structures and processes, interaction with the people and immersion in the language in use, coerce the teachers to begin to make explicit, and therefore conscious, just what their personal biases are. In doing so they also become aware of their own personal learning needs.
And this focuses or frames their personal learning whilst *Frameworks* provides the necessary common or shared 'framework' through its particular structures and processes and language in use, which all participants have the opportunity to experience.

Operating now with a more conscious personal bias, teachers more actively participate in the structures and processes, seeking knowledge to solve their personally identified problems. This problem solving search is driven by a certain amount of intellectual unrest - a state of cognitive tension and uncertainty which evolves from two sources.

First, teachers' participation in workshops coerce them to reflect and make explicit how they go about their learning, how they read, write and spell. The insights gained through this reflection and self evaluation tends to lead to an awareness of the lack of congruence in that which they do as learners, readers, writers, spellers and that which they expect their students to do. They become meta-aware of the range of strategies they use as learners, strategies which they had not realised they used let alone could use to help their students to know and use. This 'inside-out view' into learning leads to an awareness of gaps and a lack of congruence in their knowledge base which in turn leads to a state of 'intellectual unrest'.

Second, teachers are presented with theory of others. Teachers become aware of this 'outside-in view' of learning, reading, writing and spelling through what they are asked to read and what they hear during the input sections in the program. This outside-in view also leads to an awareness of a lack of congruence in what they currently do and believe as teachers and the gaps in their knowledge base, and thus also leads to a state of intellectual unrest.

Intellectual unrest is thus a cognitive state which causes the learner to embark on a learning journey in order to resolve the intellectual unrest being experienced. It is a
search to find the missing pieces of knowledge in their particular learning puzzle in order to make the connections they need to make. It is a search for order in their chaos. **It is the change process in action. It is learning.**

**In Frameworks,** the learner has the opportunity to interact with a range of potential enablers inherent within the program which assist in this problem solving process. These structures, processes, people and language in use have the potential to enable the learners to actively engage in the intentional learning of that which they want to learn or that which they perceive they need to learn, at that point in time, for **themselves,** and their students.

The structures, processes, people and language in use in any learning enterprise have the potential to also inhibit learning, even if only temporarily, if certain principles are not built into the learning culture. Thus it is vital that there are sufficient enablers within the learning culture to outweigh any potential inhibitors to learning and change.

The process of making the connections, of solving the particular puzzle (or part of the puzzle) and thus resolving the intellectual unrest, results in active intentional learning which manifests itself in a change of beliefs, values, understandings, attitudes and practices. An important by-product of this process, which in turn facilitates learning, are the insights gained by the learners into their own learning processes. This meta-awareness or metacognition also assists learners in understanding and accepting the change process in which they are involved. This all can be likened to a paradigm shift with the new paradigm evolving as a powerful personal theory which belongs to a personally empowered learner.

The overall process outlined above is cyclic. There is no end point. As teachers resolve one aspect which is creating intellectual unrest, others are likely to appear and so the process continues. It cannot be allowed to stagnate or there would be no learning; no
change. The more personally empowered the learners become, the more likely it is that they can continue on their learning journey by mapping their own learning path without the need of a formal framework of a staff development program such as Frameworks.

Personally empowered learners are in a position to set up learning cultures which will facilitate so that the members of that culture also become self empowered learners who are in a constant state of change.

Having presented an overview of how the categories all come together to work, it is important now to examine each of these categories with respect to the data which both explain and support the category.

Intellectual Unrest: the Precursor of the Change Process
All four teachers experienced intellectual unrest at various times throughout Frameworks. This occurred for various reasons and was often linked to their own personal bias which they had identified themselves through reflecting in their journals, through self evaluation and interaction with their peers.

Lonnie indicated that there were often times when he left the sessions feeling overwhelmed. Lonnie's major concern throughout the program was the schism which occurred between the theoretical framework he was beginning to accept and the implementation of this framework in his classroom. What he began to realise however was that he could choose to focus on those aspects in Frameworks which he needed there and then. He would be able to revisit other aspects when he was ready.

Thus the personal bias which drove Lonnie was trying to change the classroom practice and evaluation practices he used so that they appeared to fit with his changing beliefs about language and learning.
The intellectual unrest which Denny experienced grew out of her own personal experiencing of, and reflecting upon, her own learning, and the processes and strategies she used as a learner and language user; as a reader, writer and speller. As she became more metacognitively aware, she also became aware of the changes she needed to make in her classroom teaching and the general classroom ethos overall, as well as the importance of helping her students to become metacognitively aware of their own learning processes.

Moving herself from a teacher who must have all the answers to one who was prepared to take risks and work beside her students as a co-learner also raised many problems for Denny. Thus for Denny her personal bias focused on changing the classroom ethos so as to integrate language learning in all content areas through the use of language tools such as reflection and collaborative learning.

Ginny struggled with the intellectual unrest created by her understanding that learning best occurred through interaction and collaboration but that in reality it was difficult to trust that her students were actually learning in the group structures that she established; that they 'were not sitting back and letting the others do it for them'. This concern was exacerbated, it seemed, by her perceptions of herself as a learner. She indicated that she did not feel that she was a 'risk taker' in group situations and learning overall and felt the need to know that what she was doing in her classroom was 'on the right track'. The need for her to know that what she was doing was 'on the right track' led to her feeling insecure about whether the District really supported what she was trying to do as a classroom teacher. The evaluation system in place within the District led her to question the District support given thus far. A further issue for Ginny which she identified as causing her intellectual unrest was the need to understand how 'it (reading, writing) all comes together'. She felt that they were presently 'all chunks' in her head and she wanted to be able 'to pull the chunks together'.
Thus the personal bias for Ginny which framed her learning in *Frameworks* seemed to focus on understanding how students learned through group interaction and collaboration in order that she felt that she could 'trust' that they were learning. This involved understanding how the language components of reading, writing, talking and listening were integrated and could be evaluated in such a way that she was aware of what the students were learning. These understandings would help her to be able to justify what she was doing and why; what her students were doing and why.

Gail entered *Frameworks* feeling that she was 'much wiser' and feeling that she knew where she going in comparison with previous years. Yet Gail, and the other three teachers, experienced intellectual unrest on several occasions as they moved through the program. Gail's particular struggles seemed to grow out of a need to fine tune and extend her developing personal theory about language education.

Thus many of the aspects which created intellectual unrest for Gail caused her to examine more deeply what she already believed and did in the name of 'natural learning theory', evaluate how this was going in her classroom, and examine how she could not only fine tune her language teaching but also integrate the language program across all the content areas. For Gail, it was as if she had adopted an holistic approach to her teaching, and she had some strongly held beliefs as to why she wanted to teach in that way, but now through her participation in *Frameworks*, through her reflections and self evaluation, she was able to make explicit these beliefs and understandings. As she did this, she became aware of the gaps in her thinking and her practice. These gaps, or lack of congruence, created intellectual unrest which then forced her to seek connections between and among these beliefs and practices, thus allowing her to develop a more cohesive and coherent personal theory of learning and language learning which she could draw on to justify her teaching practice.
For instance, early in the program she was seeking ways of structuring writing conferences with students so that these became a more productive use of time. At the same time, she became aware of the vital role that purpose and audience played in the shaping of language; both oral and written. Throughout this period she was also gaining deeper insights into the reading and writing processes and the terminology used to describe these processes. These particular understandings forced her to see the lack of congruence which existed in one area of her teaching with what she was doing in other areas. This created incredible intellectual unrest for Gail as to how she should teach spelling; and how she should carry out the 'nitty gritty' of evaluation. As she progressed through the program she slowly began to work her way through these problems, making connections with what she was experiencing through her own learning, with what she was reading and with what she was trying out in her classroom.

Thus Gail's personal bias seemed to be the need to examine and evaluate her existing beliefs and to develop a more connected and coherent set of beliefs about language and learning which was realised in and reflected through her classroom practice and which would benefit the learning of her students.

In sum, Part Three of this analysis focused on the connections the teachers appeared to make as a result of their immersion in, and introduction to, the knowledge, theoretical principles and practical implications embedded within the Frameworks program. These connections were sometimes knowledge and understandings the teachers admitted having not known before, whereas other connections led to clarification and a deepening of understanding of the knowledge and practice about which they believed they already had some awareness and/or knowledge.

Often the connections teachers made led them to feel uncomfortable with existing beliefs and practices or simply raised a whole set of temporarily unanswered questions.
(It is important to note here that these tensions in, and questions about, their understandings and knowledge base were considered to fall within this theme ‘the nature of change’ and were referred to as ‘intellectual unrest’ rather than fitting within the theme ‘making connections’ within Part Three of the analysis.)

The particular intellectual unrest that each of the teachers manifested at various points in the program seemed to be inextricably linked to their own personal biases or dispositions which, in turn, grew out of their own personal needs. It was as if each personal bias operated like a fishing lure designed to catch only certain sorts of fish; those fish that were needed at the time. Unwanted fish were left unhooked swimming around in the sea of knowledge unless/until this bias changed.

Just how the teachers coped with the intellectual unrest that was thrown up at them was an important factor in their learning. It seemed that the intellectual unrest began to dissipate and lead to further connection making if there were sufficient factors (enablers) within the learning culture which enabled the teachers to continue to seek out further knowledge, understandings and practices to answer their own questions; to clarify their own confusions; to satisfy their own personal biases. Thus it can be argued that intellectual unrest was a normal and indeed a necessary pre-requisite, as well as a consequence of the connection making process, if the teachers were to be further challenged in their quests to clarify and solve their own problems/concerns.

However, often factors got in the way of this process of clarifying and dissipating the intellectual unrest and actually seemed to inhibit the change process. These factors (inhibitors) were often only temporary barriers to further connection making, but they did have the potential to become impassable barriers to the connection making with the knowledge and practices being presented in Frameworks. It would seem that the degree to which the enabling factors and the inhibiting factors existed within the learning culture impacted on the final outcome. That is, whether the intellectual unrest became...
clarified and thus a part of participants' knowledge base or remained a tension and thus a frustrating barrier to the transformation of the new knowledge into their existing knowledge, appeared to be a consequence of the degree of enabling and or inhibiting factors which operated within their learning contexts.

These enabling and inhibiting factors were identified as the structures, processes, people and language-in-use inherent within Frameworks. Thus the program seemed to not only provide opportunity for, but actually worked to coerce, teachers to identify their own particular biases in both literacy education and in education generally. Once these were identified the teachers were in a more informed position to take responsibility for engaging in that part of the ‘new knowledge’ and ‘new practice’ within the program which they believed would be useful to their learning needs. This deliberate engagement in the ‘new knowledge’ and ‘practices’ also seemed to create further tensions or ‘intellectual unrest’ with that which they currently understood, believed and did as classroom teachers. Thus this identification of personal biases and the making explicit of one’s own beliefs seemed to force participants to become aware of the incongruities among and between their present beliefs and their corresponding practices.

Overall it seemed that the sources of intellectual unrest appeared to be twofold. One source appeared to grow out of their own personal biases and their increasing metacognitive awareness of their own learning and language processes. The other source resulted from the teachers being forced to consider new concepts and practices. Whichever the original source, intellectual unrest appeared to be a necessary precursor of the change process; a necessary precursor to the teachers' learning.

**Enablers and Inhibitors in the Change Process**

As stated above there appeared to be certain components inherent within the change process (i.e. learning process) which either facilitated or acted as enablers for change to
occur, or acted as barriers or inhibitors to change. These components came together in such a way that it was difficult to isolate one as being the only component in use, or being more important than the others. It seemed that there needed to be a delicate balance of enabling components in order to facilitate the change process and to be present to such a degree that they compensated any inhibiting components, rendering them to be temporary.

There were four components or sub-categories which emerged from the data; they were structures, processes, people, and language-in-use. Combined they were called 'enablers in the change process' when they were recognised by the teachers as being factors which helped them in their learning, and 'inhibitors in the change process' when they were identified as being potential barriers in their learning.

**Enablers in the Change Process: Structures**

All teachers identified a range of enablers which could be categorised as structural and were inherent in the design and delivery of the program.

*Workshops and activities* were a significant feature of each session. All teachers indicated that the group work involved in these workshops and activities were vital in helping them clarify the concepts and understandings about the knowledge and practice which were espoused in the program.

They all indicated that many of the workshops forced them to begin to make explicit the processes that they as learners, readers, writers and spellers went through, and thus they began to get an 'inside-out view' of the usually subconscious or tacit processes and strategies that they themselves used. Once they began to make explicit the processes they used as learners, readers, writers and spellers, they began to make connections with the information they were reading, and the implications this all had for their teaching practice.
The use of an audiotape to direct the workshops and present the concepts in one session was also found to be very useful by Denny. She commented that being able to listen to the audio whilst reading along with the script was valuable as she was able ‘to relax and listen and know that there’s nothing threatening. If I want to jump ahead and see what he was going to mention, I could do that’.

Between Session Readings were structures which were provided for teachers to be read after each session. Being able to read articles which supported, extended and challenged their thinking and existing knowledge base were identified as being very useful by all teachers. Also they indicated that the readings appeared to be written in such a way that they felt that they could ‘identify with the author’ and link the information with their classroom practice. Denny, in particular, commented that it was important that the language used in the readings was not too academic; that is, written for a researcher rather than a teacher. When authors wrote for an audience of teachers she felt as if they were ‘talking to [her] and not writing for a panel of experts’. This enhanced her concept of herself as a learner as she indicated she ‘felt so good after reading that [reading]’.

All teachers found that reading the articles as an after-session activity was an enabling feature. Lonnie commented that this practice gave him the opportunity to read and reflect at his leisure after each session. He also realised that if he was unsure of the concepts being presented in the session he would be able to revisit these in the subsequent readings. This enabled him to feel less threatened and pressured during the session.

They all found it was helpful that they were asked to read the same reading(s) because when they came together in the following session to share, they had a shared knowledge and language which they could use in their discussions. They indicated that this enabled them to know what everyone else was talking about whilst also gaining
different views from each other's perspectives on the reading. When everyone was struggling with new terms it seemed easier to begin to use the terminology within such a group. Gaining a shared language to discuss the concepts and understandings was therefore also enabling.

Gail commented that many of the readings gave her 'a language' to map over what she was already beginning to think about, believe and do in her classroom. For instance when commenting on the reading about Evaluation she said, '... it is so satisfying for me to have a label for that kind of assessment that was emerging (in my classroom). It confirms the fact that we were on the right track'.

The readings were useful when teachers could make the connections with what they were reading about and with what it meant for their classrooms. This did not mean that the content in the readings had to be always practical in nature but that they were written in such a way that the concepts could be transformed by the teachers into practical use.

It would seem that providing readings for teachers as a follow up to the sessions enabled them to read and reflect on the concepts and knowledge and practice that was being presented to them in the program. It also enabled them all to be immersed in the same discourse - the terminology and language patterns - which both framed and shaped that particular field of knowledge. Such immersion seemed to enabled them to develop a shared meaning base along with a shared language amongst the group. Having a shared meaning and language base gave them the vehicle which enabled them to clarify and make explicit their own personal understandings and beliefs of the field of knowledge within the readings. It also enabled them to identify areas of confusion, to hear differing perspectives and begin to feel 'more in control' of the knowledge. This was not to say that they all developed 'equal knowledge and beliefs' but rather, they developed a language which had a common meaning for them and thus allowed them to
begin to share their perspectives on the readings and thus also to begin to make explicit their personal beliefs and theories about language learning.

*Learning journals* were kept by all teachers to reflect on the readings and the activities they tried in their classrooms. They found this a useful document. For instance, Denny commented that writing in her journal as she reflected on her reading, as well as rereading back over her journal, helped her realise that there were no right or wrong answers not only in what she wrote in her journal but in what happened in the sessions. Having a compilation of her thinking over a period of time enabled her to make many connections with what she had read in the articles, what she had heard in the session and what she was doing in her classroom. Rereading her journal enabled her to evaluate her own learning and realise the connections she had made through the program.

Thus the journal was a structure, it seemed, which enabled them to pull together all the pieces, to link theory and practice, to clarify confusions and to self evaluate. All this seemed to be driven by their own personal biases.

The sequence of information in the sessions as well as across the sessions was a deliberate structure incorporated into the program. This structure seemed to work for the teachers. All commented that understanding the concepts and terminology was made easier when they were presented to them in ways that were both interesting and made sense to them as teachers. The 'easiness' and 'simplicity' of the information, it could be argued, was a consequence of the sequence of the structures within the sessions. The opportunity to meet the concepts and knowledge through video, through workshops and through readings, was always followed by the opportunity to reflect and discuss them with their peers in small group workshops. The opportunity to consider what this meant for their classrooms and to trial activities which reflected these concepts in their classrooms (opportunities of putting the 'theory into practice'), all helped to present key
concepts and knowledge over and over again in a variety of forms. Thus confusions could be clarified and understanding could be maintained and extended.

The teachers indicated that the introduction of key concepts and terminology early in the program and then reiterating and revisiting them not only within the sessions but in the following sessions enabled them to begin to understand such concepts and to use the terminology. Gail, for instance, identified the sequencing of the sessions as being very supportive in enabling her to understand and gain control over the terminology such as 'graphophonics, semantic and syntactic'. These terms were like a foreign language to her when they were first introduced in Session 2. But by Session 6 they had been revisited sufficiently in both subsequent sessions and readings that Gail commented, 'I have made the systems my own. They are more than just vocabulary now. I understand not only what they mean but how I use them as I read'.

Being given working definitions for key issues within the sessions such as 'what is reading' enabled the group to discuss the concepts and knowledge more easily as they all shared the working definition as a starter in their discussions.

*Between Session Activities* were specific structures which teachers were asked to try in their classrooms with their students after each session. These activities enabled the teachers to see how the concepts and knowledge espoused in *Frameworks* looked in practice. Trying these activities with their students in turn enabled them to make connections as to how such practices fitted their developing beliefs and understanding about language and literacy learning. Ginny, for instance, indicated that trying out these activities enabled her to make connections between theory and practice more easily. Once the connections, or 'tie-ins' as she called them, were made by her, she felt more confident and empowered as a teacher 'to justify [her] practice to anyone who walked in [to her classroom]'.
All teachers found the activities enabling in several ways. Some of the activities were new practices for the teachers. Some they had either heard about or were already trying in their classrooms in various forms. The trialling of such activities from the program gave them the opportunity to reflect and evaluate their current practices and therefore to begin to change, to consolidate and/or extend their teaching approach by adding new ideas and practices to their repertoire.

Lonnie and Ginny indicated that being able to try the activities soon after hearing about the concepts and knowledge in the session was an important enabler for them. It helped them make connections between theory and practice that was being espoused in the program. It was useful and non-threatening for them to know that it was not only possible to adapt the classroom activities to suit their and their students' needs but in fact that it was an expectation that it was their responsibility to do so.

The fact that they were all trying similar activities was also perceived as an enabler because they had something common to share with each other. They also found that the reading which was supplied to explain and extend the classroom activity to be very useful. Coming together to share how the activity went in their classrooms not only forced them to make explicit the events which occurred but also to justify why things proceeded or in the case of Ginny on one occasion, did not proceed as was expected. This constant process of justifying seemed to help them in developing a coherent and cohesive personal theory.

*Other structures* such as the questions provided to guide their reflections and discussions and the action plan they were asked to formulate in the last session were also perceived as being supportive structures which enabled them to understand the concepts and knowledge being espoused throughout *Frameworks*. 
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Gail and Denny both indicated that formulating an action plan forced them to set their own agendas for future professional development. In doing so they were forced to evaluate what they had learned throughout the program and identify what it was that they should focus on next.

Overall, it can be seen that the structures which were inherent within the design and delivery of Frameworks worked as strong enablers for teacher learning. The structures were incorporated as an attempt to operationalise the interactive and integrative nature of the staff development theory on which the program was based. It would seem from the analysis of the teachers' comments that the theory worked in that the structures activated the inner core, namely the development of a personal theory of language and language learning; they enabled teachers to access the theory of others, to understand and try this theory in practice; but more importantly they enabled the theory and practice within their own personal worlds to come together. This development of a personal theory which could be clearly realised in their teaching approach was not only an enabling process for the teachers but one which empowered them as both learners and professionals.

*Enablers in the Change Process - Processes*

The processes that teachers went through during Frameworks not only supported them in their learning but also enabled them to gain insights into their own processes of learning, reading, writing and spelling. The understanding of these processes enhanced their knowledge base about learning, about language and language learning generally and more specifically for the students' learning in their classrooms.

All teachers identified several enabling components about the process of working in groups. Generally it gave them all the opportunity to reflect on their own beliefs and understandings of the concepts and practices which were being presented in the program. This social interaction enabled them all to share their concerns and issues with
their peers, to listen to and be challenged by the perspectives of their peers, to clarify confusions they and their peers had, and generally to support each other. Gail commented that 'sharing with colleagues was important because we are all trying things for the first time ... It's food for thought. You're getting another perspective'.

They also felt that being forced to collaborate on tasks in groups was a useful process for their learning. This process, they indicated, helped them make connections about their own learning and language learning, which in turn had implications for their students' learning. Ginny, for instance, gained an 'inside-out view' of the writing process through collaborating with her peers which she indicated gave her a better understanding of how her students learn to write and the struggles they may have in this process. Thus she was in a more informed position to change her teaching practice.

They all indicated that the process of reflecting and sharing forced them to begin to make explicit their own personal beliefs and knowledge in the field. In doing so they were able to identify their own personal biases and work through the issues and concerns which they were trying to solve. Ginny commented that the process of reflection and sharing in the group work enabled her to make connections as to 'how all the chunks tie in'. Gail commented that is was often comforting to hear about 'others' experiences' and to find out that others were having similar problems with understanding the concepts.

However, although this process may have been supportive, it was not always 'comfortable', as Denny indicated, '... to verbalise it [the process of how she learned] makes you think about it ... it is not comfortable to share your thoughts about the process you go through but once you start pulling it together you can see "I did make a connection here"'. Lonnie also found that it was often difficult but comforting to hear and discuss common concerns with his peers. He found being given the time to collaborate on the issues was an enabling factor in his learning.
They all commented that the process of sharing the trialling of the classroom activities to be a useful enabler. Hearing the process other teachers went through and their successes and failures as well as their adaptations gave them a broader view of how the practice worked (or had not worked for some of them). The expectation that they reflect in their journals on how the activity went with their students and share these reflections the next time they met as a group enabled them to make connections between the concepts and knowledge they were learning in the sessions and the implications of these for classroom practice. In doing so they were also being forced to go through the process of reflecting and self-evaluating their current practices and beliefs. This process coerced them to constantly make explicit and justify their personal theory and practices. As the theory and the practice became clearer and the links between the two became more obvious and congruent, the process of moving towards a shared meaning and using a shared language resulted amongst the group. This process was recursive and seemed to give the teachers a sense of being in control of what they were doing. It enabled the group to develop as a community of learners within a common learning culture.

Trying the between session activities was an expectation of their involvement in the program. However, they realised that whether or not they would ultimately add the activities (in their present or adapted forms) to their existing classroom teaching methodology was their choice and responsibility. Lonnie commented on several occasions that knowing that it was his choice as to whether he would ultimately incorporate the practice into his classroom repertoire coupled with the knowledge that it was his responsibility to adapt the practice to suit the needs of his classroom context enabled him to have the flexibility and time to consider the practice. He was more likely therefore to ultimately implement that practice as part of his teaching approach once he felt he was ready to do so.
It would seem therefore that the processes of collaboration, reflection and sharing in group work were strong enablers in the process of learning for these teachers. It appeared that being given the opportunity to work in small groups enabled them to develop a shared meaning and a shared language about the concepts they were learning as well as the teaching approach they were attempting to put in place. This social interaction also began to forge new relationships with their peers; relationships which involved trust and understanding and an appreciation of each other's perspectives and opinions. This shared or group constructed meaning was something that existed outside each individual but was common to the group and thus connected all the individuals in the group. Such a connectedness seemed to create relationships among the group which were open and honest and thus were the basis for them to operate as a community of learners within a supportive learning culture.

**Enablers in the Change Process: Role of Language**

The role that language played in the group workshops and activities was identified as an enabling process in its own right. Denny and Gail in particular found that these activities forced them to use the language of the content and that this in turn helped them to understand the content. That is, they were placed in situations in which it was impossible to share, to reflect, to discuss with their peers without attempting to use the terminology and the language patterns of the content in which they had been immersed. They were learning the language; learning through the language as they learned about the language. They all became aware that if their students were given similar opportunities for using language their learning also would be enhanced as they gained control over the language.

Denny realised that the process of using language to share her thoughts both orally with her peers and in written form to herself in her journal enabled her to make explicit what she already knew; what she was learning about and coming to grips with. Although it was a risk-taking experience for her she found the experience of sharing and hearing...
other's opinions, experiences and interpretations of the terminology and concepts which they were all meeting in the readings as well as in the sessions enabled her to reflect and adjust her beliefs and knowledge. Added to this was the knowledge that began to emerge within the community of learners that there were no right or wrong answers, that everyone's opinion was valued and that the expectation was for the group to work collaboratively to clarify meanings.

Although group work and co-operative learning were a part of their existing classroom organisation it was not until the teachers were placed in these learning situations themselves that they realised why 'talking and writing one's way to meaning' were powerful learning tools and therefore why these classroom structures were useful. Gail and Denny commented that it was important for students to understand (as they had come to understand) how their language use was orchestrated by the audience and purpose for that language, and how the use of language to problem solve collaboratively, to reflect, to share empowered them as young learners.

This process was also enhanced by the working definitions that were embedded in the program for the group to use as a starting point for discussion. Denny commented, 'the term "genre" was an obvious thing [i.e. being specific terminology]. But once you realised from the background [reading] it's a simple word ... but then you go back and understand from the reading what the real meaning is behind all those simple words'.

Thus it seemed that the teachers' learning of language was greatly enhanced through the use of language. Language carried the meanings and concepts inherent within the program. Language was used as the vehicle to clarify the meanings and concepts. Language was used to make explicit the processes which each of the teachers went through as they went about using language, as they read, wrote and spelt. Language was used to make the connections between and among the various sections of the program. Denny, for instance, commented that the process of collaborating and sharing
with her peers forced her to use the language (the discourse of the content) and thus she began to clarify the meanings of the terminology and make connections with what she was reading and what she was trying in her classroom with what she already thought and believed. However it was not just using language in this way during the sessions that helped the teachers in their learning, but knowing why and how language used this way assisted learning. Thus language and its use appeared to be the integrating force in the curriculum as well as the transformation of the concepts within this curriculum into their own personal knowledge and understandings.

Enablers in the Change Process: Contexts and People

There were various people in different contexts whom teachers identified as being supportive and thus enablers in their learning.

The facilitator's skills to create a weekly context which the teachers identified as being non-threatening and highly supportive was identified by all teachers as being very supportive. It was a context which enabled the teachers to feel confident that they could be risk-takers, in which they could share their newly formed and sometimes confused understandings and beliefs with their peers and receive feedback, comments and questions from them. It was a context in they were encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning. It was a context in which they could operate as a community of learners.

The facilitator was identified by all as the most important support in their process of learning. It was not simply that the facilitator was able to support them during the sessions but that she was on site during the between session periods. Being on site meant that there was someone available to them at a point in time when they personally needed support, clarification and/or affirmation. Not only could they seek her out for clarification and support but she would also come into their classrooms on request and
demonstrate teaching strategies with their students, help them identify teaching resources and generally respond to their own personal needs and biases.

They all commented on the skills of the facilitator; to keep them on task, to keep handing them the responsibility for their learning, to guide but not control, to clarify where needed, to value them as learners, to seek and value their opinions, to model the classroom strategies/activities for them. The role that the facilitator played was also very much a consequence of setting up the structures inherent within the program. However, the skill of the facilitator in establishing a non-threatening and supportive learning context in which the teachers felt safe to take risks as learners was a strong enabler in their learning.

The facilitator modelled not only the strategies which were an important part of each session but a teaching style and ethos which reflected the philosophy of holistic teaching espoused in Frameworks. Thus the teachers felt, or experienced, what it meant to be part of a workshop in which there were no right or wrong answers, in which they were to collaborate, to reflect and come up with a consensus of opinion which was accepted and valued. Thus this learning context not only supported them as learners but offered them a model as a teacher, as a facilitator-in-action, as well as a model for the establishment of such a learning context within their own classrooms.

The students in the teachers' care were also an important part of their learning contexts. The response of their students to the activities the teachers trialled with them was an important enabler. The teachers indicated that they not only learned a great deal about their students but also a great deal from them. Within this context the teachers also evaluated themselves as teachers as well as evaluated their current practices.

They all commented that the process of trying the new practices with their students gave them insights into how their students learned. For instance, Denny found that asking
her students to keep learning journals enabled her to 'peek into their brains' and to 'eavesdrop in on their thinking'. As she was keeping a journal herself she indicated that she was constantly making connections with what she was being asked to do within the context in which she was the student and what her students were doing within the context in which her role had changed.

When engaged in the same activity, all teachers found that their students made similar connections about language and learning as they themselves had done when they did the activity as students in the session. 'They [my students] were making the connections also', Gail noticed. This response, plus the positive attitudes the students displayed, gave the teachers the confidence to continue. Lonnie's comment, 'Things must be working', was typical and demonstrated that not only was the students' response positive but the actual learning outcomes were equal and often of a higher quality than was the norm.

Ginny commented that being able to get this type of instant feedback from her students was critical in her learning. Learning from them and with them as she was participating in each session, she indicated, was the most powerful learning enterprise in which she had been involved. She went as far as warning the authors that the program would fail if it was run as a summer workshop because the teachers would not have access to their students. This view was held by all the teachers but voiced most strongly by Ginny.

All teachers indicated that the researcher played a supportive role as part of the community of learners. They could seek clarification and further information both during the sessions and during the subsequent interviews with the researcher.

All teachers indicated that much of their learning took place at home. It was mostly at home that they read the articles, reflected and wrote in their journals. Thus the opportunity to be able to use their home contexts as a learning environment was also an...
enabling component in their learning. Lonnie indicated that he became aware that the learning context he and his wife set up for their children was one in which natural learning could occur. However, he realised that, although he encouraged the setting up of this learning culture for his children, he did not offer the same opportunities for the students in his classroom. Gail indicated that she needed the time at night at home when she could sit quietly and reflect on what she had taken from the session that day. 'I lost a lot if I put it off and so I really thought it was important to find time to reflect that evening', she commented. Ginny commented that she would be using the summer vacation to reread all the articles more carefully. Thus the use of the teachers' home contexts and the support given by the people in these contexts seemed to be vital in their learning.

However, these three connecting contexts, and the people who operated within them, were nested within the school context which, in turn, was nested within the district context. The personnel from both the school and district contexts were also important enablers for the teachers' learning. All teachers commented that it was important that they had the support of the key persons within these contexts. Parents, the principal and the Superintendent were viewed by teachers as key persons to whom they felt accountable. Thus it seemed that it was important that the teachers perceived that these people not only approved in principle of the knowledge, beliefs and practices which they were learning about and trying in their classrooms but also had some understanding of the philosophy which they were attempting to gain control over and implement.

Thus it seemed that all these people and the contexts in which they operated, were connected with, and interacted on each other, in such a way that together they created the overall learning culture in which the teachers found themselves. The program's design and structures could support the establishment of a community of learners; a community in which the teachers and facilitator and the teachers and their students
could work together, could co-learn in a supportive and non-threatening environment. This was a most important learning culture as it impacted immediately on the teachers and ultimately could lead to a mind set for the learner to the extent that it became both a view as well as a way of learning which each learner had experienced and thus was part of him/her.

However, this sense of community needed to ripple beyond the weekly sessions if a learning culture was to exist in which the teachers could feel confident and empowered learners who, in turn, could create learning cultures in which their students could become confident and empowered learners. Those who held the teachers accountable, the principal, the parents and the District Superintendent needed to also understand, support and be active members of such an educational culture to such an extent that all members of this society shared the meanings and the language of the culture.

*Inhibitors in the Change Process: Structures*

The structures embedded in the program in the main seemed to enable teachers as learners. However, there were several structures which were identified as inhibiting components or at least had the potential to inhibit learning and any consequent change in teachers' beliefs, understandings and practices.

All commented that readings in which the language appeared to them to be 'too academic' or seemed to be written more for the audience of academics rather than the teacher were difficult to extract meaning from. This may also indicate that the information in the reading was too new or written in such a way that the teachers brought insufficient information to the reading in order for them to take much away from it.

In some sessions the teachers indicated that there was too much information presented to them in too short a time. This left them with a sense of being overwhelmed. In most
cases the following structures within the program such as group discussion, a
prescribed reading and/or the classroom strategy enabled this overload to be sorted
through and clarified for them. Gail's comments in the final interview seemed to sum
up the potential for this inhibiting component. 'We needed more reflection time ... to
think about what you've just learned. That's what I have felt was missing. When it
[information[ is given in a hurry, it's all swimming around in your head ... it's all
important but it is just a lot to absorb and reflect on. The part I find difficulty with is
finding time to reflect.'

The group workshops had the potential of inhibiting learning when the instructions
were unclear or confusing and the purpose for doing them was not made explicit. All
commented that when there was confusion about what they were expected to do, a
sense of failure began to creep into the group until they had either gained clarification
from the facilitator or sorted things out as group. As consequence of this confusion
they often perceived themselves to be 'wasting time' and then having to 'rush through'
to finish in time. Again, Gail's comment was typical of the group when commenting on
one of the workshops, 'Time was lost because we really didn't finish the activity the
way we would have liked to because we were all sitting there and thinking what are we
supposed to be doing here'.

An interesting outcome of realising how poor instructions and unclear purposes
hindered their own learning was how often this must happen to their students within
their classrooms.

Thus it seemed that the main inhibiting components identified by the teachers were too
much information too fast, and unclear instructions and purposes in some of the
workshop and activities. Too much information left the teachers feeling overwhelmed
and insecure about taking risks both in their classrooms and in the group activities
which often followed the input sections. The feeling of being overwhelmed by too
much information seemed to be exacerbated when the purposes and procedures for the group activities were unclear and confusing. (These two major inhibiting components in structures within the program were the focus of major changes in the rewrite of the program. Although participants still comment on feeling overwhelmed by the information overload, the group activities seemed to have been tightened sufficiently that they help participants to work through the information and begin to make the concepts and understandings their own.)

Inhibitors in the Change Process: Processes

All teachers commented that there were times when they were confused about what they were supposed to be doing in the group activities and workshops. Some felt more insecure in taking the risk to share newly forming opinions, and what went on in their classrooms than others. Ginny, for instance, commented that she 'needed a little more guidance at times'. She felt the need to know she 'had the right idea'. Denny also commented that working in groups was threatening and often members in the group 'acted like the kids in their classrooms' because they felt threatened. Lonnie indicated a sense of frustration when members of the group got 'bogged down' and they could not seem to move ahead. This created frustration within the group and strained the relationships amongst them.

Time was identified as one of the major inhibitors of teachers learning new concepts and knowledge and implementing these into their classrooms. The time it took to read the articles, to try the activities with students in their classroom, to gather the appropriate resources needed to implement change in the classroom, and to reflect in their journals, were all identified as potential inhibitors in their learning process. Finding it difficult to find time to carry out these tasks could also be seen as a reflection of teachers not believing that what was being expected of them was important enough to find the time in their already busy schedules.
Teachers also identified the pressures of time within the sessions. Running out of time in the workshops so that the group felt that they had not completed the required tasks created great frustration and confusion. Not having sufficient time to share and discuss the issues that the teachers brought to the Reflection time also created frustration. All felt that more time was necessary for Group Reflection as they gained so much from what they discussed during this section. (This issue led to an increase in time in the rewrite of the program from fifteen to thirty minutes.)

Lonnie also identified the time that change takes overall as being an inhibiting factor. He had to accept the fact that change takes time and not be too impatient to get everything in place at once.

*Inhibitors in the Change Process: Role of Language*

All teachers identified that it was difficult to share their emerging beliefs and practices in the group activities. Taking the risk to give an opinion and not knowing that it was going to be valued and/or accepted was inhibiting. This process of sharing often involved having to use the terminology and language patterns which were inherent within the content of the program and which they did not feel they had under control and therefore lacked confidence in using.

It was equally as threatening to use this language in the classroom with their students. Lonnie indicated that he found it difficult to explain some of the activities to his students as he did not have the language under control and nor did they. It was necessary, he found, 'to put words in their mouths' until they began to realise the forms of language he wanted them to use.

Gail and Denny commented that they realised that much of what they expected from their students was never really made explicit to them. Having experienced in their own learning how less ambiguous learning tasks become when the purposes for the task are
given and the terms explained, they began to realise the importance of making explicit for their students the meanings of certain terms they should use in their classrooms such as 'audience' and 'purpose' and why these terms were used.

All teachers realised that just as they had found activities confusing when they were not sure of why they were being asked to participate in them, so too would their students. However introducing new language into their teaching approach could be quite difficult as there was always a period of confusion until the teachers and students began to share the meaning of the new language and thus gain control over not only the meanings but also the structures and patterns of the language.

Thus, the feelings of insecurity and risk taking that teachers sensed when they were put into situations where they needed to use the language of the content (the discourse of the content) either in group discussions with their peers or in the teaching situation in their classrooms had the potential of being an inhibiting component in their learning process. Their lack of understanding of some of the terminology and lack of control of the structures and patterns of the language inhibited their ability to use the language. However, the only way that the teachers and students would gain control over the language is to use it, and they needed to use the language in order to learn through it. Thus it would seem that the structures within the program and the learning culture overall needed to offer the teachers sufficient support in the form of enabling components so that the teachers do not feel inhibited by their lack of control in using new language.

Inhibitors in the Change Process: People and Contexts

All teachers identified the difficulty of taking risks as a learner, of making a fool of themselves in front of their peers, as being a potential inhibitor to their learning. Denny also identified the fear of taking such risks in front of her students. Becoming a co-learner with her students meant also admitting to them that she did not have all the
answers. This, in turn, changed her status in the classroom. Denny found this a potential inhibiting factor as she felt that her sixth grade students had to also learn how to cope in the changed learning context. Much depended on how they responded to the change in relationships.

Ginny perceived the trying of one of the between session activities to have been a 'failure' as her students response was not as she expected. This could have been a strong inhibitor in her learning had not the enabling components supported her during this time. Listening to her peers in the group and talking to the facilitator encouraged her to reflect on the experience as not her failure but as a learning experience leading her to change what she did initially and try again.

However, Ginny indicated that she felt that she 'had been let down by the District' because, on the surface, it seemed that the District supported the philosophy espoused in the program but still expected grades and tests to be carried out, which she felt was a contradictory expectation.

Lonnie identified the lack of financial support on the part of the school and the District as being a potential inhibitor to change occurring in his classroom practices. To implement such changes he felt he would need more resources and wondered from where these would come.

Parent attitude was also a potential inhibitor to implement change in the classrooms. All teachers indicated that they were concerned as to how the parents would respond. Lonnie indicated that he felt quite reluctant to change his evaluation practices for fear of parent response and Gail commented that she would need to 'educate the parents' before she could change the way she taught spelling. Such forces within the educational culture have the potential of being strong inhibitors in teacher learning and the implementation of new practices. Teachers, it seemed, were not prepared to commit
themselves to a new learning experience if they perceived parents, other teachers, students, administrators would not be supportive of the consequent changes in beliefs and practices.

Overall there seemed to be many inhibitors to learning within the program and learning culture which these teachers identified. However it was necessary in the analysis and subsequent reporting of these inhibitors, to label them as 'potential' in that most had a temporary life span. These components had the potential to become an inhibitor or barrier to teachers' learning. However, it seemed that their power to inhibit the teachers' learning and implementation of new practice was in the main only temporary as there appeared to be sufficient enabling components within the program and overall learning culture to ultimately support teachers in their learning of the concepts, understandings and knowledge inherent within the program.

In fact, it appeared that a range of components existed within this apparent successful learning culture which could serve the function of a potential inhibitor for some teachers. The likelihood of it becoming an actual inhibitor seemed to depend on the teacher's previous background experience with the content, in other staff development programs, or as a learner generally, and on the enabling components which also existed within the program. In the main, those inhibitors which the teachers identified were short-lived as they were able to make use of the enabling components to support them in the challenge of working through, understanding, clarifying the intellectual unrest created by their own personal bias.

**Attitude to the Change Process**

All teachers indicated that they found their participation in the program somewhat exciting and certainly challenging. All appeared to have a positive attitude to the changes they were being asked to consider and make as a result of this participation.
All seemed to be self-directed learners having been involved in other professional development programs over past summer vacations or, in the case of Lonnie, having recently completed further study.

Gail, Denny and Ginny had been involved in moving towards holistic teaching for several years and indicated that they felt reasonably comfortable with the changes occurring in their classrooms. Lonnie, on the other hand, indicated that he did not like 'keep making changes, to invest the time and effort into making change which might just be a waste of time and energy'. He further demonstrated his cynicism regarding past experiences in staff development programs when he added that he became impatient with the time it took to implement new innovations. This attitude to change, he admitted, had kept him from getting too involved in whole language teaching. Although he was aware of the philosophy and liked what he heard, he had not felt comfortable trying to put the theory into practice.

Thus, Lonnie indicated that he initially felt confused and quite nervous about the concepts and practices he was being asked to consider and try. He stated that he often felt overwhelmed in sessions, however, in spite of these feelings, he also indicated that he found the program challenging and an enjoyable learning experience.

Lonnie also found the experience of 'looking inside' himself and reflecting on his own learning and language use a challenge. He indicated that he also initially found it difficult to articulate his personal beliefs and understandings about language and learning. However, he valued highly the structures within the program and the processes he was asked to go through during the program. He commented that, unlike other learning experiences he had been involved in, this one gave him the responsibility for making decisions about that which he wanted to learn and try in his classroom. Towards the end of the program, Lonnie indicated that he was feeling far more confident with what he was doing in classroom as he now understood why he was
doing what he did. This was evidenced by the confidence he experienced when telling the parents why and how he was changing his evaluation procedures.

It seemed that as Lonnie proceeded through the eight sessions he became more aware of his own personal theory of learning and language learning and was better equipped to change his classroom practice so that there was a higher degree of congruence between his beliefs, his personal theory, and his classroom practice. He seemed to feel in a more empowered position as a learner and a teacher.

Ginny viewed change as part of a natural process of her teaching. However, she was also aware that she did not perceive herself to be a great risk taker in her learning. She felt the need to know in detail what she expected to do as she perceived herself to be 'more of a copier ... than an ingenious person'. Thus she tended to need a clear picture of what she was to do and felt insecure when this was not evident as she became unsure as to whether she was doing things the 'right way'. It seemed that as she became more aware of why she was doing, what she was doing and felt confident to articulate her emerging 'personal theory', she began to feel more comfortable about what she was doing in her class. She became aware that once she knew how 'all the bits came together' she was ready to 'justify to anyone who came into [her] room what she was doing'. Ginny particularly enjoyed collaboration with her peers, the facilitator and the interviewer. Thus Ginny, too, seemed to become more personally empowered as she moved through the program and could begin to articulate her own personal theory of learning and language use.

Gail and Denny both indicated a positive attitude towards change at the onset of the program. They both enjoyed their participation in the program and indicated that they enjoyed the experiences and the readings. Both added to their existing knowledge which also helped them to consolidate and extend this knowledge. Thus, having their present practice confirmed and being given the opportunity to make explicit their
intuitive knowledge so that it began to form a clear personal theory of why they were doing what they were doing, they found personally empowering.

Thus, it seemed that all teachers as well as entering the program at different entry points with respect to their background knowledge also entered the program with varying degrees (attitudes) of confidence in their own ability to learn and to cope with change. However, it seemed that the structures and processes embedded within the program provided the scaffolds needed to encourage the teachers to articulate and develop a coherent personal theory about learning and language use which, in turn, empowered them as learners and teachers who were able to cope more confidently with the change process.

Even though there were many times throughout the program when they felt overwhelmed, unsure of what to do and anxious due to some of the intellectual unrest they were experiencing, it seemed that the enablers which were inherent within the program gave the teachers opportunities to gain a sense of achievement and pleasure when they felt they began to clarify and solve their own particular problems. These 'warm fuzzies' came at them from their peers, the facilitator, themselves and particularly from the responses of their students.

The sense of a community of learners which was created very early in the program seemed to have led to feelings of support, being valued, trust, honesty, helping each other and pleasure in each other's achievements as well as concern for each other when appropriate. The expectations within such a community become 'we are all in this together and together we will help each other'. To this end, all teachers completed the between session readings and activities, responded in their journals and were prepared to interact and collaborate in the group work. This sense of community which developed seemed to lead to an attitude that if one member did not carry out the expected tasks, that member was letting down all other members. The peer pressure
and relationships between and among the members of the group therefore can be likened to a web; a break in any part of the web impacts on all other connections within the whole web. Thus this sense of support and caring for each other as learners seemed to be an important component of the learning culture created during the program. It became part of what has been referred to earlier as the 'ethos' of the learning culture.

INSIGHTS INTO THE CHANGE PROCESS

All teachers began to gain insights into the change process as a consequence of their participation in the program. These insights varied in type and depth and seemed to empower the teachers as to what the process of change entailed not only for themselves as learners but also for their students.

For instance, Lonnie began to realise through his involvement in the structures and his experiencing of the processes inherent in the program that it was not a simple transmission of information model. It was important, he realised, that he develop his own personal theory which he could clearly articulate. He realised that he was expected to try new classroom practices, but not to adopt them as if there 'was only one way'. The growing understanding that there was no right or wrong 'way', or answer but rather there was 'his way' and 'his perspective' or 'opinion', empowered Lonnie to accept that it was his responsibility to engage in that 'bit' of the learning puzzle which he needed at that point in time. It was his responsibility to develop his own learning path. He began to accept that learning and change takes time and that he needed to be patient with himself and his students. He realised that it was important to develop his own personal theory of learning and language use and that, in effect, this was a lifelong learning process and, as a result, changes in his classroom practice would always be occurring. His comments after the final session sum up the insights into change which Lonnie made as a consequence of his participation in Frameworks, 'I think it's time to step back and really sharpen and to find my beliefs, establish a program that may take a few years to develop. I'll probably always be changing and I guess I am...
having a hard time realising that it's never going to be one set thing. I really feel that I have the knowledge now to put something together but it's going to take some time'.

Ginny went through a similar process. She realised that change was a personal thing and it would impact differently on people (including her students). Changes in beliefs and practices which caused her some intellectual unrest and feelings of insecurity, she realised, would cause a change in routines and therefore uncertainty for her students. She realised that this was to be expected both within herself as a learner and her students.

Gail appeared to be aware of not only the excitement and challenges of being involved in a program such as Frameworks but she also became aware of her own learning and how she could use a program such as Frameworks to support her in this learning. For instance, she indicated that the teaching of spelling was an issue with her, something she needed to consider but was not yet ready to change. As she considered her own beliefs about language and learning she was pushed closer and closer to 'let go' and 'take the big step' of change. Her awareness and acceptance of this change process, it would seem, supported her through this change.

Denny seemed to have many insights into the process of change which she indicated were important for both herself and her students to accept and understand. Such understanding, she believed, was empowering for all of them. She also realised that her involvement in the various structures and processes in the program had forced her to gain an 'inside-out' view of learning and language use. She became aware as to how the various structures and processes within the program were designed to not only inform her but also to assist her as a learner. This, in turn, was a demonstration as to how she should create similar structures and processes within her classroom.
These insights were empowering for Denny. Her comments in the final interview best sum this up. 'What I got out of this ... it's that I'm going to feel more comfortable trying something new. Everyone in the class is different and next year they will be different again. So I have to keep changing and finding things that work. This is what this course has done for me. It says, "It's OK to keep changing and trying new things. You don't have to follow a set format'.

Thus it can be seen that the structures and processes inherent within the program created a context in which the teachers not only learned about the content of the program but gained insights into the change process itself. These insights helped the teachers understand the nature of change and thus gave them more control over it. It seems that such insights helped them become more tolerant of change as a process as well as the intellectual unrest that is such a major part of any change. Not only did these insights provide them with a greater understanding of change and the change process itself but also an acceptance that change, as an outcome of learning, is part of life. It was as if their participation in the program gave them permission, that it was OK to be in a constant state of change if they were to be perpetual learners. Such an understanding, it seems, took away the need to 'get it right' once and for all. It also seemed to help them understand that they as teachers did not have all the answers either and that their students also needed to understand such insights into their learning. These insights into the nature of change and the change process, it can be argued, therefore helped teachers feel more personally empowered as learners as well as teachers of learners.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The four parts of this chapter attempted to report the analysis of the data, in the form of a case study report, on the impact that a staff development program, Frameworks, had on teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education at Marcus Whitman Central
School District. At the same time, the staff development theory which underpins the program was evaluated and discussed. As a consequence of this analysis and subsequent reporting, a grounded theory of staff development began to emerge. An explication of this grounded theory is the major focus of the following, and final, chapter of this study.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

It seems obvious to say, except we don't practise it, that you can't have a learning society without learning students, and you can't have learning students without learning teachers. (Fullan, 1993:138)

This chapter is the last in this thesis, and signals the 'pulling together of the threads' of what has gone before. Most writers will agree, whether they are writing a novel, a report or a thesis, that the most difficult task is getting started. However, once started another 'most difficult' task takes its place - getting finished. And so it is this task I now face - pulling the threads together into a coherent theory which, it can be argued, has emerged from the data and thus is grounded in the data. Such a grounded theory should adequately represent the phenomenon that was studied. To quote Strauss and Corbin (1990:23),

A well-constructed grounded theory will meet four central criteria for judging the applicability of theory to a phenomenon: fit, understanding, generality, and control. If theory is faithful to the everyday reality of the substantive area and carefully induced from diverse data, then it should fit that substantive area. Because it represents that reality, it should also be comprehensible and make sense both to the persons who were studied and to those practising in that area. If the data upon which it is based are comprehensive and the interpretations conceptual and broad, then the theory should be abstract enough and include sufficient variation to make it applicable to a variety of contexts related to that phenomenon. Finally, the theory should provide control with regard to action toward the phenomenon.

The task now is to present a well-constructed grounded theory which meets the above criteria. The theory presented is not by all means the 'final word' on the matter, and that
is possibly why I find this task now the hardest to carry out. Although this study may be getting towards the end, the thinking, ideas, concepts and questions which have arisen from the study continue to drive me. There is some comforting support for this sense of there is no end (and therefore I can never finish this thesis). It comes from the research paradigm itself. The most important criterion for well-constructed grounded theory, according to Guba and Lincoln (1989:179) is that it must exhibit 'modifiability' in that 'the construction must be open to continuous change to accommodate the new information that emerges or new levels of sophistication to which it is possible to rise'.

Another support emerges from the grounded theory itself. Learning, and any subsequent change, are constant on-going processes. It is comforting to realise that we can never solve the problems; we will never arrive - we simply continue on our own individual unchartered journeys. Accepting the concept that 'productive change is the "constant search for understanding, knowing there is no ultimate answer" [Stacey, 1992:282] (Fullan, 1993:20) gives me the courage to step out into the unknown and share the theory of staff development which has emerged from this study.

TOWARDS A GROUND ED THEORY IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

As discussed in the Methodology chapter, this study was located within a naturalistic paradigm, using a constructivist methodology. The purpose of the study was to develop a grounded theory of staff development. To this end, the study set out to evaluate the impact of a staff development program called Frameworks on teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy education. Inherent within this evaluation process was the evaluation of a personally developed staff development theory which underpinned the design and delivery of Frameworks. As a consequence of the evaluation, it was anticipated that a theory of staff development would emerge which had been formally grounded in the real world of teachers, their classrooms and the schools in which they operated.
The grounded theory which has emerged can be viewed as 'pattern theory' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:206) as it is open ended and can be extended indefinitely. It is a set of principles which explains the process of teacher learning and staff development. These principles do not stand alone; they are highly connected and overlap and in fact are synergetic in nature. However, it becomes necessary in order to explain the theory and how it works to simplify it and speak to aspects of it as if they did stand alone. This is the challenge for me in this chapter.

Two major knowledge bases were analysed in this study. One was the analysis of what others had written in the field; the other was the analysis of the behaviours of participants during their involvement in a staff development program at the site of Marcus Whitman Central School District.

The staff development model which underpinned this program began as four concentric circles but after the analysis of the data, was demonstrated thus:

---

Figure 16: Interactive and Integrative Model of Staff Development
The processes teacher learners went through during their participation in the program, it was demonstrated, created a learning culture in which teachers began to identify and articulate a personal theory. This personal theory was reflected in their classroom practices and developed from their interaction with the theory of others and how this theory looked in practice. Through trialling various activities in their classrooms, being presented with various viewpoints of others, through reflecting on their own processes and practices, there was a constant interaction and integration between and among these four domains of knowledge.

What became clear from the analysis was that this model was only part of the picture. Although useful, it is too simplistic and does not depict the processes which take place during such learning. A grounded theory emanating from this study needed to explicate these process.

I proposed, after reviewing the literature in the field, that a future agenda of staff development rests within a new paradigm. The paradigm from which we have been operating does not seem to be serving staff development well. There is overwhelming evidence that staff development programs and the expected change as a result of the implementation of such programs have not resulted in lasting change; that, overall, they have failed dismally (Fullan, 1991; Fullan, 1993; Fullan and Miles, 1992; Sarason, 1990).

I therefore suggested that we should begin to view staff development from a new paradigm; one which views learning cultures as social semiotic systems in which language is the pivotal force. In such systems, I argued, empowered teachers will view themselves as perpetual learners who are in a constant state of change, and who, therefore, are better equipped to empower their student learners. Teachers will become effective change agents (Fullan, 1993:13). Thus, I argued, teachers need to become
personally empowered first and foremost; and they will be more likely to do so when we acknowledge and understand the learning culture from the perspective of a social semiotic system (Halliday, 1978).

The learning culture of teachers needs to be driven by an explicit learning theory; one which focuses on natural learning and the role that language plays in that learning. The nature and process of change, I argued, are inextricably linked to such a view of learning and language. These learning cultures should be viewed as social semiotic supra systems in which language is not only the major semiotic system but encodes the meanings of most of the other semiotic systems within the supra semiotic system.

I concluded the literature review with a suggestion that the term 'staff development' itself belonged to the old paradigm and therefore was no longer relevant; that what is needed is a focus on teacher learning and ultimately 'teachers becoming personally empowered professionals'. The theory which emerged from the field work in this study sheds light on just how teachers can become personally empowered professionals. The grounded theory therefore becomes a theory of teacher learning which leads to personally empowered professionals.

A THEORY OF TEACHER LEARNING; PERSONALLY EMPOWERED PROFESSIONALS

My first thought when trying to write this chapter was that I have written it all in the previous chapter, so what more can I say. I realise that although this may be so there is a need to now pull the threads together. I decided to do this first and foremost through a model. Although no two dimensional model can ever depict the complexity of the 'interrelatedness' and 'overlapping-ness' of the principles inherent within a theory it can serve the purpose of mapping the territory. The following is the outcome of much doodling. I am sure as I talk to it over time it will change but for now it seems to serve
the intended purpose. Without accompanying text, however, it would be quite meaningless.
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Figure 17: A Model for Developing Personally Empowered Professionals
This model is layered and multidimensional. The top layer if viewed in three dimensions would actually be the bottom layer as it represents the underlying set of conditions which underpin all else. It represents the key components of the learning culture which need to be in place. If these conditions are not in place then there is little hope that the rest of the model will operate and therefore that teachers will become personally empowered professionals. It is not a process of first this, then that; rather, they are a set of conditions which are basic to the dynamics of the whole theory. They make up the key to the paradigm and therefore represent the mind set that those involved need to understand and be consciously working at putting in place. As the other components in the model become operational they impact on these conditions, clarifying them, modifying, tuning and honing them. Synergy is in action.

Teacher learning requires a natural setting; one in which natural learning theory, as espoused by Cambourne (1988, 1992) and Kolb (1984), is in evidence. Such a learning theory needs to 'front load' any 'staff development' enterprise and be made quite explicit to all those involved in the learning process.

Within such a natural setting, conditions for learning will be in place which are highly conducive to durable learning. Such conditions require learners to be responsible for their own learning; although the expectations that learning will occur are high. These expectations emanate from the learners themselves as well as all others involved in the learning culture.

Learners need to be immersed in that which they are expected to learn as well as convinced that that which they are expected to learn is worthwhile to themselves and their profession.
There need to be many demonstrations of that which is to be learned so that the learners, when they make the decision to learn, can engage in such demonstrations (both actual and vicarious). When given the opportunities, learners too can try out that which is to be learned. Such tries are referred to as 'approximations' which learners are not expected to get right the first go.

Learners need to learn to reflect on their approximations and from the feedback they provide themselves plus the feedback gained from those who are more expert in that which is to be learned; they then make decisions about what they need to learn next.

This process is enhanced when the learners have a 'big picture' of that which they are learning, as well as an understanding of the purpose of why they need to/should learn. The process is both cyclic and recursive. As the learners refine and hone that which they are learning they continually go back through the process. Eventually learners feel they have begun to make that which they are learning their own through the process of transforming their old knowledge with the new that they are learning; it becomes time to engage in something new and so it goes.

**Theory in Action**

- All staff development enterprises need to be driven by an explicit learning theory; one which grows out of the natural learning experiences of teachers in natural settings. The 'natural learning theory' and 'experiential learning theory' of Cambourne (1988, 1992) and Kolb (1984) respectively provide useful theories for teacher learning.

Within a natural learning setting there are certain structures, processes, people and language-in-use which have the potential to either enable or inhibit the whole process.
Structures are those components in the learning culture which are set up to facilitate the learning process. These include activities and workshops, input sessions, readings, keeping a learning journal, to name a few. The purposes of each structure needs to be made explicit so that learners not only know what is expected of them but also why participation in that structure is worthwhile for their learning. The structures incorporated into any learning setting need to allow for learners to not only access new knowledge (i.e. the theory of others) but also to coerce participants to begin the process of 'looking inside themselves' so they begin to make explicit their own inner thinking; their tacit knowledge, beliefs and strategies.

Theory in Action

- Structures need to be chosen so that there are opportunities for learners to:
  - gain access to new knowledge in the form of current research and thinking and practices of others in the field. These may include video input, readings, audio input, short lectures
  - have opportunities to reflect on and share this information with others. These may include small group interaction using question starters, writing in journals, collaborating on a given problem to put theory into practice
  - have opportunities to see demonstrations of the theory being put into practice
  - have opportunities to trial the new practice in their own classrooms
  - be involved in workshops and activities which coerce learners to reflect on their own learning processes and strategies; their own beliefs about learning and that which they are learning, their own practices.

- Structures need to operate for sustained periods of time, over time, so that learners have time to try things, read, reflect, share both during periods when the learners come together as well as between these periods.

- Structures need to allow for teachers to carry out action research activities over a period of time.
The structures incorporated into a learning culture are operationalised by certain *processes*. These processes need to facilitate the process of learners transforming new knowledge with what they already know as well as digging deeper into what they already know, think and believe, so that this tacit knowledge becomes propositional knowledge.

The processes of observing demonstrations of:

- that which is to be learned
- hearing the 'think alouds' as others demonstrate the processes they go through as learners
- sharing what one is learning and reading about
- reflecting as inner speech, orally and in written form in a journal
- working through problems collaboratively, and generally
- having the opportunity to interact with peers as well as with those perceived to be more 'expert' in the field,

all need to be in operation. These processes are interrelated to such an extent with the structures which are put in place and the language-in-use that it is almost impossible to isolate them in practice.

A major outcome of these processes is the development of a shared meaning and a shared language amongst those in the learning setting. This move towards a shared meaning forges new and often lasting professional relationships among members of the group; relationships which involve trust, caring, understanding, and an appreciation of each other's perspective and opinions. Another important outcome is the realisation that there is no right or wrong answer. The process of interacting with peers highlights that there are several perspectives and understandings of certain concepts. Working their way through confusions and uncertainties places members of the group in risk taking situations as they air their opinions in front of peers. This process gives learners
insights into their own learning and thinking processes which, in turn, reflect how they will deal with other learners and so it goes on.

The processes also are the active ingredients in the transformation process of making connections between what the learners know and what they are learning. The process of bringing to conscious awareness the process itself leads learners to become meta-aware of their learning and learning processes.

These processes in action lead learners to experience what Barth (1990) refers to as a community of learners. Once experienced, there is a deeper level of understanding of what this concept itself means and teachers are more able to begin to set up similar 'communities' in their classrooms.

**Theory in Action**

- If the structures suggested above are put in place the processes discussed also must implicitly operate; however staff developers need to recognise and understand the processes involved explicitly.

- Staff developers need to make explicit not only the 'how' of the processes but, more importantly, the 'why' of these processes. For instance, why is the process that learners go through in collaborative learning useful to them as learners?

- Learners need many opportunities to reflect on and articulate the processes they go through as learners.

- Thus staff developers need to explicitly demonstrate the value of the processes that the learners are being asked to go through, as well as to demonstrate the value of each individual's processes.

The *language-in-use* as the structures and processes are put into place is both an outcome of these in action as well as the integrating force for operationalising them. Learners need language for learning. Language carries the meanings and concepts of
that which is to be learned. It is also the tool which can be used for clarifying meanings and concepts. Language is used to make explicit the processes that each goes through as each goes about the task of learning. Language is used to make connections; as a tool for transforming new knowledge into already existing knowledge.

At another level, the overall ethos of the learning community is created through language. The relationships that learners establish with each other within that community is a manifestation of the tenor embedded in the language used (Halliday and Hasan, 1985).

Having a language (or 'patterns of discourse') to describe the concepts and patterns of language which belong to that which is to be learned is vital if learners are to transform the information into their own. Understanding the terms used to label various concepts and ideas is an important part of this process. However, making this discourse part of their own language can only occur if learners are given the opportunity to be immersed in that discourse through both the oral and written modes; equally important is the opportunity to attempt to use the discourse in supportive, non-threatening settings. The processes of sharing, collaborating and reflecting are all crucial language learning tools; they allow for the learning of language, the learning through language and the learning about language simultaneously as the language is being used.

**Theory in Action**

- Staff developers need to understand the functions that language plays in society generally and in learning in particular.

- Structures need to be chosen which will maximise the use of language for learning.

- The role of language in learning needs to be made explicit to learners so that they develop a knowledge of the role that language plays in their learning and learning generally; so that they achieve
metalinguistic awareness of the language tools they have for learning and functioning in society.

- Staff developers need to use language in such a way that they demonstrate through their language that they value the expertise that each member of the learning setting brings to the learning enterprise; that they encourage risk taking; that they support each learner.

- Staff developers need to create a community of learners.

The people who create a learning setting all play an important role in that setting. They impact on the learner in many ways. In this study the facilitator played a vital role. It seems that there is a need to have someone who is seen as having the responsibility for initiating, maintaining and monitoring the structures and processes within the setting. This person needs to be someone whom the group trusts; who does not need to have all the answers but is willing to facilitate the process of solving them; who is available to supply the support that each individual needs at the appropriate time and who is known to have the support of the administration.

Teachers' students are also important people in the setting. If what teachers are learning does not have some perceived or actual positive impact on, or response from, the students in their care, then teachers will begin to question the worth of what it is they are trying to implement. The teachers' classrooms thus become vital learning settings in their own right.

People beyond the immediate context of the school impact on the learning culture also. Much of what teachers do spills over into their personal lives. It becomes more difficult for teachers' learning if there is no perceived support outside the classroom, be it at the district level, from the parents of the students or from the people they live with.
Theory in Action

- Staff development needs a person whose role and responsibility it is to orchestrate the structures and processes within the learning enterprise. This person may be a fellow teacher, the principal, or an outsider (it may be more than one person). What is important is that the person does not perceive herself/himself as an 'expert' who has all the answers but someone who has the skills to facilitate the process of establishing a caring, trusting learning setting for the learners.

- It is important that the teacher learners know that what they are learning is not only understood by the administration but is strongly supported both philosophically and financially (if necessary). It is also important that teacher learners understand what is expected from them by the administration as a result of making a commitment to take part in the learning enterprise.

- Structures need to be in place which inform, and where necessary, allow for negotiations with the parents of the students. The teacher learners should not feel this is initially their responsibility although ultimately it should become so.

- Staff developers need to be cognisant of other pressures placed on teachers in their personal lives; and where necessary take these into account. For instance, it may become necessary to set up opportunities (with comfortable space and food) for those teachers who need some quiet time at school before or after the students have left. It would be even better if some time was allocated within the school day for teachers to read, reflect and share when it becomes too difficult and stressful for this to be carried out in the home context.

- Teacher learners need to be made aware that their learning does not stop at the end of a session, or a school day; that it will be necessary for them to find some time to try things in their classrooms as well as find some quite time to reflect on what happened, what worked and what did not and why; to read and reflect on what they are learning and so on.

- Teachers need to become aware that their classrooms are key learning settings not only for their students but for themselves also.
• Teachers should not feel they are being 'coerced' into the learning enterprise by others; or that such involvement is needed because they 'need' it (i.e. remedial staff development).

• Time, money and people need to be allocated for opportunities of 'follow up' for teacher learners.

Structures, Processes, Language-in-use and People are all key components in the natural learning setting. All have the potential to become enablers and thus facilitate learning, or inhibitors and thus act as barriers to learning. At various points in time one or all of the above could have the potential of inhibiting learning. The key to success is having sufficient enablers in the setting so that any barriers or inhibitors have only a temporary life span. Inhibitors need to be recognised by both the individual and the group for what they are so that something can then be done about them. Fullan (1993:28) supports this when he says, 'Problems are our friends; but only if we do something about them'. It is knowing what can be done, or at least where to start, which needs to be in place. Thus the learning setting needs to have sufficient enablers as described briefly above and in depth in chapter four so that the overall learning culture can be created which supports and enhances learning.

The next layer in the model should also be viewed in a three dimensional way. It focuses on learning and the learning processes of teacher learners in a natural learning setting. All teachers develop a subconscious knowledge of teaching, learning and schooling in general. This knowledge, known as tacit knowledge, is knowledge that accumulates over the years of teaching but which is kept at the subconscious level. Although tacit, this knowledge orchestrates much of the teaching practices which can be evidenced in a teacher's classroom. Embedded within this knowledge is a particular bent or focus that a teacher has towards learning and teaching. This personal bias frames teachers' world views, whether they are conscious of it or not.
The interactive and integrative nature of the structures, processes, language-in-use and people discussed above begins a chain of events for those who participate in them.

This chain of events is not linear but symbiotic in nature and begins the process of helping teacher learners make explicit that which they know and believe (i.e. their tacit knowledge). In the process of doing this they also begin to identify their own personal bias. Once teacher learners begin to operate with a more conscious personal bias they also are in a better position to focus on their particular learning needs. Operating with a more conscious personal bias, teachers tend to engage more actively in the structures and processes within their learning culture, seeking knowledge which they need to respond to their personal needs. Thus, although teacher learners enter a learning enterprise with different background knowledge and experiences, they are able to take from the learning setting that which they believe they need at that given point in time. The responsibility and commitment for their learning is in their hands.

Theory in Action

- Staff developers need to understand and acknowledge teachers’ tacit knowledge.

- Staff developers need to acknowledge that each teacher learner will come into any learning enterprise with a different personal bias which frames his/her world view.

- Such personal biases need to be valued and the structures and processes within any learning enterprise need to be flexible enough to accommodate differing views and needs.

- Staff developers need to understand that once teacher learners identify their own personal biases and needs, there is greater commitment to the learning.

This problem solving search is driven by, as well as created by, a certain amount of intellectual unrest. This concept of tension in learning is not a new one (Kolb, 1984;
Cambourne, 1988). Fullan (1993) discusses the concept with respect to teacher learning in his latest writings. Ferguson (1984), Barth (1990), Sarason (1990), among others, would support Block's (1987:191) comments that,

> tension can be viewed as a sign of life ... Almost every important learning experience we have ever had has been stressful. Those issues that create stress for us give us clues about the uncooked seeds within us that need attention.

I define 'intellectual unrest' as cognitive tension and uncertainty and have argued that it is a precursor to learning and change. Fullan (1993:17) supports this claim when he says 'the capacity to suspend belief, take risks, and experience the unknown are essential to learning'.

Intellectual unrest evolves from two main sources in this model. One source is a result of the participation in structures and processes which coerce learners to reflect, self evaluate and share with others how they go about their own learning, and use of language, regardless of the field of knowledge. The insights gained through these processes have been called inside out learning and tend to lead teacher learners to an awareness, first, of what 'goes on inside my head', and second, to an awareness of the lack of congruence in what they do as learners and language users and that which they expect their students to do. Teacher learners thus become meta-aware of the strategies and knowledge they have and need in order to be effective learners; strategies which they did not realise they had themselves, let alone could help their students to know and use. This 'inside out' view of what learning is all about is a powerful learning experience in itself, as it leads the learner to the level of metacognition. However, such metacognitive awareness in turn creates intellectual unrest. And so the cycle continues.

The second major source of intellectual unrest emanates from an 'outside in view' of that which is to be learned through meeting the 'theory (or learning) of others' and thus is called outside in learning. Teacher learners are presented with the research, thinking
and practices of others through various media of input; readings, video, audio, lectures and so on. When the theories and practices of others, including other teachers within the group, are shared this too can lead to intellectual unrest within the teacher learners.

Thus intellectual unrest is a cognitive state which, having been unleashed, sets the learner off to embark on a learning journey in order to solve the particular unrest which is being experienced. It becomes a search to find the missing pieces in the knowledge base in their particular learning puzzle. Once found, the pieces either from their own resources or from the theory of others, allow the learners to make the connections needed in order 'to make the information their own'. (Cambourne, 1992, in press) Transformation occurs and the change process is in action.

The range of enablers and inhibitors within any learning culture impacts on this process. The structures, processes, language-in-use and people within that learning culture have the potential to enable teacher learners to actively engage in intentional learning of that which they want or need to learn. However, they also have the potential to inhibit learning, even if only temporarily. The critical factor is that the enablers within the learning culture outweigh the potential long term inhibiting forces.

The concept of 'inside out learning' in this model closely aligns with what Fullan (1993:138) calls 'inner learning', whereas 'outside in learning' could be said to resemble Fullan's concept of 'outer learning'. Fullan (1993:138) argues that 'inner learning (intrapersonal sense-making) and outer learning (relating and collaborating with others) run together, but they are also separable'. Inner learning, according to Fullan, is the key if teachers are to learn to cope with change. He cites Csikszentmihalyi (1990:2) who argues 'people who learn to control inner experiences will be able to determine the quality of their lives'. Moreover, Fullan argues, 'we must work out our meaning: "subjective experience is not just one of the dimensions of life, it is life itself"' (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990:192, cited Fullan, 1993:139). Fullan summarises the section on
inner learning by saying, 'A personal learning stance is the key both to optimal individual survival and to system change. To accomplish the latter people do of course need others.' (Fullan, 1993:141).

'Outer learning is about connectedness', Fullan states (1993:141). Thus Fullan's concept is more to do with how the personal self connects with others in the learning culture; about the roles and relationships between and among those in the learning culture; those in the system. The concept of 'outside in learning' discussed here reflects more the role that the theory and practice of others plays in teacher learning. As teacher learners integrate the theory and practice of others with their own personal theory and practice the process of transformation occurs which results in active learning and a consequent change in beliefs and practices.

Theory in Action

- The concept of intellectual unrest needs to be understood and acknowledged explicitly by staff developers both in what they do with, and what they say to, teacher learners.

- Staff developers need to perceive their role in teacher learning as a critical friend, co-learner, listener and resource person who facilitates, initiates, monitors and maintains the structures and processes of the learning culture rather than as a 'presenter of knowledge' who is the expert in the field.

- Staff developers need to understand how their use of language as well as the language-in-use within the learning culture works towards establishing a community of learners; i.e. a learning culture that is non-threatening and supportive.

- Structures and processes need to be in place to enable teacher learners to understand and cope with the potential anxiety and stress that intellectual unrest might produce.
• Structures and processes need to be carefully chosen to enable teacher learners to actively begin to solve their learning puzzles and thus dissipate the intellectual unrest.

• Structures and processes in staff development need to provide teacher learners with opportunities to reflect, collaborate, share with each other; to use these language tools for their own inside out learning, as well as understanding at a metacognitive level how and why such language tools work in learning.

• Structures and processes in staff development need to provide teacher learners with opportunities to read and hear the theory of others, to view demonstrations of the theory of others in practice, to trial such practices and then to reflect, collaborate and share their emerging understandings of such concepts with each other.

The next layer in the model (which becomes the second top layer in a three dimensional model) focuses on the beliefs and knowledge that teachers develop as a result of being a member of this learning culture. The process of teacher learners making connections, through solving their personally identified learning puzzles (or part thereof) and thus resolving their particular intellectual unrest, results in active intentional learning which manifests itself in a change of beliefs, values, understandings, attitudes and practices. For many teacher learners this change can be perceived as a paradigm shift in that they change their whole 'framework of knowing' (Ferguson, 1980).

Tacit knowledge which was once subconscious and not known becomes propositional knowledge which teachers not only become aware of but can articulate in the form of a personal theory of why they do what they do. Teachers develop insights about language and learning and the role that language plays in learning. They also gain insights into change and the nature of change as it relates to their learning and the learning of their students. The interrelated concept that learning involves language; language plays a major role in learning; learning involves change; change requires a change in language and language-in-use and so on, becomes explicit and understood by teacher learners.
An important outcome of the processes that teacher learners experience is that they become metacognitively aware of their own learning, their own learning strategies, their way of knowing. In the process of sharing with others they become aware of other ways of knowing. The constant process of their inside-out learning interacting and integrating with their outside-in learning through the use of language tools such as reflection, collaboration, and sharing forces teacher learners to develop a coherent and cohesive personal theory which is an empowering process. At the same time teachers learn to understand and cope with change and the change process. Therefore teachers begin to understand and articulate not only what they do as teachers in their classrooms but why they do it.

As a consequence of all of the above teachers move towards becoming personally empowered professionals. This is the pinnacle of the model. And so the cycle continues. As teacher learners become personally empowered learners, their beliefs, knowledge, understandings and practices integrate to become a personal theory which is in a constant state of change as teachers continue to reflect, to collaborate, to share, to seek information. They are personally empowered professionals who become selective in what is presented to them; who can make judgements which they can justify about the appropriate teaching practices for the students in their care. They become personally empowered professionals who are in a position of personally empowering others in the larger learning culture of the school.

Fullan (1993:143) describes this process as the 'merging of the microcosm and macrocosm', in which teachers must play the major role as 'they cannot be effective in one without being plugged into the other'. Block (1987:190) comments, 'the only culture that exists for us is in the room in which we are standing at the moment. It is the transformation of the culture of the room we are in that holds the possibility of transforming the culture of the rest of the organisation. It is change from the inside out'.
Education plays a major social role in the supra social semiotic system in our society. There is a strong call from policy makers for educators to produce graduates who can 'think critically and creatively, solve problems, exercise judgments and learn new skills and knowledge throughout a lifetime' (Brown, 1991:xii). Fullan (1993:145) ventures more broadly when he argues that education's purpose 'is a search for world-wide understanding and more complex and deeper connections and interdependencies'. The responsibility of such a charge falls on teachers. They are 'privileged and burdened with the responsibility of helping students become inner and outer learners who will connect to a wider and wider society' (Fullan, 1993:147). Such a responsibility is huge - teachers cannot do it alone but it seems at this stage they have to do it 'in spite of the system' (ibid: 147).

Thus it becomes even more imperative that teacher learning - what has been traditionally known as 'staff development' - be able to provide the opportunities for teachers to be able to fulfil their charge.

It is my belief that this grounded theory of personally empowering professionals could be a step in achieving this charge.
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APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND INTERVIEWS
Appendix - A 1
Sample of Field Notes of a Session

Gorham District - Session 2 Observation
Jackie Metz 25th September 1990

The sessions are being run in the library from 3.15 -5.30 (is this right) with a 10 minute break in the middle. Four large tables are set up in a circle, thus:

There are twelve in the group. Tea, coffee facilities and other snacks are available at the front of the room. Jackie has a display board with a chart on it explaining the workshop. On the library shelves are hung charts on which are written the things observed in the video in the last session. At the back of the group there is an agenda of the key points in the day's session: Big Picture.

Session 2

1. Naturalistic learning
   • what conditions are found operating in a natural setting, e.g learning to talk.

2. Can these conditions be successfully applied to any learning experiences in the classroom?

3. What can we do as teachers to ensure that the conditions of learning are operating at an optimal level? How can the conditions of learning drive evaluation?

Jackie began the session by introducing me. They made comments about how they had the real thing this week. It seems they really didn’t enjoy
being videoed. Jackie went on to explain the materials they had in front of them. They had the readings for the next week and a sheet outlining the sections of the session. Someone comments: do you think we will really read this fat one? Jackie replies: You'll enjoy it. It is easy reading. Trust me.

Jackie introduced the Questions and Concerns board to the group and explained its purpose.

Reflection time is introduced. 'It is an opportunity for you to share your readings and the activities you tried and make explicit your beliefs.' They were asked to share in groups of three (they were seated at the desks in 3s. Apparently they were in the same positions as the week before and Jackie comments on this).

(Do you intend to change them around?)

3.30 They begin to share.

From what I could hear from two groups they only got time to discuss the activities. They discuss the Journals and share their children's responses. They also discuss what children wrote about their own learning.

A member of the group beside me asks: are we anywhere near it Jan? I respond that the kids comments sound great. Another member of this group asked should they be responding in the Journal. I respond that it doesn't matter. She can if she wants but there is no requirement to do so. I point out that it is important that the kids know that she is reading them and she finds it useful.

There are some interesting comments from the children but I'm not sure the teachers see the things in these comments that I see. For instance the kids are telling them that they learn in a very similar way as the teachers did out of school, so what is this telling them about what goes on in school.

3.45 Jackie stops the groups and refers them to the Big Picture Chart.

3.46 Jackie explains that they are going to hear a theory of learning presented on the video by Brian Cambourne. She warned people of the length of the video and tells them that they should get up and move about if they begin to feel uncomfortable.
Groups seems to be engaged in the video. Some take notes and all refer to the Model when BC tells them to. There are some comments to each other and laughter at the jokes.

The length doesn’t seem to bother them. No one went to sleep!

4.29 Video finishes and Jackie asks for any comments. There being none she suggests they will have a ten minute break but firstly asks them to read the notes in their booklet as a recap of what they have just seen.

4.40 Jackie pulls the group together, refers back to the video and moves into the workshop.

She asks them to envision (is that what you said Jackie) a whole language classroom is operating and consider the questions in the Booklet. She links this with what they saw on the video the week before. Jackie has the grid on a chart and she refers to this explaining again what they are to do. She gives a demonstration and then sets them going, giving them a time frame and asking them to record their points on chart paper so that they can share it.

The groups begin. A woman in the group beside me asks: How does that teacher control the movement of the children in the classroom? I explain that Dianne expects the children to move around like that; that they jointly work out rules for operating in the classroom and that she will stop the whole class from time to time and discuss the rules they have agreed upon. She often focuses on how they can ‘live together’ in the classroom and not stop each other learning. I used the terms, responsibility, expectations.

Jackie moves around the groups. As she goes past one group they ask her a question: Here’s one that will cause you problems, says the woman. ‘Parents are on a one to one basis, but in the classroom it is one-25. Do I demonstrate quotation marks 25 times? There is not enough time to do that.’

Jackie handles the situation, putting the question back to her. ‘Are you saying teaching them once is enough?’
'Are you still taking the responsibility for all the kids learning?' They still aren't convinced so Jackie suggests she writes the question on the chart.

5.05pm Jackie reminds them they have ten minutes.

5.15 She stops them and asks them to share. There is a nice feel amongst the group and they are making some links. They also are interacting with each other. One group makes the point that they realised that when they were talking about immersion and demonstrations they were also talking about engagement. Jackie makes the link that the conditions don't operate as step 1, 2 but overlap and interact. They go through all the conditions. There is some good interaction here among the whole group.

Jackie sums up the session and points out that they did a good job, taking a risk as learners and giving the workshop a good try.

Jackie then refers them to their Learning Theory and shows the chart they did last week. They go through the chart and she asks them to think which conditions were operating. They go through the whole chart and overlay all the conditions on their theory. Jackie makes a nice link here for them. (Are they making the link from this to their classrooms?)

Jackie discusses the implications for evaluation. Although she is using the example in the manual she is making it her own. The spelling example seems to work well.

5.30 Jackie introduces Possible Sentences referring the group to their Booklet. Jackie has written the words on a chart and she asks the group to read them. Then she asks them to make up three sentences using the words. They do this and the group near me write quite complex sentences. (Shows good linguistic spillover) They share their sentences and discuss whether they are true or not. (I'm not sure whether they have made the connection to the classroom here. I wonder whether this bit is useful as it is very short) I hear people using the terms 'We can celebrate now.' 'They would have mistakes - I mean approximations.'
Jackie closes this section by explaining that this is a strategy they are asked to try with their kids through the week. She suggests they use factual text and offers Read and Retell as a useful source.

5.35 Jackie goes through the BSR and BSAs. She explains why the Holdaway paper is not there and asks them to read the Cochrane paper instead.

It is suggested that as they are late they might like to fill out their feedback sheet at home and put it in her mail.

*(Did you run out of time? Where did you take more time?)*
We began the interview with a discussion of the confidentiality of the data. I also asked Lonnie if he would mind me sharing his Journal at some time and coming into his classroom. Both these requests he agreed to and we will work these out as we move into the program further.

I asked Lonnie what he thought of Frameworks thus far and he felt that he was enjoying it. ‘The time goes fast. That is always a judge that something is working.’ Although time also was his greatest concern because he felt rushed in the sessions. The last part of Session 2 particularly was ‘just like a whirlwind. I feel rushed’. But he also didn’t know how the session could be shortened because he felt that everything in the session was useful. Time is at a premium for all teachers. (*Lonnie, would sessions of 2 and a half hours be a problem if you knew this before you began the course, and if some of the time was given to you in school time?*)

JT pointed out that one possibility for time saving was to eliminate the discussion of Instructional Strategies and have a more indepth reading on it with lots of examples. However, JT also pointed out that this was working outside the philosophy of the course which wanted a balance between theory and practice.

Lonnie felt he would be able to approach Jackie at other times to help him understand some of his confusions. He had already asked Jackie when it would be possible to talk with her.

Lonnie was ‘amazed that I watched a man’s head for 35 minutes straight and that it could hold me, but it did’. He found the message in the video very interesting. He felt that it would help to have some classroom demonstrations in the tape but he had mixed feelings about
that. He found that Brian had given sufficient examples that pictures could be created in his head and he could relate this to the language learning experiences of his own children.

JT asked what were the most important concepts coming out of the session.

The most important concept Lonnie felt was the idea of the natural learning process as it was explained. 'It makes so much sense. It is so different from what we have had (about learning) before but it makes so much sense. It scares me because it is so foreign to the thinking that I was raised in and what I was trained in and been teaching in. I'm not quite sure where to go and what to do next and that's what scares me.'

JT suggests that the last thing we want is a program that might 'de-skill' people and so we are interested if the program does begin to offer suggestions that he could do next.

Lonnie felt that there were general things he could begin to do. He feels the program is giving him some ideas about what sort of environment and atmosphere he needs to create. He feels that he does offer some of those things now but he can see where he can add to those things and the first two sessions have given him some ideas about how to go about that being that type of person; or at least 'how to fit that type of environment to me'.

2. The video:

Lonnie feels that he could relate to the conditions in his own house. 'I have those conditions in my house, but I get into the classroom and I get nervous about what I am doing.' He added that 'he was not turned off by it all as he did feel excited about it all'. He felt that the video was too long and that there were some parts which could be tighter and that some things were repeated unnecessarily.

3. Workshop. Felt that it was useful for the group to talk through what they heard in the video. His group spent a great deal of time discussing expectations and what that meant in the classroom.

JT: Should it be modified/changed in any way?
Lonnie: Once we got going the time went really fast and we got very involved. I really like the small group-large group interaction.

JT pointed out that the recording of comments on the large sheets allowed for the groups to then share very easily.

Did the workshop raise any issues or concerns in the group?

Lonnie: As a group we felt that we solved our concern about expectations and then we could move on.

The most beneficial learning experiences for Lonnie are those where he feels that he is being challenged and being asked to stop and think. 'It is good to hear things which make such good sense, things which support what I already know and also to know that within 12 hours I will be back in my classroom where I try things out.'

JT discussed how we as teachers often feel that the things we do are not really the things that we want to do; that we are often guided by 'our heads rather than our hearts'.

Lonnie then raised a major concern he had about the evaluation he is required to do by Nov 1 for English. 'I'm going to have to give report cards and I'm going to have to put a number on them'. He feels that he doesn't know how to do that if he takes this way of teaching on board. His Principal will support him in what he might come up with but he is finding it difficult to develop something on his own as well as do everything he has to do in the classroom. 'I am not in a unique position. I hate to keep making changes; to invest the time and effort in making a change which becomes really a waste of time and energy. I thought I was ready to make a jump but basically my program stayed the same to what it was last year. I've tried to do a little more with the writing and the reading but I'm still very what I would consider, fragmented, and I have very specific times with my teaching.'

JT: why didn’t you make the change?

Lonnie: It all came back to the grades. We thought of changing the report cards last year or method of reporting to the parents and that's something we can't ignore. The parents are entitled to something that they can understand.
Lonnie feels that parents want numbers on their children’s reports and he doesn’t know how to translate ‘into numbers this process’.

JT pointed out that we are all working towards this and it is hoped that the program will at least give him a starting point. Also that he needs to call on Jackie’s for support whenever he needs it. The Strategy Modules were also discussed and what would be in them.

Lonnie added that the one thing he ‘liked about whole language is that not everything has been given to me and a lot is left to me. I wouldn’t like it if someone said ‘you do it this way”’.

4. JT: What did you think of the Instructional Strategy?

Lonnie felt that this section was rushed as it was near the end and he was feeling confused by it. He wanted to talk to Jackie about it so he can clarify what it is all about. He felt there was something in the Strategy which would help kids gain understanding of vocabulary without isolating it.

5. BSR & BSA

Lonnie liked Brian’s article. It was general information that made him think about the different things you shouldn’t do. The Holdaway article he found difficult reading as there were some concepts he didn’t understand.

The activities he went into not really knowing what to do. The Learning Journals he kept rather structured, because he wasn’t quite sure what would come out of it. Many of the students enjoyed it. He found it difficult to explain it without just telling them what it was. He felt uncomfortable with it at first but when they came back for a whole group discussion he was pleased with what they did. The kids had a hard time coming up with similarities (or what is him having the hard time) He wonders whether it was his problem because he didn’t know how to explain it all. But in the whole group discussion it seemed to all come together. ‘I would do it again because it was interesting to hear their ideas and what works for them in learning. Lots of the things they identified matched up with what we do. I need to come up with some other way of working with the Learning Journal. I don’t
want them to see it as another activity. I want them to get something out of it.'

JT shared what Dianne did with her 6th Grade kids; how she chose kids pieces and share them with the kids and this meant she was constantly showing the kids why the things they were sharing with her on the page were useful to her as their teacher.

6. Impact in the classroom.

This was discussed when we talked about evaluation.

We discussed when I could visit his classroom. He said he felt comfortable for me to come into the classroom. I suggested he tell me what he would like to focus on when I was in the classroom.
Memo to: Denny Clark, Lonnie Gunzalus, Ginny Gridley, Gail Burr, Jackie Metz.

From: Jan Turbill

Date: 25th October 1992

Subject: Carrying out a 'Member Check' of Your Case Study Summary

At long last I have finished all the Case Study Summaries for each of you. I had hoped to have had these done before I came to the US in June but I got three and a half done and had to finish off after the Summer Training. So now they are finished and I am sending you your ‘summary’. I will be visiting your school on December 10, & 11th and am planning to spend some time with each of you on those days. First, let me explain the purpose for carrying out a member check. Then I will explain the process I went through to get to these Case Study Summaries. Finally I will explain what I would like you to do with them.

The Purpose of Carrying Out a 'Member Check'

A 'member check' occurs when a researcher like myself takes the data back to the members of the research community the data came from (i.e. you guys) and asks them to check that she has represented them accurately. It serves the purpose of ensuring that she has not let any of her biases/prejudices influence what she is doing. If you find that there are parts that are not an accurate representation the researcher is expected to go back through her data and look at it again to see if she has included anything that shouldn't be there, or distorted anything that is there. The process of constantly carrying out such checks on all the data is one of the steps taken in this kind of research to reduce the possibility of researchers either intentionally 'cheating' or unintentionally being influenced by unconscious biases.
The Process of Writing the Case Study Summaries

As you will recall when I interviewed each of you I took notes by hand but also audiotaped each interview. Each time I returned to your school I gave you a copy of my description of the interview. This was a reconstruction from my field notes and from listening to the audiotape. My request to you then was to read those field notes to check that what I had written was also your recollection of what was said. There were a few times when you did clarify points for me or I asked for your clarification. This process of you checking my reconstruction of the interviews is known as ‘member checking’. This was the level one member checking.

I took back to Australia then, the reconstructed interviews which you had checked for sessions 2, 4, 6, 8 and also a final interview with each of you as you reflected on the overall course. I also took back copies of your learning journals which you all had kept throughout the course. I also had the audiotapes of each of our interviews. These I had transcribed when I returned so that I had the exact words that were spoken. These transcripts became invaluable as I was able to use your exact words as justification for the themes that finally came through all the data. (You can see this in your Case Study).

Once all the tapes were transcribed I then took all the information for one of you. Lonnie for some reason I began with your data. Then I did Denny, then Ginny and Gail. I really have no reason for the order. Lonnie being first was the ‘test case’. When I began to work through the data I had no idea of the themes and categories that would emerge. Once these did emerge I then went to Denny’s interviews to see if the same themes and categories would hold as an ‘interpretative frame’. The first time they didn’t so it was back to the drawing board and finally after more reading through the data (they call this ‘combing the data’), more talking with my supervisor (Brian) and my fellow thesis writing students, I began to clarify what the data were telling me and a set of themes and categories began to emerge which are now the ‘interpretative frame’ for each of the case studies. This was when I felt I was finally coming out of the swamp into clear water. I could literally ‘see’ the categories in the data.

For each case study I carried out the following phases. That is I did #1 with each of you before going on to #2

1. I focused on each of the four session’s interview transcripts, reading each over and over again. I also read the reconstructed interview that I had done. As I did this I underlined in pencil any part that seemed to be linked to my thesis question. I then began to label these with words like, ‘beliefs’, ‘making a connection’, ‘concern’, ‘new class practice’ and many other such labels.
2. Having done this for each session, I tried to then pull together the ‘labels’ I was using to see if they fell into any sort of pattern. This is called ‘coding the data’. I was looking for the categories that seemed to be emerging from the data. I went through each session and then placed the ‘bits’ of the interview into the categories. This I put into data base. I had categories such as ‘existing practice’, ‘existing beliefs’, ‘new practice’, ‘new connections’ and so on. After awhile it became apparent that there were sub-categories emerging also. For instance, in ‘making connections’, there were sub-categories of making connections with respect to ‘the nature of learning’, ‘the nature of teaching’ and so on.

3. Once I had cut up each interview into the categories, I then pulled together each category across the sessions. So all the ‘making connections with respect to the nature of learning’ were placed together. This was all typed up as a descriptive account of the impact Frameworks had on you as a teacher/learner over all sessions.

4. I then read your journals looking for other evidence for what was emerging. This process is part of the triangulation process - cross checking my interpretation of your comments. I found the journals in all cases very informative, not only supporting the comments you made during the interviews but also often extending them.

5. I returned to the interviews and reread each of those looking now for the actual language used that justified and explained my interpretations.

6. I was now ready to write the ‘thick description’, the case study that you now have. I tried to write this as a type of recount. After I had completed Lonnie’s I had thought that each one would take less time. The opposite was actually true. As I took up each new case study, I began to see ‘connections’ in my work that were becoming the major findings or what is known as the ‘grounded theory’. As this ‘grounded theory’ began to emerge I realised that some of my categories were not really very clear. And so I changed several of them. This meant going back through the case study summaries that I had already written and reworking them.

It took me a long, long time!!!!

7. What I am doing now is trying to pull all the key ‘bits’ from each of the four case studies into one summary using the interpretative frame that each of your case study has. I have only just begun this but I think it will work. Each of your case studies will be then subsumed into this one, and your case study will become a part of the Appendix of the thesis.
What should you do?

So what would I like you to do with your case study?

1. I need you to read through it carefully. I am sending you copies of the reconstructed interviews as well so as to refresh your memory. I am aware that it has been two years!!

2. If you feel that there are any parts that you do not remember saying or not said in the way you intended them please note it on the Summary.

3. When I am in the School on the 10/11 Dec I will arrange for a substitute teacher (through Jackie and with the Superintendent's approval) so we can talk about any comments that you might have made. You may have nothing you need to clarify. Even so I would still like to meet with you and find out how things are going for you.

4. I need to know how you want to be called in the thesis. I will need to describe my participants in the study and also be quoting actual language used by you, therefore I need a 'name', either your given name or a pseudonym.

5. I will be asking you to sign a statement to the effect that you have read the case study summary which emerged from interviews held with you, that you have drawn my attention to any parts that you don't think accurately represent you and, that you give me permission to use the name “X”, and that my interpretation of what came out of the data is a fair interpretation from your perspective. If your interpretation and mine differ greatly we need to go back through the reconstructed interviews and discuss the point. This discussion should lead to a 'level of sophisticated consensus'; one which we both agree to, although it may not. I can then choose to amend the case study if we feel that my interpretation cannot be justified as a result of this discussion.

6. By all means share your case study summary with each other, with Jackie or whoever. This is your decision.

This process is the final member checking process. It is an important process as it adds not only to the credibility and trustworthiness of the data analysis but also to the dependability of the findings.

What next for me?

So what do I need to do now? I need to finish writing up the combined case study. I need to analyse the sessions in Frameworks and write up what the authors perceive the impact
of a course like Frameworks should be on teachers' learning and their classroom practice. Having done this I need to analyse all the Session observation field notes which I took at your site and view maybe one or two of the videos. I will do this from the perspective of what was the thing called 'Frameworks' which was presented to you via Jackie. Having established what the staff development model on which Frameworks is designed intended, and what actually happened, I am then in the position to discuss the actual impact that it did have on teachers through the combined case study summaries. Once I have done this I will be in a position of pulling out the principles of what makes 'effective staff development'; of sharing what is an effective staff development theory.

There is still a lot to do but I am further than I was last year and getting closer to finishing (one day!!!!) I am now excited about what is coming through because I do think it is an effective staff development model and that it can be used by schools to develop their own staff development.

I am looking forward to seeing you in December. I hope the weather is kind to us. No more ice storms or snow storms.

Regards,

Jan Turbill
Monday 29th March 1993

Hiya Lonnie, Denny, Ginny, Gail, Jackie

Please fill out the details and return to Jackie so she can give them to me during the first week of May when I will be in Rochester. I should have asked for this when I saw you last but I was too stupid or sick to remember (I prefer the latter excuse!). I hope all is going OK for you. Thanks Jan

Name:

Years teaching: ___________ Grades taught: ___________

Academic awards: Award Year granted Institution

Inservice, Summer Schools, Projects that you believe have influenced your thinking about literacy education.

Year Inservice, Summer School, Projects

Any other information you think I need to know.

Permission to use the information

I have read the case study written as a report on my comments, issues and concerns during the piloting of Frameworks during 1990. I agree for my name to be used in the case study and that all direct quotes in the text also can be used.

Signed: ______________________ Date: ____________________
Lynn Western  
Superintendent  
Gorham Middlesex District  
Fax No: 716 554 4882  

15th December 1991  

Dear Lynn,  

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me about your District's involvement in Frameworks. I came back to Australia last December with so much data from the piloting of Frameworks in the 30 School Districts that make up the Consortia that I was completely overwhelmed by the task of analysing them all. Fortunately I had already begun to focus in more closely on your District and had collected more indepth interviews from the four Case Study teachers and Jackie Metz. I had also visited their classrooms and observed the children in action. Once I began to analyse these interviews, I realised that I had almost enough data from just one school District and that if I could find out how things were going twelve months on, got some information from the two Principals and from you I would have sufficient data to carry out a neat case study of a rural school district's involvement in a staff development program such as Frameworks. I took this proposal to my supervisor, who is Dr Brian Cambourne, and he agreed that this would be more than enough for my thesis. 

I am now at the stage that I have analysed all the interviews I did with the Case Study teachers throughout the piloting of the course last year and have asked Jackie to ask them to respond to a set of questions that focus on their perceptions of the impact Frameworks has had on their literacy teaching some twelve months later. (Jackie Metz kindly has been acting as the 'go between' for me; my co-researcher). I have also asked Ralph and Eric to also respond to some questions. 

The final piece of information needed I felt was from the Superintendent. Before I have completed the thesis I will forward you and your School District a copy, for 'member checking' purposes. That is, I want everyone involved in the study to check that I have not misrepresented you in any way. When the thesis is complete I will forward a copy for the District's records.
As I believe that you are leaving the District in March, I would be more than happy to forward you a personal copy if you give me an address.

So now to the interview. The purpose of this interview is for me to find out why the District became involved in such a Project as Frameworks. All the literature that I have read clearly demonstrates that successful, effective and meaningful change occurs in schools due to many factors. However, the three key elements are the teacher’s commitment, the support of the principal and the role of the Superintendent. All of these are interrelated and it seems that unless all operate together, effective meaningful change will not occur, or if does will not last. It is my impression from my journal entries after my discussions with yourself, with the principals and obviously from the data analysis from the teachers' interviews that meaningful change has occurred and is continuing to occur in the District. I need more information to support this premiss.

I would like the interview to be an informal chat rather than something that sticks to set questions. However, I have listed a set of questions that I would like us to cover during the period. I also would like to audiotape our telephone conversation. I will use the speaker telephone so I will be free to take notes but I know that having the audiotape as a back up to my notes is very useful. Please fax me if you do not agree to this arrangement. It is important for you to understand that the audiotapes are for my purpose only and will not be used in any other way. The only thing I may do in my reporting of the data is to use a direct quote which is highly applicable to the point I am trying to make. You will see this in the draft report I send to you for 'member checking' before I submit the final thesis as I stated above. If you do not wish the quote to be in the body of the text you can request that I remove it.

I would also appreciate copies of any documents which are part of the District's curriculum plans for both its students and teachers. Jackie will collect these and copy them for me at the BOCES and then Gail Langton will forward them to me.

Questions:

1. Please tell me a little about your background and your personal beliefs about student and teacher learning.

2. Share with me the background of Gorham-Middlesex District - the socio-economic background of the parents, the needs of the District etc.

3. Tell my why you felt that your District should get involved in such programs as ELIC and the Frameworks Consortia,
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• What were your expectations from such an involvement for the District, for the schools, for the teachers, for the students?

• Do you think these expectations were realised?

• If so, in what way? If not, why not do you think?

4. What changes have you seen in the District over the past few years in the area of literacy education? To what do you attribute these changes?

5. What changes would you like to see occurring in literacy education?

6. What do you believe would assist/support these changes? What do believe hinder such change?

7. Any other comments that you would like to make or issues you would like to share with me?
31st October 1991

Hiya,

Thank you for agreeing to share more information with me about Frameworks and yourself. I am slowly going through the interviews from last year and they are very interesting. They also bring back some wonderful memories. I miss you all and often wonder how you are going. Please feel free to respond to these questions in any of the following ways: write a response; talk them onto an audiotape on your own or see Jackie and share your responses on audio with her as an audience. Please give your response to Jackie and she will send them to me.

1. It is twelve months since you completed Frameworks. Looking back over the past twelve months share with me in general terms the impact you think that your involvement in the Course has had on you?

2. Have you changed the way you think about learning? If so in what way?

3. Have you changed the way you think about how reading and writing are learned? If so in what way?

4. Have you changed the way you teach? If so in what way?

5. Do you think the Frameworks Course has had an impact on the school beyond your classroom? If so what?

6. What support, follow up did you feel you needed, did you get, or would you like as a result of your involvement in Frameworks?

7. Other comments, concerns, insights you wish to share.

Thanks again for your support. I will keep in touch.

Jan.
For the Principals

31st October 1991

Hiya,

Thank you for agreeing to share information with me about Frameworks and yourself. I am slowly going through the interviews from last year and they are very interesting. They also bring back some wonderful memories of my time in your school. I miss you all and often wonder how you are going. Please feel free to respond to these questions in any of the following ways: write a response; talk them onto an audiotape on your own or see Jackie and share your responses on audio with her as an audience. Please give your response to Jackie and she will send them to me.

1. It is twelve months since you completed Frameworks. Looking back over the past twelve months share with me in general terms the impact you think that your involvement in the Course has had on you?

2. Have you changed the way you think about learning? If so in what way?

3. Have you changed the way you think about how reading and writing are learned? If so in what way?

4. What impact has the Course had on your teachers do you think?

5. What changes do you think have occurred in the school, in the District?

6. What changes do you have in mind or would like to see take place in the future in the school, in the District?

7. In your opinion what kinds of support do you think Principals need to provide for teachers during and after a Course like Frameworks? Why?

8. What are the difficulties Principals face in implementing successful staff development?

9. Other comments, concerns, insights you wish to share.

Thanks,

Jan
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Questions for Jackie

I'd like you to respond to questions in the teachers and Principals list that you feel that you can comment on. As well,

- discuss the 'four circle' staff development model in light of what it means to you for a basis for a staff development program; for teacher change

- discuss the factors that help or hinder successful staff development

- share with me your perceptions on the impact of Frameworks as an agent of change on teachers beliefs and practices in literacy education.

I think that will do!!!! Please can you get this to me as quickly as possible. I realise this is a busy time at school, but I want to try and get all the data analysed by the end of November. Please impress on the group that they do not have to write pages or talk for hours. I will ask Gail to Federal Express everything once you get it to her so I get it in a few days.

Thanks Jackie. I will keep in touch.

Regards

Jan
APPENDIX B

SAMPLES FROM EARLY CODING PROCESS IN DATA ANALYSIS
Session 4 Interview
Lonnie 9th October 1990
Descriptive Analysis

Lonnie came to the interview with some points listed on paper. He took control of the interview.

Key Concepts/Connections

*He is a wrestling coach at the High school and he had become aware that those conditions of learning are in operation when he is coaching kids.

BSR&BSA

*He liked Possible Sentences. He feels he needs time to try it several times to get better at using it, but overall he feels that it is a good activity for vocabulary introduction and development. He also felt that the reading was clear and helpful.

*Myths of Whole Language by Judith Newman was very useful as it had made him aware what the label ‘whole language’ means and that this approach does incorporate the teaching of skills. He recommended that it be a reading in the final Program.

*He is pleased with the way the Learning Journals are working with his class and he wishes he had begun them on day 1 of school. He is working on finding the time to fit it in so it is not seen as another subject to the kids. It is something he will keep going throughout the year as he feels they are useful for them as well as him.
*The Alternate View* is repetitive after seeing the video but should be there as support for those who want to read more about the Conditions.

*BSA where he was asked to examine his learning experience in light of the conditions of learning was rather difficult for him to do but it made him think about the conditions and what they meant.

*Session 2 was very full and went very fast whereas Session 3 although very full he didn’t feel was as rushed.

*The Text-tapping Strategy he really liked. He had used it as part of his unit and he was very pleased with the children’s results. He found that some were very good at this particular genre and some didn’t have a clue. But those who did it knew how they knew it. They had made the connections. He thought it was something he could use weekly in a range of ways.

*The activity is one that can’t bomb. Different children will achieve success to varying degrees but it is no one’s fault. They can all feel that they have achieved something.

*In the last four weeks he was taking the strategies and using them as sources of information about the kids and not just assuming that 4th grade kids knew nothing.

*Liked the Functional Approach to Language and felt it was a good reading for where he was right now. It helped him understand the reading-writing connections.

*Session 4 Lonnie had found a very useful session. He didn’t have any major problems with the session but he hadn’t had the chance to try any of the BSAs and BSRs.

**Concerns**

*He still felt confused about what he was doing but realised that this confusion would lessen as he became more confident with everything.
He needs to consider how he can teach the kids who didn’t seem to have the same control as the others. This means group work and allocating time differently.

Lonnie commented that ‘with this whole language thing I can see it as - “there it is over there” and I know what it is but I don’t know how to get there. I have to build something to get myself there’.

He wondered how it should be determined what genres are taught and when. Should there be a scope and sequence statement about what should be done when? This question had come up in their group discussion.

Another concern he had was with finding the various models of the genres in which to immerse his students. It is something the school needs to consider as there is a need for different types of resources.

It was difficult to be patient. It had taken him three years to get where he is now and he would like to be able to speed the process up.

He was feeling very rushed at the moment.

He had the feeling that he never really stopped to reflect and consider what he needed to do next. He was just taking one day a time.

JT input

JT pointed out that the children can be immersed in all the various genres from Kindergarten on. It is a question of children gaining control over them and their complexity as they mature. JT discussed how teachers need to link the language teaching to all curriculum areas and then the genres are introduced quite naturally.

JT suggested that Lonnie may be at a point in his teaching where he may need to consider how he might re-organise his time schedule.
First Set of Categories Which Emerged from the Data

Categories: Lonnie
1/11/91

1 Beliefs about my teaching
fragmented teacher
structured schedule

2 Beliefs about Learning
learning should be relevant
learning should be enjoyed
learning should be a challenge

3 Feelings/Attitude
confusion because he was rushed
doesn't like having to follow a prescribed program
likes to be able to 'do it my way'
nervous about what I am doing because it is new to me
challenged to try to make connections between new knowledge and practice
enjoying course (time goes fast is an indicator to him)

4 Concerns
how to evaluate kids within 'this philosophy'
how to fit 'that type of environment to me'
what to do and where to go next as natural learning concept so different

5 Processes of teacher learning
group interaction/reflection on video
risk-taking to try new ideas/share new ideas

6 Factors which enhance/support teacher learners -enablers
Enablers for implementation of new knowledge/new beliefs
readings that make you think about things you should be doing
knowing that you can seek clarification/get follow up from Jackie
knowing he can take the responsibility of making the connections for his classroom
knowing that there is support from the Principal
being able to try things out in his classroom soon after hearing about it
hearing about things which support what I already know
being challenged
having opportunities to reflect after video input
hearing things that make sense/link to what I now know
solving problems in groups about a shared concern
developing a shared meaning
developing a shared language
input/message via video that was interesting and made sense

7 Factors which hinder learning/change
Inhibitors for implementation of new knowledge
lack of clarity of ideas
inability to see the connection between theory and my practice
readings that were difficult to read, abstract concepts
perception of sociocultural/political factors - parents
investing time and energy that could be seen as a waste
perception of changing for the sake of change - changing for the reasons of others being rushed in the change process repetition of input input message too long video too long with no visual connections

8 connections being made
classification of natural learning makes sense/links with what he does as a learner connections from new knowledge/new theory to real world language experiences in his own home

9 gaps in connections
classification of learning in real world to how this operates in classroom evaluating children's literacy development within this new concept of natural learning

10 intellectual unrest
natural learning concept so foreign to what he knows now about teaching

11 practice - now
report cards given with grades for reading writing spelling does some of the things he is hearing about

12 practice - new
ideas about environment he needs to set up learning journals

13 enablers for implementation of new practice
kids response positive gives insights into kids learning

14 inhibitors for implementation of new practice
unclear instructions unclear about outcomes difficult to explain to students - not a shared language difficult for students to explain
Lonnie - Pulling together of data from Sessions 2, 4, 6, 8

Beliefs/Knowledge

Beliefs Lonnie appears to have at the commencement of the Course:

* a teacher who follows a fragmented skills-base approach to his teaching
* he teaches from a part to whole model
* he has a structured compartmentalised schedule for the language arts - spelling, reading, writing, grammar etc.
* he believes learning should be relevant, enjoyable, a challenge
* he needs to teach the skills and test whether his students have learned what he has taught, giving them a grade
* he believes parents want grades on their kids work and he has a responsibility to do this.

Connections Lonnie indicates that he is making through his involvement in Frameworks over the 8 week period.

* natural learning makes so much sense and can be readily applied to settings outside the school context - to the way he learns; to the way his children learning in his home and in the way he goes about his coaching of the high school wrestling team
* what he believes and does in the outside world conflicts with what he does as a teacher in the classroom
* he is moving towards child-centred teaching and not so controlled by the content he believes he should teach, i.e. teacher centred.

* he is becoming aware that students bring varying degrees of knowledge to a learning situation and he can no longer assume that students are all the same; know the same or will learn the same things from what he teaches
* developing an understanding of what 'whole language is' and in particular the 'connectedness of reading and writing'; the power of modelling written language for students
* developing an understanding and knowledge of evaluating students individual needs
Enablers/Factors which facilitate this paradigm shift/ the understanding of ‘new knowledge’

Content focus:
* readings that make him think about what he should be doing
  that give him insights into the concepts in each of the sessions
  that support and extend what is already known
  help ‘pull things together’ for him
* activities that force him to examine his own experiences and beliefs
  that force him to make explicit the processes he goes through
  that allow him to reflect on the main concepts (new knowledge) which have been just presented to him
  that force him to see the connections between his personal learning and his students’ learning
* input which is interesting and makes sense is challenging

Process focus:
* group work for reflection with his peers
  to hear and discuss common concerns with peers
  to collaborate on issues and solve problems
  to develop a shared understanding with peers
  to develop a shared language with peers
* support knowing that the Facilitator is available to seek clarification from after the session
  knowing that the Principal is supportive of the paradigm shift he is making
* setting the establishment of a non-threatening learning environment in which
  - he is being immersed in the ‘new knowledge’
  - can take responsibility to make the connections he chooses to make
  - he feels comfortable to take risks with his peers
  - he receives feedback from his peers and the facilitator
  - he can choose to change what he wants to change and when he will change his thinking and his practice
* timing well paced sessions in which there is sufficient time for the ‘new knowledge’ to be presented and for clarification to be sought and connections to be made
  spaced learning over several weeks to allow
  - for clarification of ‘new knowledge’
  - for the development of shared meanings among the group
  - for the development of a shared language
Inhibitors of the learning of New Knowledge

Content focus:
Readings that are too academic and dense in which the author appears to belittle, talk down to teachers and/or pontificates
Activities in which the instructions are unclear
the purpose is confusing
the outcomes are unclear
Input is too wordy and repetitious
is unclear
lacks a logical flow

Processes
Timing the time it takes to get change going
trying to get the time to get everything going that you want
Support concern about parent support - particularly in the early part of the course
Groups in which time appears to be wasted by going off on tangents
discussions where one member gets bogged down and can't be moved

Practices
Practices pre Frameworks
*traditional curriculum
*spelling lists
*reading groups
*students all writing same topic and writing graded
*strong focus on text books
*grades given to students works
*some group work

New Practices tried through Frameworks
*setting up the Conditions of Learning
*more group work
*collaborative learning in groups in reading and writing
*book talk - readers response
*possible sentences
*text-tapping
*modelled writing
*a focus on writing as a process
*proofreading
*co-operative retelling
*using retelling as an evaluation strategy
*student sharing
*linking of strategies so as one informed the content of another - the outcomes of text-tapping informed what he would demonstrate in modelled writing

**Enablers/Factors which facilitate the implementation of New Practice**

**Focus on Students:**

***1.*** The students' initial response is positive (they enjoy the activity)
***2.*** The students' behaviour whilst involved in the activity is positive
*The students' products are of acceptable or above quality
*The students' make connections about their own learning
***3.*** The activity gives the teacher insights into the students' learning and knowledge base
*The teacher can see the benefits for the kids learning from what they say and do

**Focus on teaching:**

*He can see that the links to 'skills' learning
*Teaching is more enjoyable
*Insights into his current teaching practice, both what he was doing well and what he was not doing well.

**Focus on process:**

*Having the opportunity to carry out the practice soon after hearing about it
***3.*** Having the time to reflect on the practice and share with others how it went so the practice becomes clearer - clarification process
*Being able to see the links between the theory and practice
*Knowing that he can choose to use the strategy in his teaching or not; that it is not a requirement
***4.*** Knowing that he can adapt the strategy to suit his and his students' needs

**Focus on support:**

*Knowing that he has the support of the Principal
*Knowing that he can approach the facilitator for clarification
*Knowing that he can approach the interviewer(one of the authors) for clarification
*Knowing that he has parent support for changes he might make in his teaching practice (this came towards the end of the program)

---

1 several * denotes that these points came up in more than one interview
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Inhibitors to implementing practice

Focus on teaching
* unclear instructions
*** not understanding fully the purposes of the strategy - the new practice
* inability to see the outcomes
*** lack of a shared language or meaning so that it is difficult for teacher to explain instructions and for students to give responses

Focus on Process
* feeling the pressure of not enough time to adequately try the strategy during the week between sessions
* finding it difficult to find the necessary resources - books and texts
* feeling rushed during the session and not feeling confident about what is expected

Focus on support
* concern about parents response to changes in teaching practice
* lack of financial support - perceived need for more resources

Gaps/Concerns/Difficulties in Making Connections between Theory and Practice
Note: This category identifies the gaps that appeared to exist between the theory and the practice. They were often made as concerns or as gaps in what he could do. It seems that he had accepted the theoretical perspectives and could see that he would need to change his practice, the classroom environment and his relationship with his students (the physical and social environment) but was unsure how. As time went by he began to move on these 'gaps', pulling on what he was learning in the sessions, what he was trying in his classroom, what he heard from his peers about what they were taking from the readings and the strategies, and from visits from me and his facilitator to his classroom.

* how to put the conditions into operation in his classroom
* how to change the way he organised time
* how he could respond to the needs of individual students (of which he was just becoming aware)
* how should he teach the different genres of written language
* how and where does he find the appropriate resources (various texts for modelling and in which to immerse his students)
* how does he find out what good writing is
* how does he teach reading incorporating ‘Booktalk’ - readers response

Appendices A - C
*how does he find time to try all the new strategies
*how can he organise himself to evaluate individual students’ needs and then use this information to inform parents of their children’s progress (a mandated change from the Principal)

Feelings/Attitudes to the Change process
*a sense of confusion which began to clear for him as the sessions proceeded. By Session 8 he felt that ‘things were clearer now’
* nervous about what he was being asked to try, but
*enjoyed the challenge
*experienced feelings of being overwhelmed by all the information coming his way
*found it difficult to ‘look inside’ himself and become aware of his won language and learning processes
* found it difficult to make explicit what his beliefs and understandings of language and learning were
*found it difficult to be patient with the time that change takes: he wanted to be able to change everything at once
*valued being given the responsibility of making the decisions about what practices he would change and how he would change them
*began to feel confident with what he knew and did towards the end of the Course when he found that he could explain to parents on parent/teacher interview night what he was doing in language education and how he was evaluating the students without using a grade.

Insights into the Change Process
*there is no right of wrong way to implement the innovation
*he can adopt, adapt, and create the innovation as he becomes more comfortable with it and clearer about his own beliefs and practices
*although he would like to change everything at once he was well aware that change takes time and that it was his choice as to what he changed, how he did it and when
* developing a clear action plan for himself would enable him to continue to implement the innovation
*knowing that he had access to further support was an important factor in future change
*continued group support was also seen as necessary for continuing the change process

Summary statement
Over the 8 week period the evidence in the interviews with Lonnie which is supported by the observations made in his classroom and the notes in his journal, indicate that he is undergoing a paradigm shift in his view of language and learning. He is changing his
view of learning from a skills-based-teacher centred approach to a child-centred holistic view. He is becoming aware of the processes he himself uses as a language uses and making connections to what this can mean for the language learning of his students.
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SAMPLE OF THE SURVEY SENT TO ALL FACILITATORS AT COMPLETION OF TRAINING
Sample of Survey Sent to All Facilitators on Completion of Training

Please return to: Silva Bramblett
c/- Jan Turbill
Centre for Literacy Studies
University of Wollongong
PO Box 1144
Wollongong 2500

FRAMEWORKS PROGRAM (AUSTRALIA)
SURVEY OF FACILITATORS 1993

Newcastle Site

We need some authentic responses from teachers who have participated in Frameworks training. Would you please make a short written response, in the space provided, to each of the following questions. If you need any more space we don't mind if you write on the back of the sheets provided.

Jan Turbill

NAME: ___________________________ School (optional) ___________________________

Class taught/position held __________________________

1. What were the "high spots" of the Frameworks training for you?

2. What were the "low spots" of the Frameworks training for you (i.e. the length and structure of the program, sessions, BSAs, BSRs or any other aspect)?

3. What insights/connections related to literacy education did you make? List those that you feel were the most significant.

4. Have you made any changes to the way you think about or teach literacy (i.e. your beliefs, your classroom procedures) as a consequence of taking Frameworks? If so, please describe them in list form.
5. Would you recommend this course to your colleagues? Why? Why not?

6. Are you planning to run a Frameworks course soon? Explain how and when or why not.

7. Having finished your own Frameworks training, what challenges do you expect to have to deal with as a facilitator running your own courses? Discuss.

8. Consider the "four circle model". Do you feel that you are more aware of your personal beliefs about language and learning as a result of your involvement in Frameworks? If so, explain how this has occurred. If not, why not?

9. Other comments that you would like to make.

PS When you fill out this survey, we would appreciate that you do so in black biro. It makes your writing more legible in case we need to photocopy your comments.