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ABSTRACT

This project set out to study the influence of teacher beliefs and assumptions on Literacy Programs.

Two teachers were selected for a naturalistic study which focused on the influence of each teacher's theoretical orientation on:

the goals set for the classroom literacy program,

the behaviours teachers perceive as reflecting "good" writing,

the procedures, materials and information teachers use for evaluation,

the materials and resources teachers select for use in the instructional program,

the conditions for learning established in the classroom.

This project involved both teachers and three students from their classes over a twelve week period.
The influence of teacher theoretical orientation was assessed using a range of naturalistic procedures including structured and semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, program supervision and the collection of teacher and student language related products. The conditions for learning identified by Cambourne (1985) were used as a framework for evaluation.

The results of this project indicate that teacher theoretical orientation does influence the literacy program, materials selected, classroom ecology, students' perceptions and students' writing. In addition, this exercise proved to be a worthwhile professional development activity for both the researcher and the teachers.

In the course of this project issues related to future professional development activities were identified.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction..................................................1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale.........................................................2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Study.................................................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Study....................................................4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presuppositions..................................................5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning to be Literate.................9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of teacher beliefs on instruction..44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development................56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale.........................60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects..........................65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Data Collection.....66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and Procedures..67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness...................84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis.....................87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX 1</th>
<th>Theoretical Orientation Profile.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Theoretical Orientation Profile Responses A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Theoretical Orientation Profile Responses when reinterviewed A4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX 2</th>
<th>Classroom Observation/Supervision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>The Year 4 Teacher A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>The Year 6 Teacher A12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX 3</th>
<th>Conditions for Learning Operating in the Classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>The Year 4 Classroom A17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>The Year 6 Classroom A18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX 4</th>
<th>Record of Writing carried out by students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Sapen Year 4 A19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Kelly Year 4 A20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Johny Year 4 A21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Kirsty Year 6 A22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Tom Year 6 A23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Mack Year 6 A24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5  Record of Reading carried out by students.
(a) Sapen Year 4.................................................................A25
(b) Kelly Year 4.................................................................A26
(c) Johny Year 4..............................................................A27
(d) Kirsty Year 6..............................................................A28
(e) Tom Year 6.................................................................A29
(f) Mack Year 6...............................................................A30

APPENDIX 6  Student Interview - Written Interview.
(a) Sapen Year 4.................................................................A31
(b) Kelly Year 4.................................................................A32
(c) Johny Year 4...............................................................A33
(d) Kirsty Year 6...............................................................A34
(e) Tom Year 6.................................................................A35
(f) Mack Year 6...............................................................A36

APPENDIX 7  Student Interview - Writing Interview.
(a) Sapen Year 4.................................................................A37
(b) Kelly Year 4.................................................................A39
(c) Johny Year 4..............................................................A42
(d) Kirsty Year 6..............................................................A44
(e) Mack Year 6...............................................................A46
(f) Tom Year 6.................................................................A48
**APPENDIX 8**  
Teacher Interview 2.  
(a) Year 4 Teacher.......................................................... A50  
(b) Year 6 Teacher.......................................................... A55  

**APPENDIX 9**  
Teacher Interview 3.  
(a) Year 4 Teacher.......................................................... A62  
(b) Year 6 Teacher.......................................................... A66  

**APPENDIX 10**  
Follow Up Student Interviews.  
(a) Year 4 Students.......................................................... A69  
(b) Year 6 Students.......................................................... A73  

**APPENDIX 11**  
Teacher Language Related Products.  
(a) Year 4.......................................................... A78  
(b) Year 6.......................................................... A82
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Assumptions and Teaching Practice</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TORP: Phonics</td>
<td>96, 115 and A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TORP: Skills</td>
<td>97, 116 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TORP: Whole Language</td>
<td>99, 118 and A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TORP: Phonics- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TORP: Skills- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>99 and A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TORP: Whole Language- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>101, 119 and A6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transactional View of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Data Collection Model</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Triangulation</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TORP: Phonics</td>
<td>97, 116 and A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TORP: Skills</td>
<td>98, 117 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TORP: Whole Language</td>
<td>99, 100, 118 and A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TORP: Phonics- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TORP: Skills- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>99 and A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TORP: Whole Language- when reinterviewed</td>
<td>101, 119 and A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Model for Professional Development</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1.

1. INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE.

1.1. INTRODUCTION.

As a teacher and member of executive, charged with the responsibility for developing Staff Development Programs within the area of Literacy, I have become aware of some anomalies in Literacy Programs developed by teachers.

As I set out to evaluate student writing it became obvious to me that before we consider how to teach writing we need to look at what influences how teachers teach literacy. There is a mass of literature which reports on what influences students' literacy learning; school programs, experiences at home, the media, self esteem, self concept to name a few.

My thesis is that teachers are an important influence; that teachers make decisions about literacy instruction in light of the theory, or assumptions they hold about language and learning. I propose that a teacher's theoretical orientation establishes expectancies and influences goals, procedures, rewards, materials selected and classroom interaction patterns.
My belief is that the teachers (subjects) in this case study, are knowing beings. The knowledge they possess has important consequences for how behaviour or actions are influenced and interpreted. Smith (1982) suggests that we all have in our heads a theory of what the world is like and that this theory forms the basis of all our perceptions and understanding of the world, the root of all learning, the source of all hopes and fears, motives and expectancies, reasoning and creativity. If we are to make sense of our world, it is through interpreting our interactions with the world in the light of our theory.

Within the complexities of the instructional setting, the decisions teachers make are influenced by the teacher's theoretical orientation. (Harste and Burke, 1977)

The decisions made involve:

1. the goals that teachers set for the classroom literacy program,
2. the behaviours teachers perceive as reflecting "good" writing and the subsequent sanctions they offer,
3. the procedures, materials and information teachers use for their instructional diagnosis,
4. the weighting teachers give to various types of diagnostic information,
5. the materials teachers select and use for instruction in the literacy program,
6. the environment teachers perceive to be most conducive to literacy growth,
7. the criteria teachers use to determine growth in literacy.

1.3. PURPOSE OF STUDY.

The purposes of the study are to:

1. illuminate the nature of teachers' theoretical orientation and its influence on the development of literacy programs,

2. provide information on which future professional development programs can be based.
1.4. **LOCUS OF THE STUDY.**

This study was carried out at a Public Primary School in N.S.W. during 1989.

The school is new and is situated in a developing area. The staff are young and generally in their early years of teaching. Both the Library and Classrooms lack resources, though this is currently being addressed by Disadvantaged Schools Funding.

The school has a student population of 700 drawn from private housing development (30%) and from the Housing Commission Area adjacent to the school (70%). The majority of students come from homes where reading and writing are not valued.

The school does not yet have an English Policy, though there is a committee currently working towards developing one. Most members of staff have participated in the Department of Education's Early Literacy Inservice Course. The staff have come to appreciate E.L.I.C.'s two basic understandings:

"That learning to read and write is part of the child's language development."

"That learning to read and write is a developmental process."
1.5. PRESUPPOSITIONS

The following presuppositions guided this project.

1.5.1. ABOUT THEORETICAL ORIENTATION.

* That teachers are knowing beings, and that the knowledge they possess has important consequences for how behaviour or actions are interpreted. (Magoon, 1977 in Deford 1985.)

* That the knowledge teachers possess forms a system of beliefs and attitudes which direct perceptions and behaviours.

* Teachers make decisions about literacy instruction in light of the theory or assumptions they hold about reading, writing and learning.

* Teachers' theoretical orientation establishes expectancies and influences goals, procedures, materials and classroom interaction patterns.

* That teachers behaviour, verbal and non-verbal, influences student behaviour.

* That students are aware of the implicit values teachers' hold.
1.5.2. ABOUT LITERACY.

* I believe that children engage in Whole Language whether it is talking, listening, reading or writing.

* Language ought not be fragmented into isolated skills.

* All modes of language should be learnt under naturalistic conditions of learning.

* The conditions for learning to be literate are similar to the conditions for learning to talk.

  - Children learn to speak in a wide variety of registers of language.

  - Children use the register appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves.

  - Children hear such language being used around them for a variety of purposes, for a variety of audiences and in a variety of contexts.
- Their linguistic data pool (Cambourne and Turbill 1987, p. 36) is filled from the many talking and listening events in which they find themselves.

* Children learn the written registers of language under the same conditions as learning oral registers.

* The conditions for learning to write are:

  There must be lots of immersion - books, both fiction and non-fiction, poetry, letters, signs, charts, labels etc.

  There must be countless demonstrations on how writing is used - its purpose.

  There should be lots of being read to and discussion of the print - immersion in structural conventions.

  Teachers must demonstrate the personal function and use of reading and writing frequently.

  Positive expectations and feedback are important. The writer and his/her writing should be valued by the teacher and the audience.
Engagement can occur when the conditions of positive demonstrations and expectations are present.

* When learning to speak, young children see speaking as purposeful, repetitive and predictable. Their approximations are warmly received as they try to refine them as adults provide further demonstrations. Children use hypothesis making, testing and reconstructing as strategies for meeting the positive expectations of "significant" family members and friends.

* Meaning can be shared between more than one mode of language.

* Reading and writing involve the construction of meaning. Children learn the conventions as they focus on clarifying meaning.
CHAPTER 2.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.

Introduction.

For the purpose of this project three main areas of literature were reviewed. They were:

1. Learning to be literate: How beliefs about learning and learning to be literate have influenced literacy instruction.
   i) An historical overview: English as a subject.
   ii) Whole language learning.

2. Effects of teacher beliefs on instruction.

3. Professional development.

1. LEARNING TO BE LITERATE: How beliefs about learning and learning to be literate have influenced literacy instruction.

i) A Historical Overview: English as a subject

Public Education in Australia has a history which spans just over a century. During this time, an "evolution rather than revolution" (Connell, 1986, p. 211) of development in literacy education has occurred. This section of the literature review seeks to show the prevailing theories of the times and how they influenced instruction.
During this century, the period of the 1940's, with The Great Depression and World War Two, reflected a "transitional crisis" in Australian education. "The war greatly shaped the economic, social and political pattern of Australian life" (Barcan, 1965, p. 247) and served to actuate a series of educational reforms. It is from this period up to the present that this review will investigate the changes related to language theory and practice within Australian primary schools.

The central movement of language theory can be distinguished between an instructional approach, in which the main concern is the subject matter, and an educational approach, in which the main concern is the student. (Connell, 1986) Strong forces have operated throughout this century to reform public education. These pressures arose from a pervasive sense of social crisis and threat to culture. Along with this emerged a common desire to review the established policy of education and a general demand for a better way of life. (Fitzgerald, 1975)

**English as a subject - 1940's to 1960's.**

During the developments in language since the 1940's, two issues seem common to all and are raised in a review of literature by Murray, (1988) as the perceived difficulty by classroom practitioners to turn theory into practice and the issue of "accommodating a stream of
changing practices "for which teachers " were not always prepared". (Murray, 1988, p. 1)

During the latter part of the 1940's and early 1950's, reference to a crisis in education became common. (Barcan, 1988, p. 235) The crisis, predominantly in material terms, was also one of aims, curriculum, structure, and standards as an old traditional educational tradition gave way to a new. (Turney, 1975) A revision of the primary school syllabus emerged as a "departure from formal elements in many subjects" and attention to the level of work "which may be comprehended by the average child." (Radford, 1956, p. 56 cited in Barcan, 1988 p. 236) This change demonstrated the influence of progressive education and emphasised to some degree the needs of the individual child. "While the curriculum recognises the complementary character of the individual and social obligations of the child’s living, it seeks to emphasise the needs of individuality as an important concern." (1952 N.S.W. Primary Curriculum, preface, cited by Barcan, 1988, p. 236)

Changes advocated for reading emphasised the "look-and-say" approach, formal spelling lists were abolished and "In view of the weight of opinion" (Curriculum for Primary Schools, 1952, p. 92 cited in Barcan, 1988), script writing only was used in the infants grades; cursive writing was deferred till the primary grades. Projects or central themes reflecting "the child's needs and interests"
were recommended as the starting point for programs. Within subjects, teachers had a considerable choice of topics. Frequent use of objective tests were encouraged to replace written sentences or composition.

The "look-and-say" methods permitted children's early reading vocabulary to include words from their own speech, regardless of whether these words were common or not. Reading schemes emerged in sharp contrast to old phonetic schemes. The reading books were designed to attract, motivate and interest the reader. The number of words on each page was controlled, as was frequency and repetitions. (Southgate and Roberts, 1970, p. 39)

The textbooks provided for primary schools by state Departments of Education were suitably graded to the children's needs and abilities and also reflected the 'look- and- say' approach. (A.C.E.R. 1948-1954 p. 111) N.S.W. provided schools with "My First Book" (1952) for grade one and further texts included "Let's Read" (1954), "Fay and Don" (1952), "At the Farm" (1953), "Sea-side Stories" (1953), and "Open Road to Reading" (1954). These books were still in common use throughout the 1960's and 1970's, and in some cases are still available to teachers today.

Although the Primary curriculum invested much in its progressive view of education, the difficulty of turning theory into practice
remained largely an issue that could not be solved. Butt (1955) affirms this view as he witnessed "instances of eager activity, flexible arrangements, good use of colourful materials and competent group and project work", but he also saw "great evidence of rigid, uniform treatment of little children that must rest on the assumption that orderliness, discipline and development of skills are the two prime goals of primary education." (Butt, 1955, p. 47) Butt further asserts that two assumptions underlie this disparity between theory and practice. They are: that the interests of children were not held as a sound foundation for learning and a distrust of freedom as an essential ingredient of the educative process. (Butt, 1955, p. 50) Butts' appraisal of the goal of educational practice was not of the cultivation of interests, or the development of desirable attitudes and sound judgements, nor personal and social adjustment as was stated in the primary syllabi of the time but rather the efficient expression of knowledge in terms of resultant products. (Butt, 1955, p. 50)

English was held as a discrete subject in a curriculum compartmentalised into subjects such as art, mathematics, social studies, natural science, music and sport. Time was allocated for each and the importance placed was reflected in the amount of time allocated from the weekly timetable to each subject. The timetable was rigidly adhered to; including a tally of minutes. (A.C.E.R. 1955-1962, p. 118) The practical side of English namely reading, grammar, handwriting and composition had more emphasis than
That the English language had only one correct form and that this was readily translated into teaching practice, were the beliefs upon which this view of English was based. Murray (1988) explains the teaching of English was largely a matter of imparting correct forms of spoken and written language to students. In this process the teacher was the major source of information. Textbooks contained grammatical, comprehension and parsing exercises.

Standards of English were maintained by a state syllabus. (A.C.E.R. 1948-1954.) It outlined rather lock-step procedures and expectations of attainments for each age and grade level and provisions for individual needs were drawn from these. The community held the view that teachers provided the expert guidance for this learning and valued the inculcation of cultured speech, habitual use of correct grammar in oral and written forms, expressive oral reading, correct spelling in writing and fluent neat handwriting. (Murray, 1988) This view is still held in some parts of the community and is reflected in recent demands for 'Back to Basics'.


A theoretical reaction to more traditional and formal approaches on primary education occurred in the late 1950's. (Barcan, 1988)
Murray suggests this was the result of a perceived difficulty by classroom teachers to turn theory into practice. They also could not cope with "accommodating a stream of changing practices" for which they "were not always prepared". (Murray, 1988, p. 1) There was also at this time, a concern for results which emanated from the 1952 Syllabus, and sympathy with a similar mood in the United States. This heralded the collapse of theoretical progressive reforms. (Barcan, 1988, p. 248) An appraisal of the English curriculum was encouraged, as educational systems within Australia became aware of increasingly different performances amongst pupils of the same age and grade divisions.

Unprecedented numbers of children in schools and increasing numbers of children from Non-English speaking backgrounds contributed to this reappraisal. These 'differences' made a single, prescribed collection of content difficult to defend and impossible to teach.

Thus, the focus of the primary English curriculum shifted from content to be mastered, to levels of ability prescribed and to varying modes of English. Spoken, heard, read and written language were expressed as either "productive" (speaking and writing) and "receptive" (listening and reading) modes. (Murray, 1988, p. 3) Levels of ability were seen as mastery of a hierarchy of prescribed skills in each mode. Fitzgerald (1986) and Murray (1988)
Variations in skill level were viewed as being able to account for observable differences in pupils' performance.

The subject view of English was still entrenched and the approaches to English rested on two basic assumptions about language: that it could be systematically described, and that learning English was no different from anything else. These theories reflected the products of "academic, research oriented educationalists". (Barcan, 1988, p. 267) This theory was held as applicable in describing all learning as a process of conditioning, moving from minimal processes to very complex behaviour. Later developments of this theoretical stance were highlighted by Jerome Bruner (1960), who emphasised the view that

"The curriculum of a subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject." (Bruner, 1960, p. 31)

Co-existing with this view, were the "child centred educators". Their theories were attuned to discovery of the developmental nature of the child. Their premise was that schools should not mould children in a manner fitting them to the curriculum, rather "the natural order of development of the child would provide the keys to the riddle of what should be taught". (Kliebard, 1985, p. 9)
Structural linguists such as Fries, Harris and Bloomfield influenced the educational processes throughout the 1950's and 1960's, "following the descriptive lines of scientific method rigidly". (Murray, 1988, p.4) They studied only the observable features of the language, what individuals actually said and wrote, and did not consider any of the mental processing inherent in language acts. Meaning was not considered, their assumption was that language could be dismantled into minimal units which could be described exhaustively and reconstructed following structural patterns, into utterances and written language. (Murray, 1988, p.4)

Structural linguists freed to some extent the study of language from prescribed standards of correctness and from the traditional teaching of grammar. However, Skinner (1957 Verbal Behaviour, cited by Murray, 1988, p. 4) accentuated the view of learning theory based on conditioning as the structure for a curriculum centred on skills. The 'linch-pin' of Skinner's theory was the belief that children could be systematically taught basic skills, which became progressively more complex over time. Repetition of the correct form occurred until mastery was attained. This view of language learning was also espoused by advocates of 'direct instruction'.

Fries (1962) emphasised decoding in the early stages, Daniels and Diack (1957) emphasised the structure of word, while Orbist and Pickard (1967) stressed the unity of sentence. Each fragmented the
reading act into components that were 'structured' into hierarchical
levels of progression and assumed the reader attended only to the
visual detail of print to get access to memory, so that "He attends to a
word, links what he sees with similar detail remembered from past
experiences and in some kind of cognitive operation gets meaning
from the text". ( Clay, 1972, p. 2 )

In response, structured reading schemes were developed for use in
primary schools and reading was separated from literature in favour of
basal readers. Reading readiness featured, and was based on a view
that physical maturation was directly related "to the sphere of
learning" ( Goddard, 1974, p. 14 ), and that teachers needed to wait
for children to mature to a certain level before embarking on a reading
program.

The shift away from reading readiness as maturation and towards
readiness as the product of experience occurred during the late
1950's and 1960's. By 1968, Durkin ( 1968 ) wrote:

"The literature still shows some remnants of the
maturational concept of readiness, but, as a whole, articles
and books are now dominated by the opposite conception
highlighting contribution of environmental factors. Or to
put the characterisation of the current scene in the
framework of the nature-nurture debate, today the
spotlight happens to be on nurture..." (Durkin, 1968, p. 48)

Bruner's (1960) *The Process of Education*, presented an opposing view and was interpreted as providing support for extending teaching of subjects 'downward' in the grades. The result for reading being that more emphasis was placed on getting children to read as soon as possible rather than sitting back and waiting. (Teale and Sulzby, 1986)

This interventionist view still maintained the trend towards direct instruction in early reading programs. It was firmly entrenched throughout the 1960's and "remains extremely prevalent throughout the 1980's." (Teale and Sulzby, 1986, p.xiii) Every major publisher of basal reading schemes had a readiness level for its program. These generally included activities to develop auditory discrimination and auditory memory, letter names and sounds and word recognition.

In the light of developments from advocates of the psycholinguistic paradigm, this view of reading readiness seems very linear. It did not account for children learning to attend to aspects of print, relating oral language to print, developing strategies to maintain fluency and exploring detail, developing strategies to increase understanding and to detect and correct errors. (Clay, 1972, p. 269)

In terms of teaching practice, this skills-based view of learning gave
certainty to teaching procedures. There were set objectives of attainment and tests to measure achievement and efficacy of teaching. Many teachers found this attractive. Yet, Clay (1972, p.2) asserts that "the more formal the teaching sequence, and the more teachers are committed to it, the larger could be the group of children who cannot keep up with the programme".

Further implications for teaching practice at this time are reflected in Smith's view of "decontextualised" and "piecemeal" reading programs, where "Instruction is seen as a manufacturing process, with the learner the raw material, the teacher the raw tool, the instruction the "treatment", and the literate child as the product delivered at the end." (Smith, 1981, p. 14)

Writing too, had conformed to set structures. Little development took place in writing until the late 1960's, beyond exercises that often did not relate to students' interests and experience. (Butt, 1965, p. 53) Primary schools taught 'written expression' or 'composition' by a process of discussion and planning, beginning with a sentence, then the paragraph, then assembling paragraphs into longer pieces of writing on set topics. (Murray, 1988, p. 6) Teachers collected and noted vocabulary suitable to the topic prior to children writing. The assumption that exercises which gave practice in using particular patterns of usage and spelling would be transferred to children's writing was strongly held and common.
The predominately British "creative writing" movement based on a "Language Experience" approach (Goddard, 1974), disputed the traditional teaching methods for writing and its underlying assumption of transfer of standard forms through practice exercises. It argued that children best wrote when working from personal experience based on sensory experience. This 'sensory experience' held a place in preparing for writing and developing imaginative qualities in writing. Correctness of form took second place to the "sincerity of expression". (Murray, 1988, p. 7)

Goddard (1974) asserts that the basic differences between language experience approach to literacy and other methods rested on whether "the teaching should be what is called 'incidental' or what is called 'systematised'". (Goddard, 1974, p. 22) She maintained that this approach did not underestimate the importance of the teacher being as fully aware as possible of the complexities of processes in learning to read and write.

By the end of the 1960's, according to Murray (1988, p. 8) teachers within primary schools adopted a "cautious eclectism" in their approaches to teaching English. There were two parallel paradigms for language teaching and practice. They can be identified as:

* English as a separate subject and skills teaching and testing, and
* that of child centred learning based on experience as the provision for further language learning. It was common for both views to be
practiced in the same classroom, so that 'language-experience' co-existed with graded readers, and 'creative writing' with exercises for grammar. Teachers often felt unprepared, confused or doubted the value of these innovations (Warry and Fitzgerald, 1969, pp. 15-18) and most felt that these new theories and practices were simply older ones under new names. (Barcan, 1988, p. 267)

**English 1970 to 1980.**

**Language Acquisition and Oracy.**

During the early 1970's, investment in education rose to unprecedented levels. The widely held belief that equality of education and its outcomes was the prime means of ensuring social betterment, reflected the growing concerns for educational opportunities for targeted groups such as immigrants, Aborigines, the poor, and handicapped. At the same time educational practice based on the paradigm of structured acquisition of skills was also challenged.

In a national survey undertaken in the early 1970's Murray (1988) reports that most teachers believed in the prime importance of spoken English, and almost half of primary teachers surveyed believed that the primary English curriculum should be based on the child's experience. Teachers surveyed had definitive expectations of standards of achievement for age and grade levels.
Substantial challenges to the paradigm of systematised language instruction emerged as theoretically and practically inappropriate over the 1970's. The roots of this challenge can be traced to two broad trends. Firstly, to cognitive approaches to the issues of learning and development and their increasing influence on classroom practice and educational research, and secondly to renewed interest in early childhood as a period of critical and significant development. (Teale and Sulzby, 1986). These trends signified the importance of examining children during the early years when the foundations for all development were being laid, and regarded children as active participants in learning rather than passive recipients of information. This view of active participants asserted that children could generate their own hypotheses and actively seek solutions to problems regarding learning in all spheres of development, and in particular oral language and literacy.

The influence of these trends is apparent in the field of psychology of language. Research undertaken during the 1960's and 1970's increasingly turned attention to close observation of children to shed light on the mental processes involved in learning language. "Language acquisition" research was formed as an area that sought to describe the strategies used in learning and using oral language. (Teale and Sulzman, 1986)

This 'language acquisition' research found that the child was an active
hypothesis-testing-generating language user, and was modified in time toward the notion of the child-as-constructor-of-language. This paradigm accounted for language learning more successfully than the systematised view of stimulus-response. Findings from 'language acquisition' research were used to hypothesise that oral and written language might develop in similar ways.

In 1972 a seminar took place in Sydney, and papers delivered by Professors James Britton and Roger Shuy asserted that English in schools should be seen as language used in various modes rather than a collection of skills or subjects. (Murray, 1988) Much of this view was based on work by Noam Chomsky (1957), whose book **Syntactic Structures** challenged previous views on how language was learnt and described.

The mental processes underlying the production of language was crucially important in Chomsky's view. (Chomsky, 1957) The focus of his research was how children learnt the grammatical rules of oral language to make meaningful utterances without explicit knowledge of those rules. Further researchers such as McNeill (1970), Berko (1958), Halliday (1977), Britton (1977), Wilkinson (1971), Bruner (1975) confirmed and extended Noam Chomsky's (1957) contention that children managed the rules of language very capably and to some extent from an inborn predisposition to arrive at these rules inductively, from experience of language.
The focus of these extensive researches was to find out what might happen if schools tried to replicate the best features of language learning before and outside school. Halliday (1977) asserted:

"... One can see the baby is leading the dance. The mother is slightly behind, tracking his movements and responding in kind. By an analogous process, for months and even years the mother, and possibly others too may continue to track the child's language development."

(Halliday, 1977 cited by Boomer, 1980, p. 21)

Halliday points out that the mother and the close-knit "meaning" group of the child, did not actively set out to 'pump' new language into the infant but sensitively attuned and attended to the emerging meanings of the child and responded to these. As Britton (1977) states "Here in the home, then, there is a direct means-end tie up between speech and what it achieves for the speaker. Can we preserve that direct relationship throughout the years of school?"

( p. 56 )

Novick and Waters (1977, cited by Boomer, 1980) found the adult to be "an important bridger of misunderstandings, promoter of compromise and giver of rulings". (Boomer, 1980 p.23) Halliday (1977) emphasised the role of the intimate adult as a socialising agent helping the child to get "socio-semantic" and "socio-semiotic"
perspectives on the life of the community. (p 147) These researches into language acquisition also enlarged the role of the adult as expander of elliptical utterances, thereby assisting the gradual development of syntax approximating even more closely to the adult model. The more varied the interactions, the more likely it seemed the child would develop into a powerful meaning maker.

Working from different methodological perspectives, interest in the study of language variety or register variations confronted issues of natural discourse, namely language as people use it, rather than idealised models of language. Labov (1972, 1976), Halliday (1974, 1975, 1976 ) and Hymes (1968, 1972) considered ways in which language is used by any one speaker and any group of speakers and why language is so varied.

Halliday (1974) argued that language users adopt different registers depending on a) field of discourse or subject talked of and physical context, b) tenor, referring to the relationship between participants and the situation and c) mode, the means by which this language is expressed whether in oral or written form. In Hymes (1972) terms, demonstrations of communicative competence occur whenever language is used, for the social knowledge of language users ensures subtle shifts of language depending on physical context and purpose.
This linguistic interest, especially in the study of dialect had important implications for educational practice. Since no dialect, not even standard English, could be demonstrated as superior to any others, the argument for reconsidering conventional notions of 'correct' English in the classroom was raised. In particular, the notion of children categorised as not succeeding because the dialects they employed were different to those of their teachers, was reviewed.

Three general propositions concerning language teaching and learning in Australia were an outcome of sociolinguistic work. These were cited by Christie (1980 p. 71) as:

i) The notion that one's use of language (dialect) reinforces and is part of one's identification with a particular group, class or community and that educational practice should account for and recognise this.

ii) The notion that no English dialect can be demonstrated to be 'better' than others and that standard English is itself a dialect, rather than a 'correct form' of language.

iii) The notion that language is used for a variety of purposes, and the factor determining use of a particular register is always the appropriateness of the context.

The concept of language expressed as modes was also emphasised by sociolinguists. Sociolinguists believed that the setting of a taxonomy of sub-skills for language should not be the purpose of schools, but rather the setting of situations that would make certain language
demands, related to the real world of the learner.

Boomer (1980) suggests a pedagogical recipe for learning:

"Expose learners to plenty of examples of register (or language tasks), challenging them to 'crack the code' and to begin to produce their own version. Then provide plenty of opportunity for trial, error and feedback. As proficiency develops, allow plenty of time for reflection on how it works. Put the emphasis on a work-shop type approach and make sure the learner sees purpose in the endeavour. Throughout the sequence, make sure that the teacher's role is consistent with the best practice of mature adults who nurture the growth of pre-school children. The learner should be convinced of the need to guess, to take risks and to bring previous knowledge to bear on the new challenge. It would be of great help if the teacher could show, where appropriate, how he or she does it him or herself, giving access to his or to her thoughts about it. Avoid fragmented exercises. Concentrate on whole tasks. Teach component skills where needed. Learn how to organise the class into groups and how to negotiate without degenerating into chaos." (Boomer, 1980, p. 31)

This view would challenge the traditional role of the learner, the
teacher and the conditions that generate 'real' learning. This view is also similar to Cambourne's (1984) 'Wholistic' paradigm for language learning and teaching practice that would emerge throughout the 1980s as one of the most significant theories for language development and learning.

Language Acquisition and Literacy.

Marie Clay's (1967) examination of young children's reading and writing development in light of language acquisition research, demonstrated that young children could engage in important reading behaviours. Her main objective was to identify better descriptions of early reading behaviours so that children with reading difficulties could be identified as early as possible. Clay began with 5-year-olds commencing school and reading instruction did not include reading readiness but deliberately emphasised "fluency, meaning and 'learning as one reads'". (Clay, 1967 p. 12) Her study concluded with the view that "That there is nothing in this research that suggests that contact with printed language forms should be withheld from any five-year-old on the ground that he is immature". (p. 24)

Clay rejected the "neural-ripening" (Teale and Sulzby, 1986, p. xvi) view that relied on children attaining a certain level of maturity. Clay's Reading: The Patterning Of Complex Behaviour (1972) contained considerable reference to pre-school reading experience and brought
light on Clay's view of how reading development in the early years differed from the traditional view of reading readiness.

Clay's Reading: The Patterning Of Complex Behaviour (1972) was significant for several reasons. First it emphasised the importance of the early childhood period for literacy development. In particular, it highlighted the scope for research to be carried out by examining what children did as they attempted to construct meaning from books, reading and writing, although they could not read or write in the conventional sense. Finally, in this book the process of distinguishing between an emergent literacy approach to teaching and learning of reading to that of conventional, traditional approach of reading readiness was highlighted.

Clay's book What Did I Write? (1975), included writing samples from young children and discussion of their significance for literacy development, and indicated the general move of researchers toward focusing on the relationship between writing and reading in early literacy development.

At the same time that Clay was conducting her work, Yetta Goodman was also examining the reading process of young children in the United States. (Y. Goodman, 1967). Kenneth Goodman's psycholinguistic model of the reading process (K. Goodman, 1967) was gaining more widespread acceptance as valid description of what
fluent readers did when reading than previous conceptualisations. Yetta Goodman hypothesised that the model was also appropriate to describe what young children and those considered 'at risk' did for becoming competent readers. Each reader had knowledge of many aspects of reading such as knowing how to handle books, knowledge of direction of written language, the function of print and that it carried messages. Yetta Goodman concluded that "It slowly became obvious to me that children's discoveries about literacy in a literate society such as ours must begin much earlier than at school age" (Y. Goodman, 1984, p. 102) This prompted her to undertake further studies investigating even younger children.

Thus, the early environmental print awareness studies were begun. Labels, signs, logos common to pre-school children's environment were presented to children in varying degrees. Results from these studies suggested the roots of the reading process were established very early in life. As well, the results identified that function preceded the form in learning to read and write and that there is a "movement from learning to read printed symbols in familiar situational contexts toward more reliance on language contexts" (Goodman and Goodman, 1979, p. 145) The Goodmans concluded that learning to read is natural in a literate society.

Studies of psycholinguistics from an educational perspective, led to great insights because literacy and oral language are psycholinguistic
Goodman (1965, 1976) was particularly concerned with the application of psycholinguistics to the reading process. The view that words only existed within the flow of language and that neither words nor morphemes could be defined, pronounced, or classified outside the language stream of varying intonation, pitch, stress, and juncture was crucial to this model of reading. Goodman's (1965) study showed that primary school children were often unable to decode words in isolation, but were able to read the same words successfully in a running context. When given a list of words to learn, children memorised these, a procedure far more demanding than reading itself. Syntactic contexts were essential in both language learning and reading. Word recognition of individual words served the purpose of contributing to meaning rather than the source of meaning in itself. Goodman concluded that reading and thus comprehension, involved complex reactions to several signal cues such as: the order of words (syntax pattern), intonation, inflection, and certain key functions that words play (pattern markers).

Goodman also asserted that children already had significant knowledge of these systems. These operated in the process of knowing language. Their knowledge of the structural system of the sound and grammar used in speech would set expectations of the
structure of language within texts. Thus the reader would fix at a point and begin a selection process, picking up graphic cues on prior choices, language knowledge, and learned strategies. The reader formed a perceptual image, searched his/her memory for matching syntactic, semantic and grapho-phonic cues. Then more graphic cues could be selected and the reader 'guessed' or made a tentative choices from short-term memory and continued reading. Should an attempt or 'guess' not be possible then the reader would make a guess based on decoding and if this was not suitable semantically or syntactically then the reader would not continue until an acceptable choice was found or resumed reading where meaning could be found. These studies examined what proficient readers did as they read and basically these readers attended to decoding directly from graphic stimuli and then encode from the deep structure of the text. Improvement in reading, according to Goodman, was not due to greater precision, but to better sampling techniques, firmer control over language structures, broadened experience and increased conceptual development which made for more accurate first guesses.

The Goodmans' prime base was a 'naturalistic' approach to research. They observed children reading in situations that were as natural as possible or as Ken Goodman claims "we worked with real kids reading real books in real schools... everything we know we have learned from kids." (Goodman, 1973, p. 3) This had implications for teachers to become observers and researchers within their classrooms.
This view about children's learning had consequences for classroom practice. In a study reviewed by Murray (1988), many teachers showed the falsity of the frequently stated division between theory and practice. Their classrooms reflected flexibility, continual experimentation and teaching practices guided by understandings of language learning developments that were current and informed. Murray (1988) asserts that:

"by testing what is done in classrooms against the best available theory, that teachers are freed from fads and from the constant tension between the comfort of established methods and the demand for innovation. On the basis of sound theory, teachers can construct the curriculum that meets the needs of their particular pupils and can adopt teaching practices which are consistent with the nature of language and of language learning." (p. 1)

Thus, on the basis of their own informed observations of children, teachers contribute to theory and teaching practice, completing the cycle which enriches knowledge of how children best learn.

**English 1980: Whole Language Emerges**

The Psycholinguistic view took prominence in the early 1980's by putting meaning foremost. The New South Wales Department of
Education, in their new English Policy, Reading K-12, defined reading as "a process of bringing meaning to, and extracting meaning from print." (1979, p. 13) According to Parker (1985), this definition emphasised reading to be an interactive process in which the reader was actively engaged in an attempt to reconstruct the author's message. This theory emphasised the value of reading whole texts as opposed to the contrived texts of reading schemes, and was in marked contrast to other theories about language learning. Classroom practices changed and included strategies like: Neorological Imprint Method (NIM) for shared reading, uninterrupted, sustained, silent reading ((USSR), cloze and retelling.

The teaching of Writing, changed considerably. Walshe (1982), considered this, tantamount to revolution. The previous views of 'Language Experience' and structured skills for writing which involved repeated and isolated drills relating to grammar, punctuation and spelling, gave way to an orientation of writing that promoted processes of writing, as pivotal to the learner's development of writing.

A model known as "The Process of Writing ", which had emerged during the late 1970's, was taken up by teachers. Research by Donald Murray (1982) and Donald Graves (1980), cited by Walshe (1982), emphasised the process involved in writing and its interactions with all other areas of literacy. The product became far less important than
the actual process of writing, and this process was seen as an interactive, thinking process. The process was cyclic, and varied according to the individual's needs at the time of writing. Writing involved a thinking process that included experience, pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, producing or publication of the writing. 

(Writing K-12, 1987, pp. 6-7)

ii) "Whole Language Learning."

The evolving theory of natural language learning or Whole Language emerged in the 1980's and contrasts with the traditional fragmented, skills based view of education which dominated education for many years. Newman (1985, p. 1), stresses Whole Language is a philosophical stance, a set of beliefs or theoretical framework about how language is learned, which can be translated into classroom practice. Whole Language is based on the view that language is learned through real use, through opportunities to use Whole Language acts and not through practice exercises.

The key theoretical premise for Whole Language is that,

"the world over, babies acquire a language through actually using it, not through practising the parts until some later date when the parts are assembled and the totality is finally used." (Altwerger, Edelsky and Flores, 1987, p. 145)
Newman, (1985, p.1) sees no "simple definition" of Whole Language. For her,

"Whole Language is a shorthand way of referring to a set of beliefs about curriculum, not just language arts curriculum, but about everything that goes on in the classroom." (Newman, 1985, p.1) "Whole language activities are those which support students in their use of all aspects of language; students learn about reading and writing while listening; they learn about writing from reading and gain insights about reading from writing." (Newman, 1985, p.5)

Meaningful, real language is at the core of the Whole Language paradigm. In Halliday's (1975) view, learning language is a "learning how to mean process." "What is common to every use of language is that it is meaningful, contextualised and in the broadest sense, social" (Halliday, 1969, p. 26)

Language which is fragmented into letters and sounds and taught in exercises is meaningless and no longer operates as language because it serves no communicative purpose. "There is no meaning to express, no meaning to comprehend, and thus the very goal of reading and writing is lost." (Altwerger and Bird, 1982 p. 5) Written language, like oral language is meaningful when students have real purposes for making it. Meaning is central to the four modes of language: talking,
listening, reading and writing.

New learning about any of the four modes of language, feeds into the learner's linguistic data pool. Learning contributes to, and may exist as understandings, to be used in any one of the other modes. For example, information learned through writing may be stored in the linguistic data pool to be used at a later date in reading (Burke, 1984).

The four modes of language have three systems in common: semantic, syntactic and grapho-phonics. (Altwerger et al, 1987) Language users combine their knowledge of the world (semantics), knowledge about language (syntax) and their knowledge about the letter and sound patterns of language (grapho-phonics) to construct meaning. Language is learned through a problem solving process, where students construct hypotheses about how language works, test them out and confirm or modify their hypotheses in the light of response from others. (Dyson, 1982 and Newman, 1985) To ensure that students develop and test their hypotheses, certain conditions need to operate. Cambourne (1988), has outlined seven conditions which foster the development of oral language. These conditions can be replicated in classrooms to foster successful literacy learning. They are: immersion, demonstration, expectation, responsibility, use, response and approximation.

Cambourne (1987) stresses that:
"In a teaching-learning context, 'a Whole language Approach' means that the literary act or artifact being demonstrated needs to be sufficiently 'whole' to provide enough information about the various systems and subsystems of language, so that if he decides to engage, will have the data available for working out how all the pieces fit together and interact with each other."

( Cambourne, 1987, p. 7 )

A language demonstration includes the inner core of meaning, the phonemic, grammatical and pragmatic (context) systems. (Atwell, 1983 cited in Cambourne, 1987)

Cambourne (1988) in describing the conditions for learning, emphasises the importance of immersing students in print-filled environments where they are surrounded by language in all its modes. Students learn as a result of engaging with repeated demonstrations. They will only do this, if they are willing and able, to engage with the demonstrations. Smith (1983), like Cambourne believes that engagement will occur if children feel they are potential readers and writers, that it will further their own lives and that the teacher is worth emulating. Cambourne also says, that children are more likely to emulate the teachers they know, like and trust. Trust is indicated by the teacher's expectation that children are capable of learning to read and write. It is also evident in the teacher's confidence in
children's ability to make independent decisions and select from the demonstrations what they need to know about language at that point of time.

Cambourne also emphasises the importance of teacher's accepting children's reading and writing approximations and not expecting them to read and write like adults from the beginning. Approximations indicate the children have selected from their environment and established an hypothesis about literacy. Frequent opportunities for purposeful reading and writing allows children to test their developing understandings of written language. They will confirm or modify their hypotheses on the basis of responses from those around them. If the response is non-threatening, children will continue to select information from demonstrations and test their hypotheses in their own reading and writing, thus ensuring that learning will continue to occur (Cambourne, 1987). Young children have the expectation that they can learn and actively search for meaning unless conditions in their environment impede it (Smith, 1981).

Cambourne (1984) argues that children, when given the same conditions as professional writers when they are writing, manage to select their own topics, have sufficient information and succeed when they focus on the clarification of meaning. They will simultaneously learn conventions also with no apparent effort. It is therefore
important for teachers to provide their students with similar conditions. The New South Wales Department of Education Syllabus Writing K-12 requires that all primary school teachers base their programming and teaching of writing on these conditions. (1987, p. 17).

The theory of natural language learning, or Whole Language is incompatible with the evaluation procedures of the traditional, fragmented view of language learning. Traditional assessment procedures have little to offer the proponents of Whole Language, because the procedures bear no relation to real language used for real purposes. They fail to consider the language behaviours and attitudes of the learner. Kemp (1986) refers to this problem when he states

"One of the interesting problems generated by holistic or naturalistic approaches in the literacy curricula... is in various assessment procedures. ...The questions they (parents, teachers, administrators) have always been able to ask about performance levels, and have answered quickly, are not appropriate ones in the face of such dynamic changes in curricula as have been brought about by the holistic literacy curriculum movement. " (p. 218-19)

Cambourne (1986) presents the arguments against, and alternatives
to traditional assessment procedures when he stresses that

"The new pedagogy and philosophy is based on a different metaphor (holistic language) which in turn requires... a different view of assessment based on performance on tasks which involve Whole Language. This new paradigm demands the methods of qualitative data collection, namely careful observation of individuals over time, observation of "literacy in process" and or interview procedures." (p. 3)

Altwerger et al (1987) advocate the observation of children as a viable alternative to testing and recommend the "... documenting of growth in children's actual work rather than on comparing scores on work substitutes" (p. 2). This type of evaluation has been described by Yetta Goodman (1982) as kid-watching.

"The relationship between teaching and learning is part of the integral process of evaluation and curriculum development. As they operate in the school situation they must be understood as a holistic process with each impacting, interrelating and effecting each other but never as an isomorphic or one to one correspondence of the other. Kid-watching legitimatises this dynamic relationship." (p. 121)
Deford and Harste (1982) also advocate kid-watching as an alternative assessment procedure, because research has shown that the best evaluative data results from observing real language users in real language settings using real language.

Cambourne and Turbill (1988) support the view that learning, teaching and assessment should occur simultaneously in the classroom. The idea of 'dynamic assessment' put forward by Valencia and Pearson (1987), stresses the importance of teachers being able to observe, assess and respond to children's needs as they interact with children working on literacy tasks. Dynamic assessment...

"... emanates from Vygotsky's notion of the 'zone of proximal development', that region of just far enough- but not too far- beyond the student's current level of competence such that sensitive teachers, using scaffolding tools such as modelling, hints, leading questions and cooperative task completion, can assist learners in moving to their next level of learning. In such a model, instruction consists of guiding learning through the interplay of assessment and meaningful application of skills." (p. 728)

The emphasis on kid-watching as a legitimate evaluation procedure has grown out of the many ethnographic studies by Taylor (1983).

"Given the fact that language is first and foremost a process, ethnography seems an ideal methodology for the study of language. Categories that are used to analyse developmental data must evolve from the data itself and be verified in situations where constraints are known through study of the linguistic resources being demonstrated and used." (p. 96)

These studies have provided rich documented evidence of children's language learning over time and have been invaluable in increasing teachers' understanding of language development.

2. EFFECTS OF TEACHER BELIEFS ON INSTRUCTION.

There is a mass of literature (DeFord 1985), which reports on investigations into the influence of instruction on learning to read. She suggests the common thread throughout this literature is

"the belief that teachers are decision makers who process information and act upon these decisions within complex environments. These investigations have pointed out that research on teaching must
examine not only teachers' behavior but also their
judgements, plans and decisions in relation to
that behavior."

Harste and Burke (1977) hypothesised that teachers make decisions about reading instruction according to the theory and assumptions they hold about reading and learning. They propose that the teachers' goals, expectancies, procedures, materials selected and classroom interaction patterns, are established by the teachers' theoretical orientation.

Theoretical Orientation in reading is defined by Harste and Burke (1977), as the particular knowledge and belief system held toward reading, that is, those deep philosophical principles that guide teachers to establish expectancies about student behaviour and the decisions they make during the reading lesson.

In an ethnographic study of three kindergarten teachers, Ross (1979) found four factors which influenced the teachers' ability to implement their beliefs:

a) clarity of beliefs,

b) the ability to perceive a connection between beliefs and practices previously identified as important,

c) an awareness and thorough understanding of possible alternative practices, and
d) the teacher's perceptions of the beliefs of school system officials.

De Ford (1985), set out to develop an instrument which would classify a teacher's theoretical orientation to reading instruction and developed the DeFord Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile with this in mind. The instrument uses a Likert scale response system to determine teacher beliefs about practices in reading instruction. Smith (1982) argues that everyone has a theory of the world and perceives and interprets future directions and events in the light of this theory. New information is organised, reorganised and acted upon so as to create order - a unified, consistent description of the world. The theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (DeFord 1985) samples the teacher's theory of the world of reading. In this view of theoretical orientation, the theory act as a filter in perceiving, understanding, organising and acting upon the experiences in that world.

Figure I (taken from DeFord and Harste, 1982, p. 594) presents a transactional view of literacy instruction. The arrows joining the teacher to the student capture the relationship between teacher beliefs and their affect on what students believe about language and language learning. The various contexts surrounding classroom instruction may or may not support the specific instructional context as defined by the teacher. Alternate contexts such as those
represented in figure 1. can affect instruction by either heightening or diminishing the teacher variable.

**Teacher, Context, and Students: Towards a Transactional View of Literacy Instruction.**

![Fig. 1. A Transactional View of Literacy Instruction.](image)

Within the complex instructional setting, the decisions Harste and Burke (1977) suggest that are influenced by a teacher's theoretical orientation involve:

1. The goals that teachers set for the classroom reading program.
2. The behaviors teachers perceive as reflecting "good" reading behaviour.
3. The procedures, materials and information teachers use for instructional diagnosis.

4. The weighting teachers give to various pieces of diagnostic information.

5. The materials teachers select and use for instruction in the program.

6. The environment teachers perceive to be most conducive to reading growth.

7. The criteria teachers use to determine growth in reading.

The significance of what is communicated in the classroom is a result of complex processes of interaction among educational goals, background knowledge, and what various participants perceive over time as taking place (Gumperz 1981). It is the teacher's knowledge of language and language learning that directs actions and decisions made within the ongoing instructional environment. DeFord and Harste (1982) claim that teachers need to consider the impact of what they say they believe and value and what they actually communicate to students and the effects this can have on literacy learning.

Mitchell's study (1980), highlighted the influence teacher beliefs have on readers response in the learning setting. Mitchell found that, students seemed to understand what teachers value, even in one hour of contact.
The question of conflicting messages sent out by teachers is taken up by Pulvertaft (1984). Conflicting messages will occur in classrooms where during the 'reading lesson' students are locked into a reading scheme, knowing they will be compelled to finish every book and complete a series of comprehension questions. Where avoidance of error and preoccupation with accuracy occur. Yet, during the Sustained Silent Reading time, the same students are allowed to select books they are interested in, to dip, skip, skim and guess. The messages the teacher is implicitly passing on to the students about the reading which occurs in the reading lesson is in conflict with the messages passed on about the process of reading which occurs in the Sustained Silent Reading time.

In 1985 Bridge and Herbert observed two average schools in the United States. They found that many teachers spent most of their writing time doing transcription lessons involving the verbatim copying of texts. The students seldom composed discourse level texts and they rarely wrote for an audience. Teachers mainly used prewriting to stimulate children's thinking and often neglected opportunities to relate activities in the classroom that would serve as a source of ideas to stimulate writing. There was an emphasis on word and sentence level writing tasks designed to teach grammar, spelling, punctuation and handwriting. Teachers were concerned about product rather than process. Bridge and Hiebert (1985) found that teachers in both schools were uninformed about the recursive
nature of writing and the importance of prewriting activities and even though both teachers held beliefs about holistic language, they were compelled to conform through mandates and peer pressure.

Cambourne (1984) in "Learning Not To Write: Examining Instrumental Assumptions by Observing the Teaching Process", found that the children in a typical classroom were not learning what they needed in order to make use of writing as either a tool of learning or as a mode of communication. The students were not writing exploratory drafts and consequently were not discovering how thoughts, ideas and concepts they never knew they had, can be shaped and refined. He found that many teachers, like the Mrs M. in the 1984 study, taught fragmented language lessons such as spelling and grammar and ran tight, well structured prewriting planning sessions.

Like Cambourne, Oliver (1982) found evidence that traditional teachers taught with the assumption that "writers need to have a clear idea before they write"(p. 163). For Mrs M. (Cambourne, 1984), writing was a well planned, one draft affair. There was little real writing, as in revising and reconstructing meaning. Mrs M. had certain assumptions guiding her teaching practice. She believes that writing conventions must be learnt first before being able to create meaning. Learning all facets of the writing process is best achieved if the time, information and topic are all teacher controlled. She also believes that conventions are best taught by fragmenting writing into
grammar and spelling lessons.

Peacock (1986) also observed teachers decontextualising writing using spelling corrections, textbook explanations of punctuation and sentence structure.

"Pupils seem to be willing and able to produce correct answers to single isolated problems especially when they are given the support of the teacher, textbook or worksheet but as most teachers of this type of writing will tell you the greatest problem is trying to persuade each child to apply what is learned in isolation to the act of independent, continued and extended writing."(1986, p.8)

Writing is often done under the assumption that it is to be evaluated by teachers, rather than read. According to Shaughnessy (1977, p.7), in the child's mind writing becomes "a line that moves haltingly across the page, exposing as it goes all that the writer doesn't know, then passing into the hands of a stranger who reads it with a lawyer's eye."

Harste and Burke's study (1980), of a Kindergarten child as she moved from the home to the school environment, highlighted the influence of both the home and the teacher. They believe that both the parental influence and Alison's experiences at home were facilitating language development and control. On the other hand they found that Alison's teacher's activities were debilitating to her control of language.
When Alison started school, she believed she was a doer of reading and writing; it made sense to her and was predictable. But when her teacher gave her certain tests with no language context, she began to have some doubts. Alison’s teacher based her teaching on a set of assumptions which directed her instructional thinking and planning. She believed there was no need to test her own instructional assumptions regarding Alison by using open entry type activities. There was no need in her mind to tap into Alison’s growth in language development and experience. She also believed that literacy begins with being able to visually discriminate and that beginning to write and read must be error free. Errors must be pointed out and you must have control of the conventions before creativity can be mastered. Harste and Burke (1980), found these assumptions detrimental to Alison’s learning.

Teachers must believe that children can already, or have started to, read and write as they come to school. Goodman and Goodman (1983) suggest that teachers should expand upon and support the child’s knowledge rather than ignore his level of understanding of the nature of written language. The teacher in Harste and Burke’s study (1980), viewed errors as evidence that learning had not taken place. She believed that she had to point out errors to make language as error free as possible.
Negative assumptions and beliefs in teaching writing can often be a product of how a teacher views him/herself as a writer. Smith (1983) shows that teachers must demonstrate that writing is interesting, possible and worthwhile. You cannot do that if you are not a member of the writing club yourself. Teachers must see themselves as writers and read like writers. Smith states that "teachers who are not members of the club cannot admit children to the club." (1983,p. 566) Teachers must collaborate with pupils. In other words pupils must write with teachers so they will begin to regard themselves as writers and change the way in which they read text. If children regard the teacher as a taskmaster and an antagonist, they will never collaborate with the teacher. "Emphasis on the elimination of mistakes results in the elimination of writing" and correcting them is only worthwhile if the child would seek it (Smith, 1983, pp. 566-567).

Bean and Bouffler (1987) also emphasise the necessity of teacher participation in the act of writing. They say that children need to see people writing, otherwise they develop physical dysfunction notions about writing. They see negative assumptions like those held by Alison's teacher, such as "good writers and readers don't make mistakes", give children negative feelings towards redrafting and revising. (Bean and Bouffler, 1987, p.41)
The last teacher assumption this literature review addresses is the popular ideal of a quiet room is evidence of productive thoughtful writing. Smith (1982) suggests that teachers cannot expect writing to be controlled and well ordered; they cannot expect it to be quiet. Mature writers need to make noise - trying out new spellings, hearing what has just been written, expressing excitement or walking around the room. Incubating may be reading and or talking. (Smith, 1982, p.206)

The following table attempts to summarise the research on teacher assumptions and teaching practice.

**TABLE I.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER DOES</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring language brought to school.</td>
<td>Children's background has no bearing on learning.</td>
<td>Language background important. Teacher expands on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little writing - concern for product.</td>
<td>Reading reception is more important.</td>
<td>Time must be provided for regular writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented lessons - spelling and grammar.</td>
<td>Must learn conventions first.</td>
<td>Writing cannot be fragmented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER DOES</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSUMPTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALTERNATIVE ASSUMPTIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well constructed plans- no drafting or revising.</td>
<td>Must have a clear idea.</td>
<td>Writing is recursive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing is in the form of one attempt.</td>
<td>Students must control all aspects of process in one draft.</td>
<td>Controlling all aspects simultaneously is impossible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No choice of topic, or sharing.</td>
<td>Teacher must control topic.</td>
<td>The student is best able to choose topic, content, purpose and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors must be pointed out.</td>
<td>Reading and writing must be error free.</td>
<td>Errors can show learner's progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook exercises for grammar used.</td>
<td>Students must learn skills first.</td>
<td>Decontextualised exercises debilitate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting does not occur.</td>
<td>Only teacher plans are necessary.</td>
<td>Incubation of ideas helps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER DOES</td>
<td>ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVE ASSUMPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher does not write or collaborate.</td>
<td>Students are there to learn. Teachers are there to teach.</td>
<td>Collaboration facilitates construction and clarity of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher does not like writing.</td>
<td>I am not a good writer.</td>
<td>Teachers need to demonstrate that writing is worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are kept quiet.</td>
<td>Quiet lessons help writing.</td>
<td>Reading, sharing and talking help writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

The development of teacher's practices and the support provided to teachers as they clarify their beliefs and expectations about student behaviour, forms part of school Professional Development Programs.

Recent Research indicates that teachers need to be actively involved in their own professional development. Hopkins and Wideen (1984) considered the impact of the traditional mode of inservice and concluded that inservice outside the school situation is likely to lead to short term effect only and that staff development should be considered
within the school context.

Joyce and Showers (1980), analysed Inservice Training to find out how various components of training contribute to learning. They considered the literature and came up with some working hypotheses. They suggest "teachers are wonderful learners", but in order to improve their skills and learn new approaches to teaching, "teachers need certain conditions." (p. 379) Their analysis of the literature, identified a number of components which they believe, contribute to the impact of professional development activities. They suggest, when used together, each has greater power than when used alone. The components they suggest are:

1. Presentation of theory or description of skill or strategy.
2. Modelling or demonstration.
3. Time and opportunity to practice.
5. Support/Coaching by peers, consultants or others thoroughly familiar with the innovation.

Ingvarson supports this view when he stresses the importance of translating "...innovatory ideas into concrete forms which clearly communicate the message to teachers, demonstrating what the innovation actually looks like in practice, what it means you have to do." (p. 27)
Brierly and Berliner's (1982) characteristics of elementary school teachers as learners, also support the components suggested by Joyce and Showers. They state that elementary school teachers need:

* practical and concrete instructions and demonstrations of the application of the innovation.
* individualised instruction.
* extended time to practice what has been learned.
* to adapt the innovation to suit their own classroom context to give them ownership.
* coaching in the classroom to provide teachers with feedback.
* team involvement.
* instructors who are, or have been teachers themselves.
* professional incentives.

Christine Davis (1984) outlines some guidelines for professional development, which compliment those of Joyce and Showers and Brierly and Berliner. She believes activities which raise teachers' self awareness and thus contribute to their professional development are those which:

* assist teachers to become more effective observers of children.
* require teachers to reflect on their experiences.
* challenge and excite teachers.
* consider and respect teachers' knowledge of the topic of
the innovation.

* assist teachers to respect children's learning.

Waugh and Punch (1987), suggest the key to innovation, lies with the people concerned rather than the organisation or the change. Fullan (1982) supports this view, when he states, "Educational change depends on what teachers do and think" and "...educational change is a people related phenomenon". (p. 108) Crandall (1983) stresses the need for support during professional development activities and suggests:

"Follow- through is crucial. A series of several sessions, with intervals between in which people have the chance to try things (with some access to help or to other resources), is more powerful than ever the most stimulating one-shot workshop." (p. 27)
CHAPTER 3.

METHODOLOGY.

3. RATIONALE FOR THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE DESIGN.

In this chapter I will establish the fit of the qualitative research paradigm to the focus of this research project.

3.1. ETHNOGRAPHY

Essentially, the qualitative design which will be used in this project is best described as ethnographic. This study seeks to find out what influences student writing. It seeks to examine the effect of teacher attitudes and beliefs on instructional programs, resource selection and the ecology of the instructional setting.

Goetz and LeCompte say that "ethnographers seek to construct descriptions of total phenomena within their various contexts and to generate from these descriptions the complex interrelationships of causes and consequences that affect human behavior toward and about the phenomena" (1984,p3). I foresee many interrelated realities which will help to illuminate the nature of students' learning. These will be the realities of the classroom and of the home, in connection with the attitudes and beliefs of the respondents. All of these realities must be teased out and identified because they are part of the whole. They all participate in the creation of the student's reading and
Bogden and Biklen (1982) explain that nothing is too trivial - everything has the potential of being a cue to unlock the understanding of the problem. So what is required is a thick description of the respondents, their contexts and world views.

A case study design was chosen to provide information about the influence of teacher theoretical orientation. This was undertaken within two classroom contexts in one school setting over a twelve week period.

The case study is an appropriate vehicle because it allows for a detailed description of the entity being valued in a natural context. The holistic nature of the case study ensures a life-like picture of the situation under observation. Cohen and Manion (1985) emphasise that "the purpose of such observation is to probe deeply and to analyse intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of the unit with a view to establishing generalisations about the wider population to which that unit belongs" (p.120).

3.1.2. CONTEXT AND SOCIAL PHENOMENA

The educational and social context in which these students operate will help clarify what influences students' learning. Bogden and Biklen
agree with this notion when they say that "action can be best understood when it is observed in the setting in which it occurs" (1982, p.27). Cohen and Manion (1989) point out that the traditional paradigm for research is unsuccessful in the classroom because it fails to reveal the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive quality of social phenomena especially in the interactive teaching learning context. Ethnographic research can describe such social phenomena and the complexities of human nature.

In this project effort will be made to tap into the assumptions and conventions that the teachers and students hold. To do this Goetz and LeCompte say that "the investigator must live as much as possible with, and in the same manner as, the individuals being investigated" (1984, p.109). While this is not completely possible due to the other commitments of both the researcher and the participants, the methodology will ensure that I can get as close as possible to the subjects under investigation.

3.1.3. REFOCUSING, ORGANISATIONAL CHANGES AND SAMPLING

In research designs which are not quantitative, design changes and refocusing are facts of life. During the project so far, interview schedules have altered and the inquiry itself has become more focused.
This project does not lend itself to traditional sampling procedures. Instead, teachers are asked to identify three students; a good writer, an average writer and a writer experiencing difficulty. They will do this on the basis of their beliefs about good writing and their assumptions about the writing process. In this way, yet another source of information about teacher theoretical orientation was provided.

3.1.4. THE HUMAN INSTRUMENT

Traditional tests and quantitative instruments would not adapt to the demands of inquiring into students' literacy learning. The human instrument, the main tool of qualitative research, is the best means of gathering and analysing data because a person is better able to cope with "indeterminate situations" and to adapt to "multi factors at multi levels simultaneously". Lincoln and Guba, (1985, p.40).

For this reason the human instrument has been used. Teachers and students, by a process of collaboration, have been able to negotiate meaning.

Lincoln and Guba (1985), Bogden and Bilken (1982) and Cambourne (1987) speak of a research methodology called "grounded theory". A grounded theory is one which is anchored, or grounded in contextually relevant data. In this project the theories of how
teacher theoretical orientation influences student writing is grounded in the data collected from teachers, students, artifacts, classroom observation and program discussions.

3.1.5. MULTI-MODAL METHODOLOGY

Goetz and LeCompte (1984 p 11) speak of ethnography as being "multi-modal or eclectic". Ethnographers use a variety of techniques to amass their data. It would be invalid to use just one method. For the sake of validity and trustworthiness and the need for real life data, varying methods have been included in the project.

Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies were used and include:

- teacher interviews both structured and semi-structured,
- participant observation accounts,
- collection of teacher language related products,
- collection of student artifacts and other written documents,
- and student interviews, both semi-structured and unstructured.
3.1.6. DATA ANALYSIS

With traditional research the means of data analysis is tightly fixed right at the beginning. What was needed in this project was an analysis of data which will begin when the first data appears, as well as reveal itself more clearly as the research design emerges. This is supported by Lincoln and Guba who suggest that "data analysis must first begin with the first data collection in order to facilitate the emergent design, grounding of theory and emergent structure of later collection plans" (1985, p. 241).

3.2. SUBJECTS

The subjects used in this study were one Year Four teacher and one Year six teacher from one school. Each teacher was asked to identify a good writer, an average writer and a writer experiencing difficulty from their class. The six students included three girls and three boys. Three of the students came from non-English speaking backgrounds and three from English speaking backgrounds. Supportive data was collected from the students.
3.3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

3.3.1. METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Methods of data collection used in this project were:

TEACHERS

1. **Teacher interviews- structured.**
   - the DeFord Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP)
   APPENDIX I.

2. **Teacher interviews- semi-structured.**
   - Teachers were asked questions about their responses to the TORP, their teaching and professional development backgrounds, beliefs and practices. APPENDIX 8 AND 9.

3. **Participant observation.**
   - Classroom Observation / Supervision Guide. APPENDIX 2.

4. **Teacher Language - related products.**
   Review of Work Programs.
   - criterion the teacher uses to determine growth in literacy,
   - purposes for writing,
   - procedures and materials selected,
   - demonstrations planned,
   - literature shared. APPENDIX 2.
   - class program sample. APPENDIX 11.

5. **Participant Observation.**
   Review of Learning Conditions operating in the classroom: The teacher as co-researcher. APPENDIX 3.
STUDENTS

6. **Review of Writing** carried out during the term. APPENDIX 4.

7. **Review of books read** during the term. APPENDIX 5.

8. **Student Interviews- structured.**
   - Written interview. APPENDIX 6.
   - informal discussions about writing.
   - Writing Interview. APPENDIX 7.
   - what purposes do the students have for writing, what do the students demonstrate about the teacher's beliefs / practices in Literacy.

9. **Student Interviews- semi and unstructured.**
   - Follow Up Interviews. APPENDIX 10.

3.3.2. **DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES.**

**STRUCTURED TEACHER INTERVIEW- THE DEFORD THEORETICAL ORIENTATION READING PROFILE- APPENDIX 1.**

The DeFord Theoretical Orientation Reading Profile (TORP), uses a Likert scale response system to determine teacher beliefs about practices in reading instruction.

The researcher asked each teacher to complete the TORP. The questions are grouped so that a SA or a low score on questions 1, 10,
22, 6, 20, 9, 3, 21, 12, and 2, identifies a phonics orientation. A high score indicates strong disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation and, therefore, represents Whole Language. Questions 19, 8, 28, 11, 16, 13, 4, 25, 14 and 24, are grouped to indicate a skills orientation. Questions 27, 17, 18, 7, 5, 15, 26 and 23 are grouped to indicate a Whole Language orientation.

The researcher also completed a TORP to get some feel for the instrument. Teachers commented that it made them sit down and clarify their assumptions about language learning. The participants were later reinterviewed about their responses.

APPENDIX

The DeFord Theoretical Orientation To Reading Profile (TORP)

Name_________________________________________

Directions: Read the following statements, and circle one of the responses that will indicate the relationship of the statement to your feelings about reading and reading instruction.

(select one best answer that reflects the strength of agreement or disagreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A child needs to be able to verbalize the rules of phonics in order to assure proficiency in processing new words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An increase in reading errors is usually related to a decrease in comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dividing words into syllables according to rules is a helpful instructional practice for reading new words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency and expression are necessary components of reading that indicate good comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials for early reading should be written in natural language without concern for short, simple words and sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When children do not know a word, they should be instructed to sound out its parts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is a good practice to allow children to edit what is written into their own dialect when learning to read.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The use of a glossary or dictionary is necessary in determining the meaning and pronunciation of new words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reversals (e.g., saying &quot;saw&quot; for &quot;was&quot;) are significant problems in the teaching of reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. It is a good practice to correct a child as soon as an oral reading mistake is made.

11. It is important for a word to be repeated a number of times after it has been introduced to insure that it will become a part of sight vocabulary.

12. Paying close attention to punctuation marks is necessary to understanding story content.

13. It is a sign of an ineffective reader when words and phrases are repeated.

14. Being able to label words according to grammatical function (nouns, etc.) is useful in proficient reading.

15. When coming to a word that's unknown, the reader should be encouraged to guess upon meaning and go on.

16. Young readers need to be introduced to the root form of words (run, long) before they are asked to read inflected forms (running, longest).

17. It is not necessary for a child to know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read.

18. Flashcard drills with sightwords is an unnecessary form of practice in reading instruction.

19. Ability to use accent patterns in multisyllable words (pho ' to graph, pho to' gra phy, and pho to gra' phic) should be developed as part of reading instruction.

20. Controlling text through consistent spelling patterns (The fat cat ran back. The lat cat sat on a hat) is a means by which children can best learn to read.

21. Formal instruction in reading is necessary to insure the adequate development of all the skills used in reading.

22. Phonic analysis is the most important form of analysis used when meeting new words.

23. Children's initial encounters with print should focus on meaning, not upon exact graphic representation.

24. Word shapes (word configuration) should be taught in reading to aid in word recognition.

25. It is important to teach skills in relation to other skills.

26. If a child says "house" for the written word "home," the response should be left uncorrected.

27. It is not necessary to introduce new words before they appear in the reading text.

28. Some problems in reading are caused by readers dropping the inflectional endings from words (e.g., jump, jumped)
PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION - APPENDIX 2 AND 3.

The classroom observation / program supervision guide (Appendix 2) was used by the researcher to determine whether there was a match between what the teacher said as a response to the TORP and what happened in the classroom. It was designed to analyse the classroom ecology in terms of the conditions of learning outlined by Cambourne and referred to in Writing K-12 as the basis for planning instruction. The researcher acted as participant observer in classrooms as well as discussing class programs with the teacher.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION/PROGRAM SUPERVISION GUIDE.

APPENDIX 2.

IMMERSION.
What kind of texts are displayed in the classroom?
What kinds of texts are available for students to read?
What types of texts are shared by the teacher with her class?

Kerry Sweeney
Is language presented as meaningful and whole?

DEMONSTRATION.
Are the students surrounded by language?
Do the students have opportunities to engage in language learning opportunities?
Are language learning opportunities structured to demonstrate language in use?
Does the timetable fracture language into separate areas?

EXPECTATION.
Does the teacher expect that her students will learn to use language?
Do the students expect to become language users?
Is learning language regarded as important?

RESPONSIBILITY.
Does the teacher value and respond to her students' needs?
Who decides what to learn next?

USE.
Do the students use language in authentic situations?

APPROXIMATIONS.
Are the students free to approximate and experiment with language?
Are students expected to talk, read and write like adults?
RESPONSE.

Are the responses positive, reassuring and constructive?

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION- APPENDIX 3.

The class teacher acted as co researcher by completing Appendix 3. It was designed to discover the conditions of learning operating in the classroom and sought to determine if there was a match between the TORP, classroom observations and what the teacher recorded as the number of times spent daily on Whole Language activities. It also served to highlight for the classroom teacher the number of times each day their students engaged in reading and writing.
PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION- APPENDIX 3.
LEARNING CONDITIONS OPERATING IN THE CLASSROOM-THE TEACHER AS CO RESEARCHER.

Record the number of times spent daily:

1. modelling the reading process through:
   - shared book experiences
   - reading to the children
   - children reading to each other
   - other adults reading to children
   - engaging the class in USSR
   - other____________________

2. modelling the writing process through:
   - class stories
   - written conversations
   - innovating on texts
   - demonstrations
   - other____________________

3. children reading by themselves.

4. children writing by themselves.

5. children responding to each other's writing.

6. children responding to each other's reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole lang.experience</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Modelling reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modelling writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children reading by themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children writing by themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children responding to each other's writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children responding to each other's reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEMI-STRUCTURED TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Appendix 8 was developed in response to questions arising from early analysis of the data. Focus questions were developed and used to guide discussion during meetings with the year four and year six teachers.

TEACHER INTERVIEW 2- APPENDIX 8.

1. Tell me about your educational background. (Training etc.)
2. What Professional Development activities have you undertaken in the last three years?
3. Tell me about your teaching experience.
4. Tell me about your Literacy Program.
   Probes:
   - How do you organise your language session?
   - Identify three writers in your classroom.
     a good writer,
     an average writer,
     a writer experiencing difficulty.
   - Tell me about their writing.
5. What reading have you done in the area of literacy?
   Probes:
   - What about the E.L.I.C. readings?
   - The school Professional Development Program?
6. What has influenced you?

Probes:

- a teacher, something you've read or heard, inservice?

7. What concerns or difficulties do you have in implementing your Literacy Program?

8. How do you evaluate?

Probes:

- Is it School Policy?
- Do you like doing it that way?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of doing it that way?

A third teacher interview, Appendix 9, was developed in response to analysis of the data previously collected. It became more specific and sought out information related to the impact of this project on both teachers, and clarified responses to earlier interviews and observations.
TEACHER INTERVIEW 3- APPENDIX 9.

1. Has exploring your beliefs influenced your Literacy Program?
   Probes:
   - Was it a useful process?
   - Do you think your assumptions about learning and literacy learning have changed since E.L.I.C.?
   - How do you feel your assumptions/beliefs influence student writing?

2. On the TORP you said .................. Do you still agree?

3. How has the Professional Development Program of your school contributed to your class program?

4. What are your suggestions for the School Professional Development Program?
   Probes:
   - the organisation? grade, department, whole school level.
   - the content?
Appendix 11 includes school and teacher language related products. Examples of the Year four teacher and Year six teachers' language planning and evaluation products were collected at the beginning of the project. They were used to triangulate data collected during interviews with both teachers and students and participant observations. The school's Evaluation, Programing and Professional Development Policies and related documents were also collected.

Interviews and observations were supported by artifacts. Writing samples, reading and writing records provided a rich contextual source of data.
Students were asked to keep a profile of the reading and writing activities in which they engaged in their classroom. This was to include all reading and writing activities, regardless of the subject area.

### I HAVE READ THESE BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT INTERVIEWS - APPENDIX 6 AND 7.

Interviews, oral and written conversations were designed in the conversational mode. Loftnd (1971) cited in Goetz and LeCompte (1984) suggests that everyday interaction communicates empathy, trust and acceptance. Two structured interviews were designed to collect information about the students' writing, their attitudes, and sources for ideas. Student interview 1 (Appendix 6), was carried out as a written conversation between the researcher and the student. Student Interview 2 (Appendix 7), was carried as an oral conversation. It sought to triangulate data collected in the classroom, from the teacher and the class program.

PUPIL SURVEY - WRITTEN CONVERSATION QUESTIONS.

APPENDIX 6.

Hello my name is Mrs Sweeney, what's yours?
How old are you?
Do you write at home?
What do you write about?
What do you like to write about at school?
Are you a good writer?
Are you getting better at writing?
Who is a good writer you know?
What can you do if you don't know a word?
Do you like to publish your stories?
Is learning to write important to you?

Kerry Sweeney
1. Source of ideas for writing?

1* That's really interesting / exciting.
2* Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing?
3* Where do you usually get your ideas from?
4* Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?
5* Do you write at home? Who else writes at home?
6* What sorts of things do you / they write?

2. Attitudes to writing.

7* Do you like writing for other people?
8* Do you like writing other kinds of things?
9* Are there any particular writers you like to read?
10* Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?


11* Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.
12* What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?
13* How do you start writing sessions?
14* What else do you do?
Appendix 10 includes a number of semi-structured interviews carried out with the year four and six students. Focus questions arising from early analysis of the data were used to guide discussions. On some occasions our discussions were in response to questions raised during participant observation sessions and on other occasions discussion arose from questions raised during member checking. They also sought to determine what the students demonstrate about the teachers' beliefs and practices in literacy.
3.3.3. DATA COLLECTION OVERVIEW.

1. CORE DATA.

- Class Work Programs
- Classroom Observations
- Teacher Interviews

 CONTEXTUALLY RELEVANT DATA

2. SUPPORTIVE DATA.

- Language Products
- Student Records
- Student Interviews

Fig. 2. Data Collection Model.
3.4. TRUSTWORTHINESS

The issue of trustworthiness has been addressed using the areas of concern listed in Lincoln and Guba (1986).

They are:

1. Credibility- by prolonged engagement.
2. Dependability- by investigator triangulation.
3. Confirmability- member checks.
4. Peer Debriefing.

1. Prolonged Engagement

The researcher had been part of the school for some time and my executive status allowed me to spend time with teachers and students in their classrooms. Professional development of teachers forms a major part of my executive role, and so the researcher was accepted as a regular participant in the school. During the previous year, we had participated in E.L.I.C. and both teachers were in my group. Thus the researcher was able to develop a more complete understanding of the classroom context.
2. Triangulation

Triangulation, or the confirmation of each interpretation of the data by two or more sources was achieved by employing different modes of data collection and with different sources. Interviews with teachers and students, classroom observation and program supervision, as well as collection of relevant products allowed the researcher to confirm what the teacher said with what the students said and the products of the classroom. Webb et al (1966) in Guba and Lincoln (1985) stress that "Once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced" (p. 307). The following model demonstrates how the interpretation of the data was confirmed through the use of different modes and different sources of collection.

![Triangulation Diagram]

Fig. 3. Triangulation.
3. Member Checking

In a member check, participating teachers are requested to confirm or reject the data and categories resulting from the data analysis. All data collected was subject to a member check by the teachers and students to ensure the credibility of the data. In addition, the teachers were asked to check and respond to the categories to ensure the credibility of the data analysis. In some cases, this raised further questions for investigation.

4. Peer Debriefing

Peer debriefing is a "process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain implicit within the inquirer's mind" (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

The methodology undertaken was scrutinized thoroughly in terms of choice, suitability, implementation and data collection. Analysis of the results and conclusions drawn from these had to be tracked back through the data as proof of truth of statement. After the completion of the project the evaluator was involved in several peer debriefing sessions with colleagues. The support teacher at the school provided a further check on the credibility of this project findings.
3.5. DATA ANALYSIS

The initial analysis entailed scanning and rereading data. This was followed by comparing, crosschecking and tracking data in all data collection. Questions were reasked. Teachers and students reviewed their original responses.

The data was organised into categories so that it could be analysed and interpreted.

DATA

Core Data

Core data was gathered through structured and semi-structured interviews.

Supportive Data

Supportive data was collected through student interviews, participant observation, teacher and student language products, records of student reading and writing, the evaluators field notes and the school professional development program. This data was used to triangulate and cross-check the core data and has been included in the appendices.
3.6. CATEGORISING THE DATA

The categories were identified as a result of reading and rereading the core data searching for recurring patterns. The data was sorted into homogeneous groups which were labelled, tested, modified and extended by further reading all the data.

The data from the interviews were organised into three categories: beliefs, practices and implications for professional development. Within each category, sub-categories arose. The categories were then subjected to a member check by the teachers. Guba and Lincoln (1985) stress, "... who is in a better position to judge whether the categories appropriately reflect their issues and concerns than the people themselves" (p. 97). This process of member checking adds to the credibility of the data and analysis.

The resulting categories then formed the basis for the next stage of data gathering. Further interviews were developed and more data was collected to flesh out the categories for interpretation in the light of the purposes of this study.
The categories identified through a systematic reading of the data were:

1. The teacher's **beliefs** about language learning, planning and evaluation.

   This category refers to the teacher's beliefs about how students learn language and how this learning should be evaluated.

2. The teacher's **practices** as evidence of their beliefs.

   This category refers to the teacher's classroom practice, organisation, materials selected and student monitoring.

3. The implications for future **professional development**.

   This category refers to the issues and concerns that the teacher expressed about undertaking this evaluation as a professional development activity. Implications and suggestions for future professional development activities are also included.
The next step in the analysis involved making connections within and between the categories. Two summaries were then compiled. They were:

1. A descriptive summary.

The identified connections were included in a descriptive account of each teacher's beliefs, practices and suggestions for future professional development. Descriptive summaries were compiled from each teacher interview and from classroom observations.

2. An interpretative statement.

The interpretative statements included interpretations of the connections within, and between the categories. The statements also included the interpretation of the supportive data provided by the student interviews, student artifacts, teacher language related products, classroom observation and the evaluator's field notes.
CHAPTER 4.

RESULTS

a) ORGANISATION OF RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the impact of the teachers' theoretical orientation on student writing. It is divided into two sections.

1. The year four teacher.

2. The year six teacher.

Each section includes information about the teacher's background, descriptive summaries and interpretative summaries.

The teacher and student interviews, classroom observation and program supervision summaries and student writing and reading logs have been included in the appendix.
THE YEAR FOUR TEACHER

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The year four teacher has a Diploma of Teaching from Wollongong University. She is in her second year of teaching at this school. She taught casually for one year before her permanent appointment.

In the two years she has been teaching, she has completed the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC) and the Teachers Inservice in Mathematics Education (TIME) course. She has attended a number of other inservice courses related to her beginning teacher status. At the school level, she is a member of the Science Committee and has been instrumental in the development of the School Science Plan, and the resourcing of the Science Activity Cards.

She has visited other schools in the South Coast Region to look at successful Whole Language programs and shared her observations with the school staff.

At the grade level, she has worked with the school support teacher to develop a booklet on using Roald Dahl as an author study.
1. THE CLASS WORK PROGRAM. YEAR 4.

APPENDIX  11.(a)

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

She believes that:

* the approach to teaching she takes and the type of teacher she is reflects her basic beliefs about learning.
* all students are individuals and that each teacher will respond differently to them.
* the teacher's role is to establish a good relationship with each child.
* each student should feel secure and work to achieve their potential.
* children should accept part responsibility for their learning.
* peers can be used to support and help other class members.
* students need to develop the ability to work individually as well as part of a group.
* the way children perceive themselves often effects their learning.
* all areas of the child's development are important.
* children learn better if they are actively involved in the learning process.
children should have some choice in their own learning.
all honest attempts at learning should be accepted and used as a basis for further learning.

THE LITERACY PROGRAM

She believes that:

* a Whole Language approach is effective in the classroom.
* reading, writing, listening and talking activities should not be separated.
* her program attempts to link the elements of language together.
* children learn from being immersed in modelled writing sessions.
* children need time to read and write individually.
* the daily language focus should meet the needs of her students.
* students need to have some choice in what they learn.
* language contracts present language to her children in a more wholistic manner than set reading lessons.
* her current organisation is successful.
CLASSROOM PRACTICE

Her **practices** are:

* the language session should begin with **U S S R**
  (Uninterrupted, Sustained Silent Reading).
* a sharing time is important each day.
* she should demonstrate and model reading and writing.
* children should be allowed to write on self chosen topics as well as whole class topics.
* children need to be immersed in print.
* children need to be immersed in both fiction and non fiction.
* reading schemes have little to offer. That real books are more useful.
* evaluation best occurs through watching kids at work.
* collecting writing samples provides a basis for future planning.
* her anecdotal records provide a focus for modelled reading and writing sessions.

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year four teacher's program is well organised and indicates the daily focus and contract activities. The daily focus may be based on selected needs from observation of students or from demonstrations of various writing styles and skills. She is comfortable about the
classroom organisation which allows her to put this program in to place. The contract activities are well explained and understood by her students. New activities are demonstrated in the daily focus and evaluated by observation as well as during the daily sharing time. The program reflects activities discussed within the school professional development program.

2. THEORETICAL ORIENTATION TO READING PROFILE

RESPONSES. APPENDIX 1.(a)

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Table 2 shows the year four teacher’s responses to the phonics questions. Her score of forty out of fifty indicates strong disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation.

**PHONICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbalizes rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Correct miscues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Importance of phonics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instruct to sound out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Control Text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problem of reversals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syllabification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Formal Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attend to punctuation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase errors/less comp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Totals  46  38  **40**  41.33

Table 2. TORP: Phonics.

The following graph shows a pictorial representation of how the year four teacher scored on the phonics related questions. A high score
would indicate strong disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation and therefore, represents whole language.

**Fig. 4. TORP: Phonics.**

When reinterviewed, the year four teacher’s responses to the phonics questions remained unchanged.

**Table 3** shows the year four teacher’s responses to the statements which have a skills orientation. Her score of twenty eight out of fifty would indicate some support for a skills approach.

**SKILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Teach accent patterns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Must use glossary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Probs with endings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repeat sight words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Roots then inflected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inefficient to repeat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency = comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Importance of skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Label grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teach word shapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 48 33 28 36.33

**Table 3. TORP: Skills.**
These questions are grouped so that Strongly Agree responses identify a skills orientation. Strongly Disagree responses would identify a Whole Language orientation. Middle scores would identify a phonics orientation. The following graph shows pictorially how the year four teacher scored on the skills related questions.

![Graph showing TORP: Skills]

Fig. 5. TORP: Skills.

The responses made to questions sixteen, nineteen, twenty five and twenty eight were not in accord with the year four teachers stated beliefs and classroom practices for Whole Language. When reinterviewed in Teacher Interview 3 (Appendix 9), her responses changed. Her new responses and new score of thirty five out of fifty are shown in Table 6. The year four teacher's responses to the skills questions highlight the expectations she passes on to her students.
TORP: SKILLS when reinterviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Teach accent patterns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Must use glossary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Probs with endings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repeat sight words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Roots then inflected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inefficient to repeat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency = comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Importance of skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Label grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teach word shapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total | 48 | 33 | 35 | 38.67 |

Table 6. TORP: Skills.

Table 4 shows the year four teacher's responses to the statements which have a Whole Language orientation. These questions are grouped so that Strongly agree and a low score indicate a Whole Language Orientation. Her score of seventeen out of forty indicates a Whole Language perspective.

WHOLE LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alphabet unnecess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flash cards unnecess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total | 11 | 17 | 17 | 15.00 |

Table 4. TORP: Whole Language.

Figure 6. shows pictorially the year four teacher's responses to the
Whole Language questions. A score of eight out of forty would indicate strong agreement with a Whole Language orientation. A high score, would indicate a strong phonics orientation.

![Whole Language Chart]

Fig. 6. TORP: Whole Language.

The year four teachers responses to Questions Seventeen and Five did not correspond with her stated beliefs and practices. When reinterviewed in Teacher Interview 3. (Appendix 9), the year four teacher changed both her responses. Her new responses correspond with her the stated beliefs which guide the decisions she makes when teaching literacy. Her new score of eleven out of a possible forty and her new responses are shown in Table 7.
**TORP: WHOLE LANGUAGE when reinterviewed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kerry Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alphabet unnecess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flash cards unnecess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 11 15 11 12.33

**Table. 9. TORP: Whole Language.**

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year four teacher's responses to the theoretical orientation profile are consistent with her stated beliefs and classroom practices and indicate a Whole Language orientation. The TORP highlighted the belief system which guides the expectations she has for students and the concerns she holds for teaching the skills she perceives as being necessary within a Whole Language context.
3. TEACHER INTERVIEW 2. APPENDIX 8 (a).

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

In this interview the Year Four Teacher indicated the following.

She believes that

- a Whole Language approach is the most effective approach for her classroom.
- reading, writing, listening and speaking activities should operate together.
- her students learn to read and write through immersion in modelled reading and writing.
- demonstrations should be authentic.
- her students need time to read and write both as individuals and as part of the class.
- teachers cannot infer process from student's products.
- her evaluation is not threatening to her students. That talking with students while they work, provides evaluative information on the program, classroom organisation, and on her teaching.
- evaluation involves using regular class activities.
Her classroom practices are

* to have a modelled reading or writing session followed by time for students to read or write.
* to provide a weekly contract of activities from which students can choose.
* to use student needs as a focus for demonstrations.
* to allow students to share their reading and writing.
* to evaluate through observation, talking to her students, listening to them read, watching them write, interpreting their responses to class activities.
* to collect work samples as a basis for evaluation.

Her thoughts on the school Professional Development program are:

* that it should be practical.
* that participating in ELIC did not influence her immediately.
* that visiting other schools to observe Whole Language classrooms influenced her classroom practice and confirmed her beliefs about Literacy Learning.
* that reading books about Teaching Literacy influence her.
* that staffroom discussion provides useful ideas.
**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year four teacher is comfortable with her beliefs about Whole Language and the classroom practice arising from those beliefs. She is aware of the impact of the Conditions of Learning and uses them as a framework for her class program and classroom practice. Her daily language program reflects an organised, well established and predictable routine with which the children are comfortable. There are opportunities for students to select from a range of activities.

She recognises the value of her new organisation of using a two hour block and language contracts. It has allowed her to become more aware of her students abilities.

4. **TEACHER INTERVIEW 3. Appendix 9 (a).**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

That her beliefs and classroom practices have been influenced by:

* exploring and examining her beliefs.
* a more supportive supervisor, and the support provided to develop Whole Language programs.
* the reading she has done in the area of Literacy Learning.
* her experiences as a child learning to write.
* visiting other schools to observe classrooms where whole language activities occur.
* problems with access to Library resources.

That her **beliefs** influence student writing through:
* the resources she selects.
* the demonstrations she plans and the reading and writing she models.
* the choices she provides for her students.
* letting her students know what she values.
* the way she conferences with students about their writing.

The school's **Professional Development** Program has contributed to her Professional Development through:
* the grade program.
* raising her awareness about kid watching as an evaluative tool.
* opportunities to visit other schools.
* opportunities to work with consultants.
* staff meetings which had Literacy as a focus.

The school's **Professional Development** program could be improved through:
* more involvement by staff in the organisation of the Library lesson and resources.
* providing opportunities for teachers to visit other classes within the school.
* more pressure from the supervisor to evaluate the class program.
* more work within the areas of programming and evaluation.

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year four teacher is comfortable with her beliefs and understands the influence they have on her students' writing. She is aware of the impact of the Conditions of Learning and uses them as a framework for her class program and classroom practice.

She recognises the value of her new organisation of using a two hour block and language contracts. It has allowed her to become more aware of her students abilities. Her excitement and confidence about the language program have now been replaced by anxiety about evaluation.

She monitors the children's work habits through observation and their reading and work logs. She says she is concerned about evaluation and lacks confidence in what she is doing, yet recognises the value of the class program and the place observing her students has in planning future activities. She uses the children's responses to
evaluate both herself and the program. Student needs provide the key
to future planning. She needs now to step back and take a broader
perspective when evaluating the total program.

**SUMMARY OF THE YEAR FOUR TEACHER**

This project has challenged the year four teacher's **beliefs and
practices**. It has caused to examine her **beliefs** about learning and the
role **evaluation** plays in making appropriate planning decisions. This
project has highlighted the value of observing students in the process
of reading and writing. She is now aiming at developing the recording
of **evaluation** information.

She has also developed a greater understanding of the **influence** her
**beliefs** have on student learning. Furthermore, she has become aware
of the nature of the **implicit understandings** she is offering to her
students about the place of conventions in the editing process. This is
reflected in her statements like "Part of what I believe and what I put
into practise is effected by the things I learnt as a child. And I think
they come through even though I don't want to. For example, you've
got to get the spelling right and I think the kids pick that up even
though the conference looks at meaning."

The year four teacher's **beliefs** about literacy development are
reflected in her classroom **practice** and the **goals** she sets for her
students. Her beliefs and practice indicate her emphasis on implementing the conditions for learning in the classroom to foster successful language learning.

She believes the students should take responsibility for their own learning and this belief is reflected in her practice. Her program and practice emphasise the importance of students accepting responsibility for making choices and working independently.

She believes that reading and writing development best occurs in the context of real books. This is reflected in the resources she selects and the high profile print plays in her classroom.

She believes evaluation of processes rather than products should form the basis of programming. This is reflected in her observation of students and the use of this information for future planning needs. However she indicates that perhaps she does not record this as efficiently as she could.

This project has:

* reinforced her beliefs about the role students play in the evaluation of their learning and literacy development. As well as the impact this has on student learning.
* made the year four teacher aware of the need to record evaluation information and the role this will have in looking at the language program from a broader perspective.

* has highlighted the role she plays in student learning as she considers the impact of what she may be implicitly teaching her students.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The year six teacher trained for three years at Riverina College of Advanced Education where he received a Diploma of Teaching. He later undertook part time study to complete a Bachelor of Education from Sydney College of Advanced Education.

He has taught for a total of twelve years. Five years at B..... Primary School, Four years at V..... Primary School, where he successfully sought placement on List One. This is his third year at his current school. He is the Executive Teacher Primary and Computer Contact Person for the school.

In the last three years he has completed a number of professional development activities. He has completed both the ELIC and TIME courses, which focused on the early learning needs of students in Literacy and Mathematics. He has been involved in the Western Sydney Basic Skills Program, a program designed to inservice the staff within the area of Mathematics. As the school's Computer Contact Person, he has participated in the Computer Contact Persons Course. He is a member of the Apple Users Interest Group and has undertaken a number of Computer Inservice Courses. He is a member of PETA (Primary English Teachers Association) and ARA (Australian Reading Association).
1. THE CLASS PROGRAM - HOW STUDENTS LEARN.

(taken from the class work program. Appendix 11 (b) )

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

He believes that:

* all students are individuals, that their interests and rate of learning differ.
* each student should feel secure and work to achieve their potential.
* that his role as their teacher is to recognise the unique learning needs of his students.
* it is sometimes necessary to group students with common needs.
* his senior students should be made aware of what they are learning and where they are heading.
* his students can communicate about learning with others and assist others with their learning.
* his students should be encouraged to accept responsibility within the learning process.
* it is important to be available when students need feedback.
* the topics/ themes he develops should relate to the needs and interests of his students.
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* integration with other subjects both complements and supplements student learning.
* evaluation should be diagnostic and form the basis of planning.
* it is important to collect finished products to indicate development over time.

THE LITERACY PROGRAM

He believes that:

* a Whole Language philosophy is effective in the classroom.
* language is best learned for a variety of purposes and in a wide variety of situations.
* it is important to develop a realization that reading and writing are a worthwhile, necessary and enjoyable part of life.
* it is important to integrate the various components of language.
* integration is more in consonance with the natural processes of language.
* it is necessary to teach orthographic conventions, such as spelling, grammar and punctuation.
* language experiences should be individualised and needs based.
* writing is a process.
students need to write for a variety of purposes.
students learn when they experience success.

**CLASSROOM PRACTICE**

**His practices are:**

* to base the planning of the language program around a theme/topic, which relates to the needs and interests of the students or may integrate with other subjects.
* to teach orthographic conventions in meaningful situations.
* to teach the conventions of spelling as they relate to a topic.
* to group students with common needs for modelled reading and writing.
* to start the language session with a focus. This may be modelled reading or writing, innovating on a text or student sharing.
* to conference with his students.
* to encourage students to share their writing with others and to review their work in the light of peer responses.
* to evaluate student progress through observation.
* to record information for anecdotal records during conferences and from observation.
* to complete a checklist of skills acquired.
* to use student's performance on class activities as a basis
for future planning.

* to use his observations to provide a focus for modelled reading and writing sessions.

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year six teacher is an experienced teacher, who has developed a program based on his beliefs about learning. He has carefully considered the implications of implementing a Whole Language classroom and developed appropriate classroom organisation and management practices. His daily language program reflects an organised, well established and predictable routine which his students are comfortable. For three days each week, the daily language program is taken up by another teacher. The focus of these sessions is drama. This involves the students reading and writing scripts, role playing, discussing ideas, improvising and acting. The focus of the other two days is based on student needs within a theme/topic. During the term of this study the themes were: the Dream Time, Following Instructions - the genre of informative writing and Self Chosen Reading and Writing.

The year six teacher's evaluation forms part of the daily language program. He monitors his student's work habits. Individual needs are followed up during the daily reading and writing conference time. His students indicate that they feel supported by the teacher.
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2. THEORETICAL ORIENTATION TO READING PROFILE

RESPONSES. APPENDIX 1.(b)

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Table 2 shows the year six teacher's responses to the phonics questions. His score of thirty eight out of fifty indicates mild disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbalizes rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Correct miscues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Importance of phonics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instruct to sound out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Control Text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problem of reversals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syllabification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Formal Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attend to punctuation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase errors/less comp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Totals 46 38 40 41.33

Table 2. TORP: Phonics.

The following graph shows a pictorial representation of how the year six teacher scored on the phonics related questions. A high score would indicate strong disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation.
When reinterviewed about his responses to the phonics questions, they remained unchanged.

Table 3 shows the year six teacher's responses to the statements which have a skills orientation. His score of thirty three out of fifty would indicate some support for a skills approach.

**SKILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.Teach accent patterns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Must use glossary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.Probs with endings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Repeat sight words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.Roots then inflected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Inefficient to repeat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fluency=comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.Importance of skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.Label grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.Teach word shapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 48 33 28 36.33

Table 3. TORP: Skills.
These questions are grouped so that Strongly Agree responses identify a skills orientation. Strongly Disagree responses would identify a Whole Language orientation. Middle scores would identify a phonics orientation. The following graph shows pictorially how the year six teacher scored on the skills related questions.

**TORP: SKILLS.**

![Bar Graph](image)

**Fig. 5. TORP: Skills.**

The year six teachers responses to some of the skills related questions are not in accord with the responses the researcher would expect from a teacher who believes they hold a Whole Language Orientation. When reinterviewed about his responses, they remained unchanged. This ambiguity is reflected in the expectations the teacher passes on to his students during language lessons.

**Table 4** shows the year six teacher's responses to the statements
which have a Whole Language orientation. His score of seventeen out of forty indicates a Whole Language orientation.

WHOLE LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alphabet unnessess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flash cards unnessess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-group Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 4. TORP: Whole Language.

Figure 6. shows pictorially the year six teacher's responses to the Whole language questions. A score of eight out of forty would indicate a strong agreement with a Whole Language orientation. A high score would indicate a strong phonics orientation.

Fig. 6. TORP: Whole language.
When reinterviewed about his responses, he changed his response to Question Eighteen from four to two. **Table 7** shows his new score of fifteen out of forty.

**WHOLE LANGUAGE when reinterviewed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alphabet unnecess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Flash cards unnecess</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 11 15 11 12.33

**Table. 7. TORP: Whole Language.**

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year six teacher's responses to the theoretical orientation profile are consistent with his stated beliefs and some of his practices. His class program indicates a Whole Language perspective which uses the conditions of learning as a framework. Yet there is some support for teaching phonics and skills and this support guides the decisions the teacher makes in the classroom. Thus, there is an ambiguity within the stated beliefs about Whole Language and practice. This can be seen in the class program where he indicates a belief that it is necessary to teach orthographic conventions. This belief guides his plan for writing process, where he includes conferences to check spelling and grammatical conventions.
The three students in his class indicated that during writing conference time they "look at punctuation, change the story around if it doesn't make sense", and "he let's you read it and waits till you realise that you've got something wrong and after that you fix it up." His practice is also to provide demonstrations, model writing, immerse students in a variety of writing styles and to organise both individual and group sharing sessions, where students respond to each others' writing in terms of clarity of meaning. The teacher, when interviewed indicated that he intervened at the individual conference time to "help students refocus or reconstruct meaning." Writing conventions, thus form part of the teachers support for students in their quest to get their meaning across to their audience.
3. TEACHER INTERVIEW 2. APPENDIX 8 (a).

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

In this interview the year six teacher indicated the following:

He believes that

* the aims and objectives of the program are based on his beliefs about learning.
* reading, writing, listening and speaking activities cannot be separated.
* it is important to use real life books and not text type readers.
* it is important for students to share their writing with other audiences.
* learning to write for a variety of purposes is important.

His classroom practices are

* to organise the literacy program around a theme or genre.
* to use the conditions of learning in the classroom.
* to allow students choice from within a range of activities.
* to monitor that choice through work logs.
* for students to book conferences on a booking sheet.
* for students to have at least one reading and writing
conference each week.

* to choose resources that reflect the language theme or focus.

* to choose real life books rather than readers.

* to keep a log of reading and writing from their conferences.

* to keep a checklist of progress through expected skills.

* to evaluate the program from two aspects. The content and the classroom practices and organisation. This is done through student response and feedback.

His **classroom practices** are:

* inhibited by a lack of resources.

* inhibited by his role as Computer Contact person, in that three language sessions per week are taught by another person.

* inhibited by a lack of time to evaluate.

His thoughts on the school **Professional Development** program are:

* that reading PETA and ARA publications and the readings from ELIC made him refocus on what he was already doing in the classroom.

* that the school professional development program reaffirmed and reinforced what he was trying to do. The work he did
in staff meetings reaffirmed that he was comfortable with what he was doing.

* that he was influenced by Writing K-12.
* that talking to other teachers in the staffroom, particularly the year four teacher was great.

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year six teacher's beliefs about literacy development are reflected in his classroom practice. His beliefs and practice indicate his emphasis on providing for the Conditions of Learning.

The class program and classroom organisation emphasise the importance of students accepting responsibility for making choices and working independently. He believes that students should take responsibility for their own learning and this belief is reflected in the expectations he shows to his students. The year six teacher's beliefs and practices also demonstrate concern for the needs of individual students.

The year six teacher is selective about the resources he chooses. He prefers to use real books. In the classroom students have access to a range of fiction and non fiction resources. There are some basal readers in the room, these have been chosen because the texts have been taken from real books. There is a lack of access to Library...
Resources in the school. His students indicate that they rarely borrow from the Library. However the year six teacher overcomes this by using his own resources as well as borrowing from other Libraries.

He believes that student feedback and observation provide the key to evaluation of both the content of the class program and the classroom organisation. However, he indicates that it is difficult to keep up with recording the evaluation.

The year six teacher's beliefs, practices and concerns relate to his position as an Executive Teacher, Computer Contact Person as well as a classroom teacher. He is frustrated by his triple role and the lack of time available to meet the requirements of his teaching position.
4. TEACHER INTERVIEW 3. Appendix 9 (a).

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

In this interview the year six teacher indicated the following.

That his **beliefs** and **classroom practice** have been influenced by:

* professional reading, revamping his beliefs and then experimenting with putting them into practice.
* exploring his beliefs; the students are now more in control of their learning; teaching skills and comprehension activities no longer have a place in his classroom practice.
* ELIC. It was a good motivator.
* sharing with other teachers, particularly the year four teachers.

That his **beliefs** influence student writing through:

* the provision of more opportunities for writing to occur.
* the provision of Whole Language activities.
* using genre as basis for programming and the provision of opportunities to write for a variety of purposes.
The school's **Professional Development Program** has contributed to his Professional Development through:

* opportunities to share with other teachers.
* the staff meeting activities.
* being a supervisor; this has allowed the year six teacher to see how other people do things.
* the staff meetings where programs were shared.

The school's **Professional Development** program could be improved through:

* continuing with the grade, department and whole school program organisation. This reinforces what is happening as a total school focus.
* continuing the sharing of ideas and units of work.
* organising the release program on a grade basis, so that the teacher and supervisor can get together.
* the development of a modelled writing ideas bank.

**INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

The year six teacher's beliefs about Literacy development have changed over the years. He has moved away from a skills approach towards a Whole Language program. He believes that his students are now more in control of their learning. His program and practice emphasise the importance of students accepting responsibility for
making choices and working independently. He believes students should take responsibility for their own learning and this belief is reflected in his practice.

Exploring his beliefs has influenced the year six teacher's Literacy Program. This has occurred in conjunction with his professional reading. He has considered the ideas put forward in terms of his beliefs, confirming and rejecting as he went along.

The year six teacher is comfortable as a supervisor, but does not see a place for supervisors influencing teachers to examine their beliefs and classroom practices. Yet as a teacher, he uses his beliefs as a framework for examining new ideas and practices.

**SUMMARY OF THE YEAR SIX TEACHER**

The **goals** the year six teacher sets for the language program are based on his **beliefs** about how students learn, the **conditions** necessary for both oral and written language development, and his understanding of Whole Language programs.

The **behaviours** he perceives as reflecting "good" writing are understood by his pupils and reflected in his **beliefs** about teaching language.
The evaluation procedures he believes are useful, are reflected in his classroom practice and form the basis of his intervention with students and the planned demonstrations of the class program.

The materials he selects for use in the classroom are based on his beliefs about the need for students to experience real life books. He uses his observations of students to predict future planning needs and selects resources accordingly.

The conditions for learning established in the classroom are based on his belief that students should be in control of their learning and that learning best occurs when the conditions for learning are used as a framework for developing a favourable classroom climate.

The year six teacher's professional reading and the professional development he has undertaken both at the school and regional level have reinforced and extended his beliefs and practices. He has concerns about implementing his literacy program due to the demands on his time within the school and the lack of time available to meet the requirements of his students.

The year six teacher's beliefs and concerns relate to his position as an Executive Teacher as well as a classroom teacher. He feels that there should be more time for teachers sharing within the school. As a supervisor he has the opportunities to see a number of classrooms in
action and feels that this kind of opportunity would be useful for others.

The year six teacher has recognised the important role he plays in student's learning. Observation of students and planning demonstrations to meet student's needs has highlighted his own writing needs. He is aware of his perceptions about his own writing.

This project has:

* highlighted the impact his demonstrations have on his student's learning, the role he plays in student's engagement with literacy demonstrations and the role he plays in developing student's awareness of their own learning.

* reinforced his beliefs about the role students play in the evaluation of their learning and literacy development through the feedback they provide for evaluation of the class program.

* has highlighted the need to monitor the implicit understandings he may be teaching his students through the selection of demonstrations he plans for his students and the value he places on what he perceives as "good" writing.
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CHAPTER 5.

CONCLUSIONS

This project, has effectively challenged, reinforced and extended the teachers' understandings about their beliefs and their impact on their students' learning. It provided a framework for each teacher to explore what had influenced their beliefs and in turn the influence their beliefs had on the class program, classroom organisation and conditions for learning established, resources selected and evaluation procedures used. It also created a greater awareness of the crucial role teacher's theoretical orientation can play in students' literacy learning.

Influence of Teacher Beliefs on Goals Set

The goals both teachers set are based on their beliefs about how students learn, and on the decisions teachers make about future planning needs, based on the evaluation they carry out. Their beliefs about how evaluation should be undertaken and its impact on the literacy program, in turn influence the goals they set.

An analysis of the goals set in both class programs for literacy indicates alignment with their interpretation of Whole Language philosophy. There were some instances where the goals set were contrary to the researchers understanding of a Whole Language philosophy, but were
in accord with the class teacher's statement of beliefs and practices. This can be observed in the year six teacher's responses to the TORP and in the language program, where the year six teacher indicates he believes that "there still exist orthographic conventions that demand a teaching of spelling, grammar and punctuation. However these will be treated and taught in meaningful situations as the need arises." The year six students were aware of their teacher's belief and indicated that during the sharing/conferencing time they proofread for conventions in their quest for making their meaning explicit to their audience. They also indicated that the year six teacher did teach orthographic conventions "but only to those kids that don't understand it."

**Influence of Teacher Beliefs on Evaluation Procedures Used**

The theory of natural language learning that both teachers hold, is incompatible with the evaluation procedures of the traditional, fragmented view of language learning. The traditional view which advocates assessment procedures such as; spelling tests, dictation, comprehension questions and reading tests which focus on language products and the parts of language, do not have a place in either the year four or year six classroom. Instead, tasks which involve regular Whole Language classroom activities are chosen, namely careful observation of students in the process of reading and writing.
Both teachers believe that observation of students in the process of talking, listening reading and writing is a viable assessment procedure. The teachers have identified indicators of literacy development in the checklists they use. The indicators help them recognise what to look for and what they need to record for evaluation purposes. Kemp (1986) indicates that teachers' evaluation expertise depends on teachers knowing what to look for when they observe their students. The indicators are based on their beliefs about how students learn to be literate. Their practice is to use this information for future planning and the development of the literacy program.

Deford and Harste (1982) support this practice. They emphasise that teachers who have a knowledge of their students' strengths and weaknesses are able to make the most appropriate instructional decisions.

As both teachers evaluate their students' learning, they simultaneously evaluate their own role. They indicate that they evaluate their teaching and the program they provide. The year four teacher indicates that the "sharing sessions in her classroom are evaluative. I can evaluate myself - the whole show, the content, the activities, resources and the organisation." The year six teacher supports this notion when he indicates "I evaluate the program from two aspects. 1. The content, through students' responses. 2. The classroom practices and organisation. I also use the school program policy checklist."
The year four teacher indicates that through observation of her students in the process of reading and writing, she began to find out her students true capabilities. She became aware of their strengths and weaknesses. "I've just realised some of the kids true abilities. So perhaps I wasn't evaluating effectively before."

**Influence of Teacher Beliefs on Classroom Practices**

Both teachers are aware of individual student's needs and believe their students are unique individuals. They plan for individuals and small groups of students with common needs. This understanding effects their classroom practice. They group students together with common needs for modelled reading and writing experiences rather than having static streamed groups.

Both teachers follow the schools' programming and evaluation requirements. This has brought literacy learning, assessment and teaching together in the classroom. Cambourne and Turbill (1988) suggest that teachers should watch and listen to children involved in literacy tasks, offering them assistance when they need it, observing and monitoring children at the same time. This leads to collaborative learning. The year four and year six students support the notion of collaborative learning as a regular class room practice. They recognise the support the teacher gives them. Both teachers indicated that this
was a dual learning experience, where both the teacher and student learn as a result of the experience. The teacher learns about the student's literacy knowledge, processes used and attitudes and the students learn as a result of involvement in the task with the teacher's support and assistance.

The choice of activities chosen for use in both classrooms, is based on the belief that language is learned through opportunities to use Whole Language activities for real purposes and audiences. Reading, writing, listening and talking activities are not separated. The daily language session in both classrooms provides regular opportunities for students to share their reading and writing.

**Influence of Teacher Beliefs on Materials and Resources Selected**

The year four and year six teacher both indicate that they select books to support the demonstrations, modelling and immersion planned within their language program.

In the year four classroom, students select from a range of print materials for silent reading. There is a balance between fiction, non-fiction. Individual student, group and class/teacher published stories are also available. There were some readers in the room. However, the teacher indicated that they were used as a source of plays and poetry. The year four students' reading logs indicate a variety of books
were read during the term for example, Sapen's reading log indicates she read twenty eight books during the term. They were borrowed from the classroom, school and local council library. They were all 'real books'.

The year six teacher indicates that the language program uses 'real life books and not text type readers. I choose books which reflect the theme, focus or demonstrations that I plan.' He also indicated that he likes poetry and will often use verse as a language focus. The year six students were familiar with a number of writing styles and could analyse print material and talk about a number of factual and story genre. During this study the year six students read a variety of books, borrowed from the classroom and local council library.

This study highlighted the school library as a major influence on materials selected for use in the classroom. Both teachers indicated that the implementation of the literacy program was inhibited by a lack of access to resources in the library. Each of the students indicated that they preferred not to borrow from the school library.

**Influence on Conditions for Learning Established**

Both teachers indicated that they use the Conditions for Learning as identified by Cambourne (1988), rather than in Writing K-12 (1987 p. 18-20). Implementing their literacy programs and
observing their students' responses to the program, has allowed both teachers to develop their understandings of and the connections between the Conditions for Learning they have developed in their classrooms.

Both teachers evaluate their role in their students' learning and evaluate the demonstrations they select and its relationship to student engagement. They have also considered the question of responsibility as they spend more time with individuals, and small groups of students, watching and listening to them in the process of reading, writing and sharing. Both the year four and year six teacher provide opportunities and support for their students to accept responsibility for learning as they work independently without the teacher. Greater understanding of their students' approximations is also gained through observation of students in the process of reading and writing.

This study has extended the teachers' understandings of using the conditions for learning as a framework for developing literacy programs and the implications it has for classroom practice.

Some Implications Identified For Professional Development

Murray (1988 p. 1) identifies two issues common to changes in language development since the 1940s. They are, the perceived difficulty by classroom practitioners to turn theory into practice and
the greater one " of accommodating a stream of changing practices" for which teachers " were not always prepared". In this study both teachers used their theories about how students learn as a framework for developing their classroom practice and accommodating a stream of ideas for changing classroom practice.

The year four teacher indicated that " It's easy to get caught up with doing what's in vogue." and to overcome this, she said " I weigh things up against the way I believe kids learn and learn literacy."

The year six teacher indicated that exploring his beliefs had influenced the literacy program but more importantly " what I've actually learned has been through professional reading. I've revamped my beliefs then experimented with putting them into practise. I looked at what was put forward, thought let's try it and on that basis trying again, confirmed and rejected as I went along." It would seem that both teachers have overcome the two common issues identified by Murray.

This study was undertaken within the context of the school's professional development program and adhered to the components of improving inservice training suggested by Joyce and Showers.( 1981 )
The following components were an integral part of the support provided by the researcher:

* presentation of theory,
* modelling or demonstration,
* practise under simulated conditions,
* feedback and support,
* coaching for application.

This study helped both teachers to learn more about their student's individual literacy learning and helped them both develop and extend their understandings of literacy development. Both teachers became researchers in their own classrooms and this resulted in the professional development of both teachers as they developed their understandings of the role their beliefs and practices play in students' literacy learning.

This study also had a number of characteristics which made it a successful professional development tool. It raised the teacher's self awareness and thus contributed to their professional development through:

* assisting teachers to become more effective observers of children,
* requiring teachers to reflect on their teaching,
* challenging and exciting teachers,
* assisting teachers to respect children's learning.

( Christine Davis, 1984 )
This project set out to clarify the impact of teacher beliefs on class literacy programs. A grounded theory of the influence of teacher beliefs on instruction emerged. The data collected was contextually relevant and supports the following theory.

That the teacher's theoretical orientation

* established expectancies and influenced goals,
* influenced the teaching and evaluation procedures teachers selected for use in their classrooms,
* influenced the conditions teachers established in their classrooms to support learning,
* influenced the materials teachers selected for use in the classroom.

That the teacher's theoretical orientation is influenced through

* the professional reading they engage in;
* the professional development activities they undertake;
* the demonstrations provided by teachers they believe to be credible;
* trialling new ideas for practice in their classrooms, which they then confirm or reject. If the practice highlights facets of students' learning not previously considered, then such trialling may induce a modification of their theoretical orientation;
collaborative learning, where teachers watch and listen to students involved in literacy tasks, offering assistance when needed and where teachers observe and monitor students at the same time helps teachers to reject or confirm the worth of their beliefs about learning.

This study occurred within the context of the school's professional development program. A model for professional development emerged. The model is grounded in the data collected which relates to professional development.
MODEL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

TEACHERS NEED

* experiences which confirm the worth of their current knowledge and classroom practice;
* experiences which encourage reflection on their current beliefs and practices;
* experiences which encourage observation of students to focus on learning theories;
* demonstrations by other teachers they believe to be credible.

WHEN COMBINED WITH

* the support of a supervisor/colleague they believe to be credible
  and
* feedback in the classroom

THIS WILL LEAD TO

SUCCESSFUL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Fig. 10 Model for Professional Development.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has highlighted a number of recommendations for further consideration. They are

1. the benefits of exploring teacher beliefs on literacy programs,
2. the implications for the school programming and evaluation policies,
3. the professional development needs of teachers.

1. **Benefits of exploring teacher beliefs on instruction.**

This project was successful in assisting teachers to explore their beliefs. It effectively reinforced, challenged and extended the teachers' understandings about their beliefs and their impact on students' learning. The Conditions of Learning could be further used as a diagnostic framework. Each condition could be presented in the form of questions that teachers might ask. This would provide three sets of information. Firstly it would provide information on the classroom environment, the print displayed, the resources selected, the feedback teachers provide and the likelihood of engagement occurring. Secondly it would provide information on the students' literacy development. Lastly it would allow the teacher to assess their own role in student's learning.
2. Implications for the schools' programming and evaluation policies.

This study highlighted the frustrations teachers face when observing a student's need and not being able to meet that need with the appropriate experiences. Observing students has increased both teachers' depth of knowledge of language and helped them understand students' strengths and weaknesses. A bank of language indicators and demonstrations which meet students' language and literacy needs could be developed to guide both observation and planning. Additional information on assessment procedures such as retelling and proofreading, as well as possible interview questions could be included to extend teachers' evaluation expertise. Supervisors need to reinforce and further raise awareness about the provisions in the schools' policies which allow teachers the freedom to make their own planning and evaluation decisions.

3. The professional development needs of teachers.

The model for professional development applied in this study would be useful in other school contexts. Professional development programs could include the following elements:

* observation of teachers in action in classrooms,
* regular and prolonged support from a supervisor or colleague the teacher perceives as credible.
time and opportunity to try new ideas in the classroom,
regular meetings with other teachers to discuss classroom practices and programming,
teachers pooling their planning ideas, resources and references for planning,
the development of indicators to guide teachers observations,
the development of appropriate teaching strategies and experiences to meet indicated needs.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

1. The model used for this research project would be suitable for use in other school contexts and with other teachers. Results from further research would serve to highlight the impact of teacher belief on Literacy Programs and Instruction.

2. This study highlighted the role teachers play in the learning process through communicating learning strategies to their students and assisting students to accept responsibility for their own learning. As students become more aware about their own learning strategies they become more effective readers and writers. A future project could focus on the implications of assisting students to evaluate their own learning.

Kerry Sweeney
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APPENDIX 1. (a) THEORETICAL ORIENTATION TO READING PROFILE. TEACHER RESPONSES.

TABLE 2: These questions are grouped so that SA or a low score identifies a phonics orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHONICS</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Verbalizes rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Correct miscues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.Importance of phonics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Instruct to sound out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.Control Text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Problem of reversals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Syllabication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.Formal Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Attend to punctuation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Increase errors/less com</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Totals 46 38 40 41.33

FIGURE 4: The following graph gives a comparative picture of how each teacher scored on the phonics related questions. A high score indicates strong disagreement with the statements which have a phonics orientation and, therefore, represents whole language.

TORP: PHONICS
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TABLE 3: These questions are grouped so that SA identifies a skills orientation. SD would identify a whole language orientation. Middle scores indicate a phonics orientation.

SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Teach accent patterns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Must use glossary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Probs with endings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repeat sight words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Roots then inflected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inefficient to repeat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency = comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Importance of skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Label grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teach word shapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 48 33 28 36.33

FIGURE 5: A score of 10 would indicate a skills orientation. A score of 50 would have identified whole language.

TORP: SKILLS

![Graph showing skills scores for Kerry and Yr 6 T, Yr 4 T, and Average]
TABLE 4: These questions are grouped so that SA or a low score indicates a whole language orientation.

WHOLE LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.Alphabet unnecess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.Flash cards unnecess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total: 11 17 17 15.00

FIGURE 6. In this graph a low score indicates a strong agreement for the whole language statements. A score of 8 would be the lowest possible. A high score (max. 40) would indicate a strong phonics orientation.
APPENDIX 1. (b) THEORETICAL ORIENTATION TO READING PROFILE. TEACHER RESPONSES WHEN REINTERVIEWED.

TABLE 5. TORP PHONICS: when reinterviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbalizes rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Correct miscues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Importance of phonics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instruct to sound out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Control Text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problem of reversals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syllabication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Formal Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attend to punctuation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase errors/less com</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Totals 46 38 40 41.33

FIGURE 7. TORP PHONICS: when reinterviewed.

![Bar chart showing scores for Kerry, Yr 6 T, Yr 4 T, and Average](file.png)
TABLE 6. TORP SKILLS: when reinterviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Kerry Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach accent patterns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must use glossary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probs with endings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat sight words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots then inflected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient to repeat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency=comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach word shapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 48 33 35 38.67

FIGURE 8. TORP SKILLS: when reinterviewed.
### TABLE 7. TORP WHOLE LANGUAGE: when reinterviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>Yr 6 T</th>
<th>Yr 4 T</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. No word introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alphabet unnecessary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flash cards unnecessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Read in Dialect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guess and go on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do not correct house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initial focus on meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group Total 11 15 11 12.33

### FIGURE 9. TORP WHOLE LANGUAGE: when reinterviewed.
IMMERSION.

What kind of texts are displayed in the classroom?

Students' writing, posters, magazines - school and published magazines, book jackets, signs, instructions, reward charts, "How to" Charts, books, Puffin Packs, Story Strand, Book Shelf, authors table Roald Dahl.

What kinds of texts are available for students to read?

Dictionaries, atlas, old readers - used for poems and plays, Library Loan, school magazines, teacher's books, student made books, recipe books, range of fiction and non-fiction books.

What types of texts are shared by the teacher with her class?

Serials, poems, teacher selected books, student selected books, letters, author studies, reports, cartoons, posters, brainstorming lists, book blurbs for inside book jackets.
Is language presented as meaningful and whole?
Yes. Whole books are used. Demonstrations are in whole texts and are relevant to materials read.

DEMONSTRATION.

Are the students surrounded by language?
Yes. Instructions, descriptions, directions, book blurbs, labels, commercial print.

Do the students have opportunities to engage in language learning opportunities?
Yes. The language session begins with USSR- a great way to demonstrate what reading is all about. Students have opportunities to skim, skip, guess/predict, flip through books or read leisurely. This is followed by a planned demonstration. Intervention occurs when students are writing - this may be in the proofreading or editing process- demonstrations to individuals or groups of students with common needs who require similar intervention.

Are language learning opportunities structured to demonstrate language in use?
In integrated language session.
In daily sharing sessions; students respond by talking, listening, reading and writing.
During USSR.
Completing work contracts.
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Does the timetable fracture language into separate areas?
No, Language is timetabled in a two hour block:-
USSR, Demonstration and Contract work and a Sharing Session.

EXPECTATION

Does the teacher expect that his/her students will learn to use language?
Yes, though there are some concerns about first phase ESL users.

Do the students expect to become language users?
Yes, students are confident, their sharing sessions have helped them to become confident about sharing what they know, seeking clarification, responding to others. They see reading as reading books for real purposes and writing as writing for real purposes and real audiences.

Is learning language regarded as important?
Yes, in all areas of the curriculum. Language within each area of the curriculum is displayed around the room. Students read and write within other areas of the curriculum.

RESPONSIBILITY.

Does the teacher value and respond to her students' needs?
Yes. The teacher's personal philosophy refers to individual needs. Students are encouraged and given opportunities to accept responsibility for their own learning. Intervention occurs for
individual students or groups of students with similar needs.

**Who decides what to learn next?**
Teacher directed; there is internal contract choice.
There is self selection in USSR. Discussion with support teacher helps with students seeking direction.

**USE.**

**Do the students use language in authentic situations?**
Yes, purposes and audiences are provided for writing.
In sharing sessions with peers/class; students engage in relevant whole language purposeful activities.

**APPROXIMATIONS.**

**Are the students free to approximate and experiment with language?**
Yes, though some students are over concerned about conventions when presenting to adults. When sharing with peers, their main concern is whether the story line makes sense.

**Are students expected to talk, read and write like adults?**
No.

**RESPONSE.**

**Are the responses positive, reassuring and constructive?**
Yes, the teacher responds positively to all students. Intervention is offered when required. The contracts students complete are self
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rewarding. Student's work is valued and displayed around the classroom.
APPENDIX 2. (b) THE YEAR SIX CLASSROOM.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION/PROGRAM SUPERVISION GUIDE.

IMMERSION.

What kinds of texts are displayed in the classroom?
Posters, school magazines from Victoria and N.S.W., magazines published by the school, various other magazines—Time Life, Modern Motor, Hot Rod, Aussie Kids, Lucky, Powder Puff, Vogue, Belle, posters from Ashtons Scholastic, signs, instructions, class rules, booking sheet for conferences, prompts about the writing process, reminders about the school pet show, class award lists, fiction and non-fiction books borrowed from the school, local council and other libraries, level 6 'Bookshelf' materials, Big Books, dictionaries, thesauri, atlases, telephone books, a street directory, writing published by students, results of a science experiment, details about the components of a cubic metre and other mathematical concepts, generalisations from 'The Dreamtime' Book Week unit and much more.
What kinds of texts are available for students to read?
Reference materials and other non-fiction books, magazines, writing published by the students, poetry anthologies, picture books and a range of junior fiction books plus print material from students' homes.

What types of texts are shared by the teacher with his class?
Books read as serials, poetry, teacher selected books which support the language focus, materials which relate to other curriculum areas—especially Computer Studies, Science, Social Studies and Mathematics.

Is language presented as meaningful and whole?
Yes, real books and other print materials are used, modelled writing and reading are based on authentic experiences and real texts.

DEMONSTRATION.

Are the students surrounded by language?
Yes. Print materials have a high profile in the room.

Do the students have opportunities to engage in language learning opportunities?
Yes, in individual, paired, group and whole class situations. The students believe them to be useful, authentic and interesting. Reading, writing and drama have a high profile in all areas of the curriculum. Intervention occurs at point of need. The teacher admits that there is an emphasis on poetry. He has also focussed on a
number of genre through immersion, demonstration and joint text construction.

**Are language learning opportunities structured to demonstrate language in use?**

Language opportunities are structured in all areas of the curriculum. The language session starts with a teacher directed focus. This could be students sharing, teacher innovating on a text or teacher reading.

**Does the timetable fracture language into separate areas?**

The timetable allows for a two hour language block. The students engage in oracy and literacy learning as they share, discuss, listen, plan, read, write and conference. The teacher demonstrations are authentic.

**EXPECTATION**

**Does the teacher expect that his/her students will learn to use language?**

Yes, the teacher expects his students to be language users. He plans for individual, paired, small group and whole class experiences. The focus may arise from the planned teaching/learning experiences or may arise from point of need.

**Do the students expect to become language users?**

Yes, the students are confident that they are language users. Though, there are a few students who try to avoid publishing their writing.
Is learning language regarded as important?
The teacher regards language learning as having prime importance in all areas of the curriculum. Some students see it in terms of being important for enjoyment. They have lots of ideas in their heads and they enjoy seeing how they look on paper. Some students see it as being important in terms of future job prospects. Some see it as having importance for future studies.

RESPONSIBILITY.

Does the teacher value and respond to his students' needs?
Yes, the language program accounts for whole class foci as well as meeting the needs of individual students. The teacher groups students with common needs for intervention. Mixed ability groups feature at other times.

Who decides what to learn next?
A combination of teacher and student decisions occur. The teacher provides opportunities for students to accept responsibility for their own learning. There are also opportunities for students to self select in reading and writing and to pursue their own interests. The teacher plans the demonstrations, the joint construction of texts and the print materials he shares. The students select the writing they will share.
Do the students use language in authentic situations?
The teacher is aware of the need to provide for authentic situations.
The language situations the researcher observed were related to a number of curriculum areas. For example the students wrote up their predictions in Science, experimented, rejected, confirmed or revised their predictions and then wrote up the results.

APPROXIMATIONS.
Are the students free to approximate and experiment with language?
The writing process allows for students to approximate. They attend to the conventions of language when conferencing and use each other to test their approximations.

Are students expected to talk, read and write like adults?
The teacher, through careful observation is aware of individual student's capabilities and values their responses. At the same time he also pushes his students to achieve their potential.

RESPONSE.
Are the responses positive, reassuring and constructive?
The responses by both the teacher and students are supportive. Students work is valued and displayed around the room. The students engage in peer tutoring with younger students. The teacher conferences allow for control of the student's writing to remain with the students.
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APPENDIX 3. (a)
LEARNING CONDITIONS OPERATING IN THE YEAR 4 CLASSROOM. THE TEACHER AS CO RESEARCHER.

Record the number of times spent daily:

1. modelling the reading process through:
   shared book experiences
   reading to the children
   children reading to each other
   other adults reading to children
   engaging the class in USSR
   other_____________________.

2. modelling the writing process through:
   class stories
   written conversations
   innovating on texts
   demonstrations
   other_____________________.

3. children reading by themselves.

4. children writing by themselves.

5. children responding to each other's writing.

6. children responding to each other's reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole lang.experience</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Modelling reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modelling writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children reading by themselves</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children writing by themselves</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children responding to each other's writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children responding to each other's reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3. (b)
LEARNING CONDITIONS OPERATING IN THE YEAR 6 CLASSROOM.
THE TEACHER AS CO RESEARCHER.

Record the number of times spent daily:

1. modelling the reading process through:
   - shared book experiences
   - reading to the children
   - children reading to each other
   - other adults reading to children
   - engaging the class in USSR
   - other______________________.

2. modelling the writing process through:
   - class stories
   - written conversations
   - innovating on texts
   - demonstrations
   - other______________________.

3. children reading by themselves.

4. children writing by themselves.

5. children responding to each other's writing.

6. children responding to each other's reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole lang.experience</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Modelling reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modelling writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children reading by themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children writing by themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children responding to each other's writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children responding to each other's reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4. (a)

**REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. SAPEN. YEAR 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home is boring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The hairy face</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Recount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Park</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Book Jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Hit-Contrary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>News Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5-2 School</td>
<td>The sale where</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delays but not</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wonderful</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look out!</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look out!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My lazy letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right in time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. KELLY. YEAR 4.

### TITLE TALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE Started</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-7-89</td>
<td>Maths Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-7-89</td>
<td>contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-7-89</td>
<td>Golden days</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-7-89</td>
<td>Write folder</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-89</td>
<td>Solely Bred</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8-89</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8-89</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-8-89</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Anecdote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-8-89</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-8-89</td>
<td>My favourite friend</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-8-89</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-8-89</td>
<td>Handwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9-89</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9-89</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9-89</td>
<td>See ya later alligator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Anecdote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9-89</td>
<td>My house</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9-89</td>
<td>contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-9-89</td>
<td>Playing outside</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-9-89</td>
<td>My Friends</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-9-89</td>
<td>At school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9-89</td>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-9-89</td>
<td>My teacher</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerry Sweeney
APPENDIX 4. (c)

REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. JOHNY. YEAR 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6-89</td>
<td>Aussie Rules</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Story Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-89</td>
<td>Vampires</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Story Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-89</td>
<td>Limericks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8-89</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-89</td>
<td>Riddles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-89</td>
<td>The hairy toe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Story Recount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-7-89</td>
<td>Turtles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Story Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-89</td>
<td>The monsters</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Story Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7-89</td>
<td>My friends</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Story Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4. (d)

REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. KIRSTY. YEAR 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.7.89</td>
<td>Haunted House</td>
<td>8.8.89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Poster (Dream Time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8.89</td>
<td>Fashion Boots</td>
<td>9.8.89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8.89</td>
<td>Sun's Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.7.89</td>
<td>Never Step Nightmares</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8.89</td>
<td>Chocolate Fudge Slices</td>
<td>14.8.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8.89</td>
<td>How to Annoy People</td>
<td>23.8.89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Instructions Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8.89</td>
<td>Maths Problems</td>
<td>22.8.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.8.89</td>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>28.8.89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Poem Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.8.89</td>
<td>Spelling Activities</td>
<td>28.8.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.89</td>
<td>Limericks</td>
<td>10.9.89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Limericks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.89</td>
<td>Who Influences Me</td>
<td>4.9.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.89</td>
<td>What is a Group</td>
<td>6.9.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9.89</td>
<td>You be the Jury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4. (e)

REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. TOM. YEAR 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-7-89</td>
<td>two dragons</td>
<td>9-7-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-89</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>9-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>Dream story</td>
<td>9-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-89</td>
<td>experiments</td>
<td>8-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>The trouble making bin</td>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-89</td>
<td>Trick Stencil</td>
<td>3-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-8-89</td>
<td>two dogs and a fence</td>
<td>1-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-8-89</td>
<td>Instructons</td>
<td>4-8-89</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-8-89</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forested</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limericks</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>poem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerry Sweeney
# APPENDIX 4. (f)

## REVIEW OF WRITING. WRITING LOG TERM 3. MACK. YEAR 6.

### TITLE TALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-8-89</td>
<td>Addis</td>
<td>7-8-89</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pictures and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-8-89</td>
<td>The marina: comic book school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Death of the Human Fly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The time machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Nightmare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food web for birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desert Ecosystem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility and Maliceability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coccasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That Cootivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity Conduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If mice could roar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Sorceress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL AVVENTATRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Highway Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moths, Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limericks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kerry Sweeney
APPENDIX 5. (a)

REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. SAPEN. YEAR 4.

I HAVE READ THESE BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-7-89</td>
<td>Roald Dahl</td>
<td>Chie Babyl</td>
<td>3rd day of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-89</td>
<td>The Rest of the Bunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7-89</td>
<td>Hard Luck Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-9-89</td>
<td>Fire and the Passum</td>
<td>Jean Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-9-89</td>
<td>War and Peace</td>
<td>Michael Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-2-89</td>
<td>The Big Brass Egg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2-89</td>
<td>Mr Wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-8-89</td>
<td>The Man Who Liked Whales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-9-89</td>
<td>Wildcat Wenda + the Peacock and the Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10-89</td>
<td>Little Miss Sunbonnet</td>
<td>Regal F. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-10-89</td>
<td>Mr Sneeze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-11-89</td>
<td>Riding the Motorbike to School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12-89</td>
<td>Little Miss Twins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-12-89</td>
<td>Hey, a Lion Party</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-89</td>
<td>Selected a thousand pages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only Sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-9-89</td>
<td>Rotten Apples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9-89</td>
<td>The Yellow Ribbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-9-89</td>
<td>Hairy Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10-89</td>
<td>The Holy Grail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-10-89</td>
<td>The Skull + the Skeleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-89</td>
<td>In a Dark Dark Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10-89</td>
<td>The Hundred Chemises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-9-89</td>
<td>This Golden Wedding Sing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9-89</td>
<td>The Very Busy Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-9-89</td>
<td>The Lion Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-9-89</td>
<td>The Little Match Girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-9-89</td>
<td>The Aurora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-9-89</td>
<td>The Golden Egg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerry Sweeney
APPENDIX 5. (b)

REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. KELLY. YEAR 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-9-89</td>
<td>Cats and Miss</td>
<td>Rita Golden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-9-89</td>
<td>The special Romance</td>
<td>Orbis publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-9-89</td>
<td>Capekild</td>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-9-89</td>
<td>Too much noise</td>
<td>Ann Mccormen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9-89</td>
<td>The school bus</td>
<td>Lorraine Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-9-89</td>
<td>Durel the owl</td>
<td>Pamela Lofus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-9-89</td>
<td>The Great Zoo break</td>
<td>Susan Grotz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-9-89</td>
<td>Tikki Tikki Tembo</td>
<td>Blaintent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-9-89</td>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-9-89</td>
<td>Country Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9-89</td>
<td>Nobody to play with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-89</td>
<td>Mr Day dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-89</td>
<td>Mr Busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-9-89</td>
<td>When the earth was born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-8-89</td>
<td>The sick sheik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-89</td>
<td>Charlotte's Web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-8-89</td>
<td>The country cat</td>
<td>Norman Bridwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 5. (c)

## REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. JOHNY. YEAR 4.

### I HAVE READ THESE BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-7-89</td>
<td>Charlie and the chocolate</td>
<td>Roald Dahl</td>
<td>really good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-89</td>
<td>factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7-89</td>
<td>Mr Greedy</td>
<td>Roger H.</td>
<td>Not bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-7-89</td>
<td>Hide-out</td>
<td>Roger H.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-8-89</td>
<td>The school bus</td>
<td>Lorraine Wilson</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-8-89</td>
<td>When I chopped my toe</td>
<td>Lorraine Wilson</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9-89</td>
<td>The Country Cat</td>
<td>Norman Bridwell</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-8-89</td>
<td>Drive in a car</td>
<td>Jack Larkin</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-8-89</td>
<td>Magpies</td>
<td>Lorraine Wilson</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9-89</td>
<td>Bare feet</td>
<td>Lorraine Wilson</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-89</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>CB, AT, KH.</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-9-89</td>
<td>Brought</td>
<td>Marvin M.</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9-89</td>
<td>Megscar</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. KIRSTY. YEAR 6.

### I HAVE READ THESE BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.2.89</td>
<td>Dangerous Game (Deadly Class)</td>
<td>W Harris</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6.3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.89</td>
<td>Me, Myself and I (faceless school)</td>
<td>W Tenn</td>
<td>O.K</td>
<td>13.3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3.89</td>
<td>Inspector Thackery Investigates</td>
<td>R. James H. Mulke</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17.3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3.89</td>
<td>The Thirty Nine Steps (Abominations)</td>
<td>J Buchan</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24.3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4.89</td>
<td>Grand Hotel of Horror (Mystery)</td>
<td>H. Milton</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28.4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.89</td>
<td>A Christmas Carol (Christmas)</td>
<td>C. Dickens</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5.89</td>
<td>A Case of the Kidnapped Brain</td>
<td>M. Masters</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>26.5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.89</td>
<td>Penny Polard’s Letters (Peterkin)</td>
<td>R. Klein</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12.6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7.89</td>
<td>Ghost Stories (Black)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29.7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.89</td>
<td>Nancy Drew in the Clue in the Old Stagecoach</td>
<td>Carolyn Keene</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>18.7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8.89</td>
<td>Paper Fun (Bunker) (Instructions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8.89</td>
<td>The Haunting (No. 1)</td>
<td>Margaret Mahy</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.8.89</td>
<td>The Witch and the Rainbow Cat</td>
<td>Terry Tines</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28.8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.89</td>
<td>You be the Jury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. MACK. YEAR 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-2-89</td>
<td>Race for Treasure</td>
<td>Michael Duggan</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27-2-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3-89</td>
<td>The Man Who bought a Dream</td>
<td>Yoshiko Uehara</td>
<td>Pretty good</td>
<td>3-3-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-3-89</td>
<td>The Legend of the Sleepy Hollow</td>
<td>Washington Irving</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Didnt finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-4-89</td>
<td>The Witches</td>
<td>Roald Dahl</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>23-4-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-5-89</td>
<td>The Adventure of Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>21-8-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems
APPENDIX 5. (f)

REVIEW OF BOOKS READ. TERM 3. TOM. YEAR 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE STARTED</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE FINISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-6-89</td>
<td>The brum by mytry</td>
<td>Mary Barbert</td>
<td>tops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-8-89</td>
<td>You be the Jew mytry</td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>twenty mini mytry</td>
<td></td>
<td>exciting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello, my name is Mrs. Sweeney. What's yours? Sapen.

- How old are you? I'm ten.
- Do you write at home? Yes.
- What do you write about? Things I do at home.
- What do you like to write about at school? Acrostic poems.
- Are you a good writer? I don't know, but I say I am.
- Are you getting better at writing? I think I am.
- Who is a good writer you know? Roald Dahl.
- What can you do if you don't know a word? Ask the teacher.
- Do you like to publish stories? No, but stories.
- What do you like to publish? All sorts of poems. (Short)
- Is learning to write important to you? I think yes.
- Why? Because it's easy to learn and is fun.
**APPENDIX 6. (b)**

**WRITTEN CONVERSATION. KELLY. YEAR 4.**

---

**KELLY**

* Hello my name is Mrs Sweeney. What's yours? **KELLY**
* How old are you? I'm 9
* Do you write at home? **yes**
* What do you write about? I write about Santorin
* What do you like to write about at school? The pool's
* Are you a good writer? **no**
* Are you getting better at writing? **yes**
* Who is a good writer you know? Kathleen
* What can you do if you do not know a word? Look it a dictionary
* Do you like to publish your stories? **yes**
* Is learning to write important to you? **yes**
* Why? Because it is important to write
Hello my name is Mrs Sweeney. What's yours? Johnny

* How old are you? 9

* Do you write at home? Yes

* What do you write about? Vampiers

* What do you like to write about at school? Vampiers

* Are you a good writer? Yes

* Are you getting better at writing? No

* Who is a good writer you know? Chad

* What can you do if you don't know a word? Lurr.

* Do you like to publish stories? Yes

* Is learning to write important to you? Yes

* Why? Because my mum will be proud.
Hello, my name is Mrs Sweeney. What's yours?

My name is Kirsty.

How old are you Kirsty?

I am 12 years old.

Do you write at home?

Yes, I do.

What do you write about?

Things I have to remind myself to do, my diary, I write in my diary about how I felt about the day, etc.

What do you like to write about at school?

I like to write about the subject we are doing in Social Studies and I also like to write about stories about Mystery and Horror.

Are you a good writer?

In story writing—not really, but in others, yes.

What do you mean in others?*

Well, when I mean "in others," I mean in Social Science etc

When I'm writing in projects and reports, some of my story writing are good and interesting, but some are not because I tend run out of ideas. I also don't like poetry.

Are you getting better at writing?

Sometimes, when I have the mood in writing.
* Who is a good writer you know?
  Manisone, a girl who sits next to me.

* What can you do if you are writing and you don't know a word?
  The first thing I would do is ask my friends, and if they are not sure, I look it up in the dictionary or ask the teacher.

* Do you like to publish your stories?
  It depends. If I like the story I wrote, than I do like to publish it.

* Is learning to write important to you?
  Yes, it is. I would certainly like to have a good future, and know as many things as I can.
Hello my name is Mrs Sweeney, what's yours?

My name is Mack

How old are you Mack?

I'm eleven years old

Do you like to write at home?

Sometimes, but not a lot.

What do you write about?

Personal things and sometimes a story.

What do you write about at school?

Stories, letters and language.

What sort of stories?

Spooky, adventures and dreamtime.

Are you a good writer?

I don't know.

Are you getting better at writing?

Yes.

Who is a good writer?

Manisone, Reeta, Anna, Robert W and Mr P.

What can you do if you don't know a word?

I could ask Mr P or look it up in a dictionary.
* Do you like to publish your stories?

Yes.

* Is learning to write important to you?

Yes but not as important as Maths. Because if you driving past a sign you will not know what it says.
APPENDIX 6. (f)

WRITTEN CONVERSATION. TOM. YEAR 6.

* Hello my name is Mrs Sweeney, what’s yours?
  my name is Tom

* How old are you Tom?
  yes
  I am 12 and 8 months

* Do you like to write at home?
  yes sometime

* What do you write about?
  I write about dragons and things like that

* What do you like to write about at school?
  I write about dreamtime stories and made up stories

* Are you a good writer?
  not really

* Are you getting better at writing?
  yes

* Who is a good writer?
  Manison, Reeta, Anna

* What can you do if you don’t know a word?
  Ask someone or think of another word

* Do you like to publish your stories?
  yes
* Is learning to write important to you?

yes  Writing is important to me

because I will need it sometime in my life.
APPENDIX 7. (a) 

STUDENTS WRITING INTERVIEW. YEAR 4 STUDENT. SAPEN

1. Source of ideas for writing ?

1. That's really interesting / exciting.

2. Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing ?
Pictures, what you've done, things around us.

Probe" What about books ?" Don't get any ideas from books, mostly living things.

3. Where do you usually get your ideas from ?
Looking at people, from a book if I wanted to find out about something.

4. Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else ?
Places, like libraries, looking around.

5. Do you write at home ? Who else writes at home ?
Yes,

Probe "What about your family? " just some, Mum and Dad, Uncle, brother and sister . Probe " Who doesn't?" My Grandma and Grandpa, my father and brother write it for them.

6. What sorts of things do you / they write ?
Cambodian letters, they write stories for my sister and me to read in Cambodian.

2. Attitudes to writing.

Kerry Sweeney
7. **Do you like writing for other people?**
   
   I haven't done it before but I'll say yes. I'd like to write anything.

8. **Do you like writing other kinds of things?**
   
   Letters, comics, cartoons and lots more.

9. **Are there any particular writers you like to read?**
   
   Chris Powling, Roald Dahl, Stevens Cosgrove. He wrote Nitter, Pitter and Weedle Needle. I borrowed them from C.... Library

10. **Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?**
    
    Yes, Letters, plays, comics, adventure.

3. **Perceptions of what the teacher expects.**

11. **Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.**
    
    It's a free choice, especially on Wednesday. She usually asks us to write about the worst days of our lives, things that happen to us.

12. **What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?**
    
    Publish things, read things, bring things down to get mailed.

13. **How do you start writing sessions?**
    
    Like if we have something to continue on with or start something new. Sometimes if we're stuck, we go to the writing room and get a card- "story starters". Sometimes we write jokes, we experiment with jumbled up words.

14. **What else do you do?** Not much.
1. **Source of ideas for writing?**

That’s really interesting / exciting.

2. **Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing?**

Brain, teacher, by the words that she says. What the teacher teaches you, I change the stories from books, things that happen at home, from my Flinstones book.

3. **Where do you usually get your ideas from?**

My head.

4. **Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?**

T.V. Shows.

5. **Do you write at home? Who else writes at home?**

Yes, everyone in my family. My mum gets phone calls every two minutes and she has to write it down.

6. **What sorts of things do you/they write?**

Homework, stories, telephone numbers.

My sister writes stories, Mum and Dad write letters.

2. **Attitudes to writing.**

7. **Do you like writing for other people?**

No because I'm usually out playing that's the thing like to do.
8. Do you like writing other kinds of things?
Yes, like handwriting, reports when we play schools.

9. Are there any particular writers you like to read?
Roald Dahl.

Probe "Kids?"- Kathleen, Sarim

10. Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?
Yes writing letters.


11. Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.
We do writing for 20 mins in our folders and we have to write a story, letters or poem.

12. What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?
Rule up the page.

13. How do you start writing sessions?
Miss tells us to go to our seat and she picks three kids to give out the folders. Sometimes she reads a book and gives us ideas.

14. What else do you do?
Probe "Anything else?" she tells us to look words up in the dictionary.

Probe " What about editing?" She asks us questions and we have to fix it up.

Kerry Sweeney
APPENDIX 7. (c)

WRITING INTERVIEW. YEAR 4 STUDENT. JOHNY

1. **Source of ideas for writing?**
   1. That's really interesting / exciting.
   2. **Where do you get your ideas for this piece of writing?**
      Brain, books, things that happen. Books funny things from class, Library books, sometimes books from home.

3. **Where do you usually get your ideas from?**
   Nature, imagination, Roald Dahl and when I want to find out things.

4. **Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?**
   Friends, My family.

5. **Do you write at home? Who else writes at home?**
   Yes, my sister, my brother and my other sister.

6. **What sorts of things do you / they write?**
   Things about their work.
   **Probe** "What about you?"- sums homework.

2. **Attitudes to writing.**

7. **Do you like writing for other people?**
   Sometimes, depends on what you want to write.
   **Probe** "What kinds of things?" like things that are funny, exciting things.

*Kerry Sweeney*
8. Do you like writing other kinds of things?
   Signs, like directions.

9. Are there any particular writers you like to read?
   Roald Dahl.
   Probe "What about kids?" Savory and Sargon.

10. Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?
    Yes.


11. Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.
    Miss tells us to write, sometimes she reads to us and that gives us ideas.

12. What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?
    Write things about Science.

13. How do you start writing sessions?
    Read a book and get ideas from books.

14. What else do you do?
    Nothing.
APPENDIX 7. (d)

STUDENT WRITING INTERVIEW. YEAR SIX STUDENT. KIRSTY

1. Source of ideas for writing?

1. That's really interesting / exciting.

2. Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing?

A movie.

3. Where do you usually get your ideas from?

T. V. Shows, books and my sister. Probe "How old is she?" She's in Year 10.

4. Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?

From my relatives and just things I pass when I'm walking.

5. Do you write at home? Who else writes at home?

Yes. My whole family.

6. What sorts of things do you / they write?

My family writes letters, and just shopping lists and things.

2. Attitudes to writing.

7. Do you like writing for other people?

Yes. I write things like homework, some stuff or whatever, when I'm bored I draw pictures.

8. Do you like writing other kinds of things?

Yes, letters.
9. Are there any particular writers you like to read?
Yes, Caroline Keen. My dad likes Agatha Christie.

10. Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?
Yes, like recipes and portraits of people.


11. Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.
We get to write in our spare time on topics like the dream time or we can choose other topics. We've been writing instructions, like How to make people stare and stuff like that.

12. What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?
We used to have a student teacher who told us how to write.

13. How do you start writing sessions?
We discuss it. We do examples- things that lead us into that thing. We have to conference with someone before we bring it to him. He asks us to look at punctuation. We change the story around if it sounds funny or doesn't make sense we talk about it.

14. What else do you do?
We have charts around the room for different words to use instead of said. We also do Science experiments. We have to write our predictions, observations. We draw graphs and diagrams. We also go to the AV Room and look at ads. and see what the hidden message is. Then we make up our own ads. with hidden messages. For Maths we do experiments like finding the volume and write up our predictions.
APPENDIX 7. (e)

STUDENT WRITING INTERVIEW. YEAR SIX. MACK

1. Source of ideas for writing?

1. That's really interesting / exciting.

2. Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing?

From a picture about a lady and her dog.

3. Where do you usually get your ideas from?

From books, movies and TV shows.

4. Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?

Yes, when I go to my relatives and friends.

5. Do you write at home? Not really.

Who else writes at home? Only my Mum and Dad and sometimes my Nanna.

6. What sorts of things do you / they write?

They write letters and send gifts overseas.

2. Attitudes to writing.

7. Do you like writing for other people?

Yes, comics and stories.

8. Do you like writing other kinds of things?

No.

9. Are there any particular writers you like to read?


Kerry Sweeney
10. **Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?**
Yes, describing things, writing out orders, funny things to make them laugh, changing the endings.

3. **Perceptions of what the teacher expects.**

11. **Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.**
We write in our spare time or when Sir's writing. We write on topics like the dreamtime.

12. **What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?**
To look around the room for topics. Sir teaches us to write things like letters.

13. **How do you start writing sessions?**
We write in the heading in our writing folder. We put in full stops and punctuation.

**Probe** "Does he teach you to edit?" We read it through. We've got rules for reading and writing and steps for conferencing.

14. **What else do you do?**
We write projects. We do research. We write books and design new book covers and write a blurb about what the story is about. Sir teaches the ones who don't know how to do things.
APPENDIX 7. (f)

STUDENT WRITING INTERVIEW. YEAR SIX. TOM

1. Source of ideas for writing?

1. That's really interesting / exciting.

2. Where did you get your ideas for this piece of writing?

From a cartoon.

3. Where do you usually get your ideas from?

Magazines and the books I've got at home and sometimes on TV.

4. Do you ever get ideas from anywhere else?

When I go on excursions and to Grandmas house.

5. Do you write at home?

Only homework. Who else writes at home? My mum used to when she was learning to type.

6. What sorts of things do you / they write?

My mum writes postcards and thank you letters.

2. Attitudes to writing.

7. Do you like writing for other people?

Yeah, stories about holidays. I've published a book for little kids

8. Do you like writing other kinds of things?

Comics.

9. Are there any particular writers you like to read?

Ruth Park, Christabel Mattingly. My mum likes Stephen King.

10. Do you like to experiment with different types of writing?

Kerry Sweeney

11. Tell me what happens in writing time in your class.
I like it when there's no sport. We get to write.

12. What sort of things does the teacher tell you to do?
Sometimes he gives us a topic.

13. How do you start writing sessions?
We do a first draft. If it's not enough, he asks us to put in more details.

14. What else do you do?
Like yesterday we had to write up an ad for a commercial. Like even if it's not a good product but you had to say it was.

Yes, stories, poems, greeting cards and ads. for posters.
TEACHER INTERVIEW 2. THE YEAR 4 TEACHER.

1. Tell me about your educational background. (Training etc.)

Diploma of Teaching from Wollongong University.

2. What Professional Development activities have you undertaken in the last three years?

ELIC, TIME, Football for Women, Beginning Teachers, An Art Inservice, Assertive Discipline.

3. Tell me about your teaching experience.

A half year day to day casual, 2 weeks on year 4, 1 week on OA class. A half year on Kindergarten.

1988 at R..... School.

4. Tell me about your Literacy Program.

Probe:

- How do you organise your language session?

It is a 2 hour language block. I usually start with a focus/demonstration based on class or individual student needs.

Kerry Sweeney
Silent Reading 20 minutes.

Contract review followed by work on contract.

Sharing session 20 minutes.

**Probe:**

- **Identify three writers in your classroom.**
  
  a good writer,

  an average writer,

  a writer experiencing difficulty.

- **Tell me about their writing.**

**Sapen**- very willing, highly motivated, writes in a variety of forms from letters to stories. Her stories and ideas flow well. She can maintain and develop them. She searches for interesting words and is influenced by what she reads. She can edit her own work. She re-reads her work and makes adjustments.

**Johny**- writes well when motivated. He has some good ideas and can organise them so they flow. He uses predictable language. He will try new genres but revert to what is familiar. He is beginning to self edit, especially spelling.

**Kellie**- has some good ideas but doesn't express them clearly. A lack of conventions makes her work difficult to follow. She tends to stick to a "safe" type of writing, usually stories.
5. **What reading have you done in the area of literacy?**

   **Probe:**
   
   - **What about the E.L.I.C. readings?**

   I didn't really read a lot of the ELIC materials. It sounded too much like Uni and the readings didn't really seem to have practical ideas.

   **Probe:**
   
   - **So you read books that were practice oriented?**

   Yes, like Literacy Through Literature, Bringing it all Together, Books Alive, Teaching Literature, Teaching Literature, Literature based Reading Programs at work, Literature a Focus for Language Learning, Spell by Writing.

   **Probe:**
   
   - **The school Professional Development Program?**

   I read the handouts, they've been practical. More so this year than last year.

6. **What has influenced you?**

   **Probe:**
   
   - **a teacher, something you've read or heard, inservice?**
Partly what I learnt at college. When I did casual work I saw lots of classrooms. Staff Meetings, more this year than last year. ELIC didn’t inspire me. The schools I visited on the South Coast, R.... and N.... H.... Books Alive, Literacy Through Literature and Bringing it all Together. Plus I’m always listening for ideas in the staff room.

7. What concerns or difficulties do you have in implementing your Literacy program?

I have more trouble finding a focus and finding a good demonstration, one that’s realistic, authentic because the kids see straight through them. Sometimes I look at what I’m doing and think OK, but what’s next. It’s easy to get lazy with it. But the kids adore the activities. I’ve just realised some of the kids true abilities. So perhaps I wasn’t evaluating effectively before.

8. How do you evaluate?

Probe:
- is it school policy?

Yes.

Probe:
- how do you do it?
Very loosely, I collect work samples every 5 weeks. I check their work logs, and individual reading cards. I talk to kids. They read to me at least once a fortnight. The sharing sessions are evaluative. I can evaluate myself— the whole show, the content, the activities, resources, the organisation. I use activities like cloze, lazy letters, retellings, so that provides evaluation.

**Probe:**

- do you like doing it that way?

In some respects I do, but I worry that I might be missing something or overlooking a kid. I'm sure I get to most of them.

**Probe:**

- what are the strengths/weaknesses of doing it that way?

**Strengths.** It's not threatening to kids. I find out more from talking to kids than when I look at something they've written on paper. Like work habits, I observe them, I see how they check their spelling rather than what they produce.

**Weaknesses.** Kids may be able to avoid work unless I monitor them closely and I don't document it as well as I should.
TEACHER INTERVIEW 2. THE YEAR 6 TEACHER.

1. Tell me about your educational background. (Training etc.

Diploma of Teaching from Riverina College of Advanced Education.
Bachelor of Education from Sydney College of Advanced Education.
This was undertaken part time. Its focus was Curriculum Development and Basic Issues in Education.

2. What Professional Development activities have you undertaken in the last three years?

Early Literacy Inservice Course-ELIC
Teachers Involved in Mathematics Education-TIME
Western Sydney Basic Skills.
Computer Contact Persons Course and other Computer Inservices.

Probe:
Did any of these courses ask you to examine your classroom program in the light of your beliefs and assumptions?

ELIC and TIME did. The other courses were content based and on their beliefs rather than exploring mine.
3. Tell me about your teaching experience.

Teaching Experience:

B.....-5 years

V.....-4 years- placement on list 1

Current School-3 years- Executive Teacher Primary- Computer Coordinator

4. Tell me about your Literacy Program.

Probes:

- How do you organise your language session?

The Literacy Program is organised around a theme or a genre base. I've been working this way for a year. I've developed a routine which has changed a little over the time, but my focus has remained the same. The aims and objectives are based on my beliefs and support the learning activities. This is sometimes inhibited by the lack of resources. I get them from outside the school- from the St. George Institute and the local library. Plus my own resources. I try and use real life books and not text type readers. I choose books which reflect the theme, focus or demonstrations that I plan.

The language session:

1. Starts with a teacher focus.

This could be-students sharing, teacher innovating on a text, teacher reading. This usually supports the focus e.g. If the focus is verse then

Kerry Sweeney
I read a variety of verse.

2. **Students move into activities.**

This could be personal reading—a text that they have chosen or perhaps I choose. Students work through a set of activities which the teacher selects or self select from a list of activities in their reading folder. The activities may follow the focus and be a prescribed activity like writing a letter or story mapping.

3. **Students work on their activities.** During this time they can book a group or individual conference. There is a booking sheet, they write their name on it. There may be a group conference. They must have at least one reading and one writing conference a week. In group conferences students read their work with others to get ideas and feedback. They might pose questions or contribute to others writing.

**Probe:**

- **When do you intervene?**

I intervene at the individual conference time. I help the students refocus or reconstruct meaning.

**Probe:**

- **Identify three writers in your classroom.**

  a good writer,

  an average writer,

  a writer experiencing difficulty.

- **Tell me about their writing.**
Kirsty- is self motivated, enthusiastic, she has a good concept about what writing is about. She has a good knowledge of conventions. She is a good reader. She reads a variety of genres.

Mack- is self motivated. He has problems with language structures because of his ESL background. He can identify a problem and go back to edit. He picks up problems through proofreading and conferencing. He likes to read simple texts. He is not interested in overly complicated books. He reads a variety of texts.

Tom- isn't really motivated, needs to be spoon fed, wont initiate and will try to avoid both reading and writing. When writing he wants to take short cuts. His sole motivation is to get it done. His writing does make sense. He just wants to get it down and then come out to conference.

5. What reading have you done in the area of literacy?

Probes:
- What about the E.L.I.C. readings?
- The school Professional Development Program?

I'm a member of PETA and ARA. I read their publications. The ELIC readings were useful. They made me refocus on what I was doing in the classroom. Particularly in terms of the conditions of learning.
The school professional development program?

This was basically stuff I already knew. It reaffirmed and reinforced what I was trying to do.

6. What has influenced you?

Probes:
- a teacher, something you've read or heard,
inservice?

The Writing K-12 document. It made me start examining what I was doing.

ELIC reaffirmed Writing K-12. I read PETA materials. All this plus the work we were doing in staff meetings reaffirmed that I was comfortable with what I was doing.

Talking to the Year 4 teachers has been great.

7. What concerns or difficulties do you have in implementing your Literacy program?

Concerns- time factor. Because I'm the computer coordinator it means I'm out of the classroom. The other teacher takes up other aspects of language like drama. I'm not in control. There is communication. She chooses the focus of the drama. But I'm not physically there so I cant get through what I want to get through.
Resources - trying to find them is a problem. It would help if it were easier to bulk borrow from the Library. There are limited school resources.

Expertise - this still needs developing. I'd like to do much more in modelling writing. I'm still examining what it is I should be doing. I hate writing, I'm hopeless. I model writing when I don't have the necessary skills- but I'm learning.

8. How do you evaluate?

Probes:

- is it school policy?
- do you like doing it that way?
- what are the strengths/weaknesses of doing it that way?

I keep a log of reading and writing from their conferences. Plus a checklist of expected skills.

I evaluate the program from two aspects.

1. The content through the students responses.
2. The classroom practices and organisation. I also use the school program policy checklist.

Is it school policy? Yes.

Do you like doing it that way? Yes I like doing it that way. It works.
**Strengths and Weaknesses.**  
**Strengths-** I keep a record of what each student is doing. The students can give me feedback about the content and activities and organisation.

**Weaknesses-** time, keeping up, trying to keep up. The impact of the Computer Coordinator Role.
APPENDIX 9. (a)

TEACHER INTERVIEW 3. YEAR 4 TEACHER.

1. Has exploring your beliefs influenced your Literacy Program?

Probes:

- Was it a useful process?

Yes it made me think about it more, rather than muddling along. It made me think, which is always useful. It's easy to get caught up with doing what's in vogue. I weigh up things against the way I believe kids learn and learn literacy.

Probe:

- Do you think your assumptions about learning and literacy learning have changed since E.L.I.C.?

Yes, but not because of ELIC, but because of a more supportive supervisor and probably most importantly a more settled class. I feel more confident. Plus the readings and a change in attitude inside the school. People seem more willing to give things a go. Last year some people were more negative. They were more concerned with control rather than what the kids needed.

Probe:

- How do you feel your assumptions/beliefs influence student writing?

Part of what I believe and what I put into practise is effected by the things I learnt as a child. And I think they come through even though I don't want them to.
Probe:

- Tell me about that.

Well for example, you've got to get the spelling right and I think the kids pick that up even though the first conference looks at meaning. So they know I value meaning. Then there's the resources I select. I provide a wide variety of texts. I avoid reading schemes, unless they use real books. The demonstrations I plan and the reading and writing I model. I provide examples or "how to" demonstrations, but the kids can choose whether they use it or not.

2. On the TORP you said ................... Do you still agree?

Question 5. "Materials for early reading should be written in natural language without concern for short, simple words and sentences." No I'd like to change that to 1.

Question 16. "Young readers need to be introduced to the root form of words (run, long) before they are asked to read inflected forms (running, longest). Oh no I strongly disagree, change that to 5.

Question 17. "It is not necessary for a child to know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read." Yes I agree, I didn't pick up the word not. Change it to 1.

Question 19. "Ability to use accent patterns in multisyllable words (pho' to graph, pho to' graphy, and pho to gra' phic) should be developed as part of reading instruction." I'd only use it as part of teaching reading. I'll sit on the fence for that one. Change it to a 3.
Question 25. "It is important to teach skills in relation to other skills." I thought that meant linking skills in relation to other areas of talking, listening, reading and writing. Change it to 4.

Question 28. "Some problems in reading are caused by readers dropping the inflectional endings from words (e.g., jumps, jumped)." Yes I still agree. This is particularly so with Asian children.

3. How has the Professional Development Program of your school contributed to your class program?
Mostly at the grade level. This year we have had support from our supervisor to develop whole language programs. We have discussed lots of ideas like, author studies, directed thinking activities, using newspapers, developing class libraries. I've visited other schools to look at whole language classrooms in operation. I've become aware of the need to plan future directions from watching what the kids need.

4. What are your suggestions for the School Professional Development Program?
Probes:
- the organisation? grade, department, whole school level.

Provide more opportunities for people to look at what is happening in our own school. There are lots of good things happening within our own school.

Kerry Sweeney
The organisation of the Library needs changing as well as the Library lesson. Teachers need more say in the organisation and more access to Library materials. There should be more say in the resources purchased for the school.

There should be more pressure from other supervisors to evaluate the class program. Though this depends on the supervisor.

At the department level, more action is needed, though not from the top down. Teachers don't want to be told 'you must do this', our opinions should be sought.

At the Whole school level. The opportunities to hear consultants and have your questions answered is great. There should be more demonstrations on how we can use the resources we have got.

Activities you could use from K-6. We have skilled people in the school, it would be great to use them.

Programming. This is still an iffy area. It would be great to see how other people do it.

Evaluation. How do you evaluate? Its all very well to have whole language activities and evaluate the kids, but you need opportunities to bring it together. I've been focussing on kids, now I need to look at the total program. Where I started at, where we are now and where we need to go to.
APPENDIX 9. ( b )

TEACHER INTERVIEW 3. THE YEAR 6 TEACHER.

1. Has exploring your beliefs influenced your Literacy Program?
   Yes but what I've actually learnt has been through professional reading.
   I've revamped my beliefs then experimented with putting them into practice. I looked at what was put forward, thought let's try it and on that basis trying again, confirmed and rejected as I went along.

Probe: Was exploring your beliefs part of your training?
Not through my training, but through teaching practise.

Probe: Have your beliefs changed over the years?
Yes, I used to rely on teaching skills and comprehension activities.
Now I've changed, it's the same in Maths. The students are more in control of their learning.
ELIC was a good motivator, but I wasn't putting it into practice. I was still experimenting at that stage.

Probe: Did your inschool supervisor influence you to evaluate what you were doing?
No.

Probe: Should they?
Not overtly. You can't force someone to change their practices or beliefs.

Kerry Sweeney
Probe: Do you think it is the role of the supervisor to explore what you are doing?
Yes.

Probe: How do you feel your assumptions and beliefs influence student writing?
There are more opportunities for writing to occur. By making language whole. I use reading to reinforce writing etc. A lot of kids writing is traditionally based on personal experience. But by using a genre base, it gives them opportunities to write for a variety of purposes.

2. On the TORP you said ..................... Do you still agree?
Question 4. "Fluency and expression are necessary components of reading that indicate good expression." Yes, I still agree with that. It gives you a key which tells you whether they have understood what they have read.

Question 18. "Flashcard drill with sightwords is an unnecessary form of practice in reading instruction." Yes-No I misunderstood unnecessary. Change it to 2.

Question 25. "It is important to teach skills in relation to other skills." I see it in the context of whole language and teaching as a whole rather than teaching skills in isolation. The question is obscure.
3. **How has the Professional Development Program of your school contributed to your class program?**

Oh yes we took on ELIC, plus the work we've done in staff meetings. Also sharing with other teachers within the school. The year 4 teachers have helped me to think about ways of finding time, and thinking about ways of introducing contracts.

Being a supervisor gives me opportunities to see how other people do things. I got ideas from the meetings where we shared programs and the sharing sessions.

4. **What are your suggestions for the School Professional Development Program?**

**Probes:** the organisation?

Organisation should continue as is. The opportunities to share with the consultant have been great. The organisation of grade, department, whole school reinforces what is happening as a total school focus. The grade level is imperative. Just sharing ideas and units of work is valuable. It would be great if release could be organised on a grade basis, so that the teacher and supervisor can get together.

**Probes:** the content?

I'd like to do more work on writing-like modelling writing, developing a writing ideas bank.

*Kerry Sweeney*
APPENDIX 10 (a).

STUDENT INTERVIEWS. YEAR FOUR. GROUP INTERVIEW 1.

1. What do you think your teacher thinks makes good writing?

Sapen - She likes a good beginning, middle and ending.

Kelly - Full stops, capital letters.

Johny - How you put your story together. It's got to make sense and put in all your full stops.

Sapen - She likes you to read it to another person to see if they like it and see if it's correct.

Johny - Yeah, I don't like that. That's when I start to get nervous. I feel embarrassed. Mmm, but you write good stories don't you? Yeah, but I still get nervous.

Sapen - I don't like how I write. People say it's good. Miss.... says "its great!", but I don't think it's good enough. How would you change it? Like take some things out and make it shorter or make it longer.
1. The other day we talked about where you get your ideas for writing. Could you tell me some more about that?

**Sapen** - Home is boring. I like to write at school. I don't like to write stories, I like to write poems. I read for about three hours every day. I like Ruth Park and Stephen Cosgrove and Robyn.... I can't remember her last name, they're partners, they wrote Needle Wheedle.

**Johnny** - I like drawing pictures and I like reading Sapen's stories. I read for about one and a half hours each day, like Roald Dahl and Ruth Park. Well, my brother has published a book. He's twenty three.

**Sapen** - Yeah my brother has published a book about Science and Engineering. He's in Year Eleven.

**Kelly** - My Nan's the best speller- Well my mum can't spell many words. I read for about an hour.

2. Do you borrow books from our library?

**Sapen** - No, I like C... Library. I'm afraid I'll get screamed at at the school library.

*Sapen*  

*Kerry Sweeney*
Kelly - I haven't got a library bag and I might forget it and I don't want to get screamed at.

Johny - I haven't got a library bag.

3. What do you do in your library lesson?

Sapen - We just sit and read and sometimes we do activities and tick it off in our folders.

Anything else? No. (the other students shook their heads in agreement. Their body language indicated that they were uncomfortable with this subject, so I stopped probing.)

4. Tell me about USSR.

Sapen - We read. We select a book and we can keep it till we've finished and we can take it home.

5. Do you read the same way in USSR, at school and at home?

Kelly - It's best at home, you get more time and you don't have to stop at the good parts.

Johny - Yeah, it's better at home cause you don't get disturbed.

Probe: Is it different?

Kirsty - the teacher always stops you at the good parts.
Johny - you feel more comfortable at home.

Sapen - at home I read silently.

Probe: Is it the same?

Sapen - Yes!

Probe: Was it difficult to learn to read silently?

Sapen - Yes, like Kristy said, I read in my room so I can shout out when I need to and I don't disturb people.

Kelly - Yeah, cause when you get to a word you want to shout out you can't.

Johny - it was easy, you read in your mind, you feel comfortable. When you read out aloud you don't feel relaxed. Why? You feel nervous and tensed up if you have to read to someone. Is the way you read the same? Yes.
APPENDIX 10 (b).

STUDENT INTERVIEWS- YEAR SIX. GROUP INTERVIEW 1.

1. Can you tell me about conferencing in your classroom?

Mack- He lets you read it through and waits till you realize you've got something wrong and then you fix it up. I do it straight away, then I read it to someone else or they read it themselves.

Kirsty- When we've written a story, you read it to yourself and then to a friend and discuss it with a friend to see if it makes sense. Then I read it again and then I book a conference with the teacher. We discuss the story like whether it makes sense and if you mentioned something- we discuss whether its consistent throughout the story, and punctuation and sentences and whether there are too many 'ands'.

2. What's the best part about Writing? Tell me three things you like.

Mack- The headings, drawing the pictures and picking out the fancy borders.

Tom- I like to publish and do nice headings. I like to make it attractive, cause then people will say "Hey that looks great I'll read that".

Kirsty- I get to write stories. Like if I've got some ideas in my head and I get to see what it turns out like. I like horror stories.
Tell me about the three things you hate.

**Mack**- Writing out the story. We've got these rules like you've got to read it to someone else and stuff like that.

**Tom**- When you've got all the mistakes and you've got to go through and check it again and when you finish you find out it doesn't make sense, you've got to fix it up.

**Kirsty**- Well when I haven't got an idea in my head and I can't figure out what to write. When I'm halfway through a story and I forget what the ideas were and I have to change the ideas.

3. **We talked once before about borrowing books. Can you tell me about borrowing from the Library?**

**Kirsty**- I prefer to use C... Library. **Why?** Well sometimes I only get to read half the book and you have to return it. Lately I haven't had enough time. A week's not long enough and you can't borrow the books I really need. **Mmm...** Well it hasn't got the authors I like and like if you're writing about a project, you can only use them in the Library and there's not enough time.

**Mack**- I was going to borrow a book today but I didn't. The last time I borrowed was last term, cause I keep forgetting my bag.

**Probe:** *What do you think about the books?* Some of them are interesting and some of them are not kind of my taste- like romance. I like comics, mysteries and adventures and I like dinosaurs.
Probe: *What if you are doing research?* It’s useful—like there’s a computer but I still haven’t used it. *Who has?* Michael and Rita have. No one else. I just go over to the chart and look at what’s on the shelf. 

Tom- I’ve only borrowed once cause I keep forgetting my bag. She doesn’t bother if we don’t borrow. She doesn’t notice who does and doesn’t borrow. **Probe: What do you think about the books?** Like Mack, some of them are interesting and some are boring. I like Science books, pre-historic animals and mysteries, adventure stories.

**What if you are researching?** I look in the Encyclopedia. If there’s not enough info, I look up the number.
The students were asked to bring along three pieces of writing.

1. Tell me about each piece of writing.

Kirsty - This is a poem called Jealousy. It's a dream story. It's fiction. It's a recount.

 - This is a Limmerick. We've been looking at different forms of poetry. It was easy to write because we had lots of examples and the other kids said if it sounded right.

 - This is an instruction. How to Annoy People. We've been practising reading and writing instructions ready for the Year six testing (Basic Skills Testing). I've also written a project on Making Paper Flowers. You have to make something from a book and then write instructions for other people to make it.

Tom - This is a poem. It's called Astonished. The teacher said we had to write a poem about feelings, so I wrote about Astonished.

 - This is a Limmerick.

 - And this is for my project. I wrote How to tell if eggs are fresh and my project is about Making a Pinball Machine. I got the idea from a book in the classroom. I'm gonna write it for little kids and they need easy instructions.

Kerry Sweeney
**Mack** - This is a dream story. It's fiction. It's called *My Nightmare*.

- This is a poem. It's called *Worry*. It's like Tom's its about feelings.

- This is a Limerick. Once you got how it was supposed to sound right, it was easy.

- My instruction writing is a recipe. Recipes are easy but you've got to make sure its in the right order.

**2. The Teacher told me you are learning about comedy.**

**Tom**- Yeah, its great. **Mack**- Yeah we're writing a play called Punkerella and you should hear the jokes. **Kirsty**- Well they're not really jokes like you ask a question and you get a funny answer. Like they sound funny cause the way you say them... **Mack**- Like they mean two things.

**Is it a play?**

**Tom**- Yeah well there's a narrator and then there's the sisters and the godmother and stuff. We made Cinderella a punk. **Mack**- Yeah and we changed the ending so that it's not so sexist. **Mmm...** Well you know in the fairy stories, they always get married and live happily ever after and stuff, well Punkerella tells him off and she only agrees to get married like if they do it her way.
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TEACHER RELATED LANGUAGE PRODUCTS. YEAR 4.

THE CLASS PROGRAM SAMPLE.

LANGUAGE RATIONALE

Talking and Listening....
"Children learn to talk and listen before learning to read and write. Talking and listening are important communication skills which contribute to learning in all areas of the curriculum."
(The Primary Purpose, p.8)

Literature......
"Good literature enriches the lives of all people by opening the world of fine writing to them. Literature helps students to clarify their personal thoughts and reflect on their own experiences. It also introduces students to events and human relationships beyond their own lives. It assists them to use and understand forms of language that may be different from those they use themselves. It stimulates the imagination and provides an activity that is for leisure and intellectual growth."
(The Primary Purpose, p.9)

Writing.......
"The aim in teaching writing is to help students become better writers and better learners. The school should aim to teach students to write, so that they are able to write competently whenever they need to write in their present and future lives."
(Statement of Principles, Writing K-12, p.3)

Reading......
"Reading is a process, a process of getting meaning from print. This process has two characteristics. One is that the reader is attempting to get at meaning. The second is that the reader is using whole language to do so (where whole language is a result of the readers own experiences)."
As a result, reading in the classroom involves reading the actual printed word and making a response to it.

Spelling......
"...learning to spell is a lifelong process that best occurs in the context of purposeful writing, where students recognise the need to master standard spelling in order to communicate effectively."
(Writing K-12, p.132)

Handwriting......
"Handwriting serves writing when students can produce legible handwriting fluently and with minimum conscious effort. The fundamental purpose of handwriting instruction is to help students develop a legible, fluent handwriting style."
(Statement of Principles Writing K-12, p.3)
WHOLE LANGUAGE PROGRAM STRANDS

Reading

Poetry

Spelling

Literature

Handwriting

Writing

Talking and Listening

Dictionary Skills

U.S.S.R.

These strands all interact to give a whole language approach. Although these areas overlap they have been put into strands on the term overview. So I can identify areas not being sufficiently covered, and for ease in organisation within the program.

WHOLE LANGUAGE AIMS

To present a language program that links the elements of language together.

Reading Aims:
- To encourage children to read a variety of materials from various sources.
- To encourage reading for a variety of purposes.
- To encourage children to read for meaning - not just to get the words right.
- To provide a classroom that encourages reading and the sharing of literature.
- To extend children's vocabularies.

Writing Aims:
- To encourage children to write freely.
- To promote self-selection of topics and formats.
- To provide experiences in a number of formats and topics.
- To encourage children to respond to their writing and that of others.
- To provide opportunities and develop skills, for children to see the process from start (draft) to finish (published copy).
- To demonstrate the writing process.
- To relate writing to other subject areas.

Poetry Aims:
- To provide opportunities for children to read and write poetry.
- To encourage interest in poetry.
- To introduce poems about different topics relevant to the class.
- To encourage children to recite poems.

Spelling Aims:
- To provide opportunities for children to develop self-help techniques.
- To remove, as far as possible, the fear of spelling words incorrectly.
- To relate spelling to children own needs.

Talking & Listening Aims:
- To encourage children to express themselves and ideas.
- To develop skills in speaking and listening in group situations.
- To develop individual's confidence in speaking and being able to listen.
- To develop vocabulary.
Literature Aims:
- To provide experiences with a wide variety of literature.
- To encourage children to select quality literature for their own needs and interests.
- To provide opportunities to respond to literature.

Handwriting Aims:
- To help children develop a personal handwriting style that is neat, automatic, legible and fluent.
- To help children master a simple foundation set of handwriting movements.
- To encourage pride in their handwriting.

U.S.S.R. Sims:
- To provide time on a daily basis for children to read quietly and independently.
- To demonstrate my own enjoyment of reading.

Dictionary Skills Aims:
- To develop children's ability to use a dictionary.
- To develop confidence in ability to use a dictionary.
- To promote dictionaries as a useful tool in language.

WHOLE LANGUAGE OBJECTIVES

The children will be able to:

Reading:
- identify different part of books.
- self-select reading material accurately.
- record what they read (reading cards).
- respond personally to what they read.
- retell stories after reading.
- use a variety of strategies to assist in their reading.
- read aloud confidently, clearly and with expression.
- share their readings with others.

Writing:
- choose their own topic and genre when writing.
- continue writing for more than one writing period.
- complete pieces of writing in standard conventional forms.
- begin editing their own work.
- identify the strengths and weaknesses of their own work.
- make decisions about their publishing of stories.

Poetry:
- make a personal response to poems read.
- read/re'cite favourite poems.
- use set poetry formats to produce their own poems on set topics or a topic of their choice.
- when writing choose a poetry form to suit their purpose, ability, topic and taste.

Spelling:
- use spelling in realistic and purposeful writing.
- check their own spelling.
- recognise similarities in groups of words.
- develop their own mnemonics, to assist in their own spellings.
- invent their own spellings when writing and follow through to check their spelling.

Talking & Listening:
- express their ideas in a clear and logical manner.
- take 'turns' during discussions.
- ask sensible questions of others.
- accept the opinions of others.
- listen carefully and retell events.
- speak on a variety of topics.
- give elaborated responses to questions.
Literature:  
- recommend/reject literature, after reading.  
- choose ways responding personally to the literature presented.  
- select their own literature.  
- share opinions with others.

Handwriting:  
- demonstrate correct posture, seating and grip for writing.  
- demonstrate and use a clear, legible and fluent style, based on the Foundation style (as per Writing K-12).  
- by the end of the year, earn a Pen Licence.

U.S.S.R.  
- select sufficient reading material for the entire period.  
- read alone for the period.  
- stay in the same spot for the complete period.

Dictionary Skills:  
- estimate where a word will be found in a dictionary.  
- use the guide words to locate specific words.  
- find the given meaning of a word.  
- check spelling accuracy.

ORGANISATION

Even though the language program of last term and previous terms, has been successful I am changing my organisation - yet again.

During the last unit Food! Food! Food!, I began reading Roald Dahl's 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory'. The response from the children was sheer rapture - complete silence while I read it! Wow - what a winner. From this I decided to do an author study on Dahl. The study is overleaf.

At the same time I was keen to try language, contracts, after successfully using them before and seeing them in action. I felt this would present language to the children in a more wholistic manner, rather than set 'writing', reading etc. lessons, especially as many of the activities I do fit into more than one area.

For each contract I choose activities that include all strands of the Language program - except handwriting which I am still doing as a whole class lesson. The children must complete each contract before moving onto the next weeks. Stickers are given for completion of each contract. The language session begins with U.S.S.F. (10-15 mins.), Focus or Demonstration, (10-15 mins.) Children do activities (40 mins.) then finishes with a sharing session (20 mins. The activities and focus/demonstrations are recorded on weekly sheets.
Language Contract!

**Contract Activities.**

- Add – spelling words to the class list.
- Put 8 spelling words into sentences.
- Illustrate your favourite Dahl character. Write a description of it & why you liked it.
- Prepare a book talk about a book you have discovered.
- Write a short poem, with lots of sounds in it for a class book.

---

**FOCUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choosing a suitable book to read.</td>
<td>Demonstration use of a flow chart for writing</td>
<td>Read through some alliterative sentences.</td>
<td>Tense activity from Week 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling in work log sheet.</td>
<td>&amp; brainstorm ideas for a topic &amp; record it on a chart with diagram.</td>
<td>Discuss how they could be illustrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**EVALUATION.**

- Work logs - gem of an idea - instant check on homework.
- On this whole went well.
- Most book talks went well.

Kerry Sweeney
APPENDIX 11. (b)

TEACHER RELATED LANGUAGE PRODUCTS. YEAR 6.

THE CLASS PROGRAM SAMPLE.

AIMS

* to develop and extend language growth in all children

* to develop confidence in using (speaking, reading, writing and understanding) the English language

* to communicate effectively in the oral and written forms

* to speak confidently and fluently in a variety of situations both simulated and actual

* to promote language learning through the use of language for a variety of purposes and in a wide range of situations

* to develop an appreciation of the need to communicate effectively

* to develop positive attitudes towards clear communication

* to increase fluency and expression through exposure to a variety of printed media

* to develop a realization that reading and writing are a worthwhile, necessary and enjoyable part of life

* to build self confidence

Kerry Sweeney
GENERAL OBJECTIVES

TALKING
Children will:
- speak clearly and precisely on a given topic
- participate in class discussions, conversations and drama activities
- increase spoken vocabulary

LISTENING
Children will:
- develop the skills of accurate recall
  following directions
  responding
  interpreting
- respect the contributions of others
- through conversation, discussion and debate develop social skills and self discipline

WRITING
Children will:
- record own experiences, thoughts and feelings using a variety of written forms
- through assistance, improve the conventions used in writing
- evaluate their own writing through oral reading, peer conferencing and teacher conferencing
- write in a variety of forms including narratives, reports, reviews, letters, directions, note taking, poems and plays
- develop and extend vocabulary through exposure to written media and dictionary use
- develop spelling conventions through weekly spelling charts, spelling rules and self editing
- develop a legible writing style through maintaining a good posture, using a comfortable pen grip and using a fluent, sloped letter formation
Children will:
- read with comprehension and recall facts
- participate in group/class oral reading to develop fluency and confidence
- develop expression and phrasing in reading realising the importance of punctuation
- use semantic, syntactic and grapho-phonie cues to obtain meaning
- use a number of books to research information
- use other written media such as atlases, dictionaries, catalogues charts, graphs, newspapers, etc. to obtain information
- develop word attack skills through "word families" and word building exercises
- sequence events
- summarise information
- query and analyse what they read
- predict or change story endings
RATIONALE AND CLASS ORGANISATION

Children throughout the ages, in a diversity of cultural groups have learned language through using language in a multitude of verbal interactions. Consequently by integrating the various components of language, teaching techniques will be more in consonance with the natural processes of language learning where as a series of related experiences one use of language leads naturally to others.

There still exist orthographic conventions that demand a teaching of spelling, grammar and punctuation. However these will be treated and taught in meaningful situations as the need arises. This will occur in individual and small group conferences and whole class lessons if there is a perceived need.

The Language program will operate as two distinctive parts. Each Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, Mrs. Shaw will take the class for Language. During this time the Language will be based on Drama, involving children in reading and writing scripts, role playing, discussing ideas, improvising and acting out.

On Mondays and Fridays the Language program will be based either on a theme/topic which in many cases will relate to the needs and interests of children or integrate with other subjects to complement and supplement the learning activities and enhance understanding and knowledge or on children's independent reading and writing. Activities will involve exposing children to situations where they can experience, talk, listen, read, write, draw, act and make so they feel a need to communicate and express.
Spelling charts will be created based on words used in the literature and children's experiences and knowledge of the topic. Further conventions such as word families, prefixes and suffixes will also be treated within the topic. Children will be encouraged to use dictionaries to enhance understanding and check spelling.

Children's writing will at times be based around the theme/topic and be a response to some stimulus e.g. story, poem or an excursion. This directed writing will involve various forms outlined by class discussion and brainstorming. Other writing will be free choice where children can draw on their own experiences or ideas gained from peer writing and topic lists in the classroom.

The writing within the classroom will follow the following process:

1. Pre-writing - talking, observing, listening, reading, note taking, researching, drawing.

2. Draft - copy down ideas in prose form using invented spelling
   - self correction; use spelling chart / dictionary, check grammar / usage, add / delete detail
   - peer conference
   - re-draft if necessary

3. Conference (group and individual)
   - discuss ideas
   - check and reinforce grammatical conventions
   - proof read

4. Editing - children make necessary changes as discussed at conference
   - decide whether to publish
5. Publishing - children can publish work as an individual work, part of a class book, type written story on the computer or as a wall display.

6. Follow up - stories read to class or to other classes at assembly
   - convert into plays
   - read during silent reading

Drama will be used as a form of expression in response to something ..... discussion, magazine story, piece of music, news events, rewriting stories into a play. These responses may be improvisation, mime, role play or exploration of movement. In most cases these will occur as small group activities.

Reading activities will include whole class, small group and individual oral reading, silent reading, comprehensions (factual and inferential), sequencing, summarising, reporting (oral and written), improvising and cloze passages.

Resources used will include story books (Bookshelf, Rigby, Class Library, bulk Library loans, Puffin packs, books from home), reports, School Magazines, reference books, atlases, poems, leaflets, newspapers and teacher prepared stencils.

Children will also be exposed to a diverse range of literature for language models. e.g. reading to children, having poems, poetry books and story books available, encouraging use of the library. Time will be set aside each day for a quiet reading time and also teacher serial reading. Books will be chosen based on student interest.
TERM 3

**THEME/TOPIC:**

DREAM TIME

**AIMS:** To introduce children to the world of FANTASY through exploring poems, plays and stories dealing with DREAMS

**DURATION:**

3 WEEKS

**OBJECTIVES:** Children will:

- share their own dreams or dream stories orally
- search school library for suitable titles to read and explore
- write own stories that end as a dream
- dramatise a dream story using appropriate props and music
- discuss what dreams are and strategies for dealing with bad dreams

**RELATED ACTIVITIES:**

- Book Week Theme: DREAM TIME
- Teacher telling: "The Story of Joseph" from Genesis 37 - 50
- Discuss -
  - What are dreams?
  - Who dreams
  - Share some own dreams
  - Discuss the term "FANTASY"
  - Relate own dreams to some 'fantasy' stories
  - Brainstorm stories, movies, T.V. programs based on Fantasy and Dreams
  - Children share and discuss recurring daydreams.
  - Compare with others.

**STIMULUS:**

- "There's A Sea In My Bedroom" by M. White
- "The Slaves Dream" by H. W. Longfellow
- Discuss the term "FANTASY"
- Read together with expression
- Comprehension questions
- Search library for suitable title to read and explore
- Prepare a poster or book cover containing an illustration and brief summary.

**RELATED ACTIVITIES:**

- Write a DREAM/NIGHTMARE adventure where you wake up and discover it was only a dream
- Book summaries
- Collect magazine pictures of anonymous people. Write daydream captions inside thought bubbles.
- Write ideas for overcoming 'bad dreams' - produce into 'getting rid of bad dreams' book.

**TALKING / LISTENING:**

- Discuss -
  - What are dreams?
  - Who dreams
  - Share some own dreams
  - Discuss the term "FANTASY"
  - Relate own dreams to some 'fantasy' stories
  - Brainstorm stories, movies, T.V. programs based on Fantasy and Dreams
  - Children share and discuss recurring daydreams.
  - Compare with others.

**READING:**

- Class reading "There's A Sea In My Bedroom" by M. White
- Cloze exercise
- Innovate on text
- Poem "The Slaves Dream" by H. W. Longfellow
- Read together with expression
- Comprehension questions
- Search library for suitable title to read and explore
- Prepare a poster or book cover containing an illustration and brief summary.

**WRITING:**

- Write a DREAM/NIGHTMARE adventure where you wake up and discover it was only a dream
- Book summaries
- Collect magazine pictures of anonymous people. Write daydream captions inside thought bubbles.
- Write ideas for overcoming 'bad dreams' - produce into 'getting rid of bad dreams' book.

**SPELLING / VOCABULARY:**

- Create a wordbank - brainstorming and recording
- Use words in sentences
- Find dictionary meanings
- Complete word-search maze