

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Colleen M. Larson for the degree of Doctor of Education in
Education presented on October 15, 1992.

Title: A Study of the Commonalities and Differences of the
Classroom Environment in Whole Language and Judicious
Discipline Classrooms

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved _____ Forrest Gathercoal _____

This study specifically investigated the commonalities and differences among the classroom environments, the teacher's role and the student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms. A qualitative research methodology characterized this investigation and analysis.

The sample included two first grade Whole Language classrooms and two fourth grade Judicious Discipline classrooms. For each classroom, a set of descriptive data was collected, i.e., classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews.

During each classroom observation, teacher and student verbalizations were tape recorded and later transcribed. Approximately ten weeks were allotted for data collection. Observations included 15 hours in each Whole Language classroom and 15 hours in each Judicious Discipline

classroom. The times of observations were scheduled to provide an equal number of morning and afternoon sessions for each classroom.

The combination of the three sources of data, i.e., classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews, was referred to as the "data set" for each classroom. Qualitative analysis of the data sets generated a pool of classroom variables, i.e., classroom climate, teacher instructional strategies, teacher's role and student's role. Data analysis consisted of three qualitative comparisons between paired data sets. The purpose of this procedure was to determine commonalities and differences with respect to classroom variables, the teacher's role and student's role between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms.

The major findings of this study indicated the existence of more commonalities than differences between the classroom environment, the teacher's role and the student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms.

A STUDY OF THE COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES
OF THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT IN WHOLE LANGUAGE
AND JUDICIOUS DISCIPLINE CLASSROOMS

by

Colleen M. Larson

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Completed October 15, 1992

Commencement June 1993

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Director of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented October 15, 1992

Typed by researcher

DEDICATION

Many important factors which enrich my life have been untended during these past two years. This dissertation has demanded time, a certain sense of tunnel vision, and myopia. With a sense of accomplishment, I return to a world filled with

joy and laughter with my children, family,
and friends.

sails on ocean waves and walks on the beach.
camping, and snow skiing in
the mountains.

opportunities to share love and encouragement.

I re-enter the world where acts of respect and dignity for every human being and acts of peacemaking capture my commitment.

To this end, I reach out to a new and enriched life.

CML

1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research and dissertation writing is the most frustrating and loneliest work in the world! However, this work was not accomplished alone. The contributions of the teachers and children in this study made this research meaningful and possible.

I especially acknowledge the contribution of my doctoral committee who provided expertise, encouragement, and evaluation throughout the experience:

Forrest Gathercoal, my major professor, who so wisely gave encouragement to me to finish this project.

Norman Lederman, who demanded excellence and clarity consistent to a thesis, and guided me through the qualitative design of this study. He deserves a medal of honor for his patient assistance and counsel.

Hugh Wubben, who guided me through the revision and editing processes consistent to a thesis.

Ken Ahrendt and Ed Strowbridge, who contributed time and optimism at crucial moments. To these persons, I owe a special debt of gratitude.

My parents, Carl and Allegra Thomas and Ida O'Mara hold a special place in this dissertation. Their patient and loving nurturance laid the foundation for the completion of this dissertation.

Special appreciation extends to my two children, Kohner Larson and Carrie Larson. Without their dedication and patience, this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Statement of Problem	3
Significance of the Study	3
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations of the Study	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Introduction	7
Psychological Basis of Whole Language	7
Behaviorist Theory	8
Psycholinguistic Theory	9
Cognitive-Interactionist Theory	11
Sociolinguistic Theory	12
Primary Research Resources of Whole Language	16
Why the Process is called Whole Language	31
Whole Language Classroom Environment Research	34
The Democratic Philosophy of Whole Language	49
Judicious Discipline Research	53
Summary of the Review of the Literature	56
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	61
Introduction	61
Sample	62
Method	65
Classroom Observations	65
Teacher Interviews	67
Student Interviews	68
Researcher's Background	70
Data Analysis	71
RESULTS	72
Categories	73
Classroom Climate	73
Teacher Instructional Strategies	76
Teacher's Role	79
Student's Role	81
Qualitative Comparisons	83
Whole Language (1) (Rue-First Grade)	84
paired with Whole Language (2)	
(Caster-First Grade)	
Judicious Discipline (1)	146
(Anderson-Fourth Grade) paired	
with Judicious Discipline (2)	
(Oliver-Fourth Grade)	
Similarities and Differences Between	231
Whole Language and Judicious Discipline	
Classrooms	

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	250
Summary	250
Research Questions	252
Findings	252
Conclusions	254
Process Approach	254
Classroom Environment	258
Teacher Roles	263
Student Roles	263
Differences	265
Implications	268
Recommendations for Future Research	270
REFERENCES	272
APPENDICES	
A. Mrs. Caster's Daily Schedule	281
B. Mrs. Rue's Daily Schedule	283

A STUDY OF THE COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES
OF THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT IN WHOLE LANGUAGE
AND JUDICIOUS DISCIPLINE CLASSROOMS

INTRODUCTION

Background

The schools of the United States face a challenging task, to help students acquire social learnings which enable them to function as responsible members of a democratic society. Dewey (1944) declares that the school is the institution most able to cope with the task. The school helps students to acquire the common values, ideals, and behaviors needed for social living; and also to become increasingly competent at using intelligently the communication processes of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Of all the institutions in society, the school is the one in which both the needs of children and requirements of society can best be addressed.

Alice Miel (1986) agreed with Dewey and felt that the need to teach this process is particularly pressing when the country's population is becoming so increasingly diverse.

Miel and Brogan (1957) analyzed the task of teaching democracy to foster socialization skills to our youth which were suitable for a democracy:

" . . . The process of democratic socialization means learning more and more responsible membership in a society whose discipline requires that the individual maintain his integrity and discover his uniqueness within the context of a group which supports him but which he also supports and enriches. In other words, democratic socialization embodies the interwoven process of individuation and socialization." (p.5-6)

Accordingly, if democratic socialization is an important goal of education, we need the types of classrooms and school organizations that foster it and which develop the concomitant skills and attitudes needed to perpetuate it (Miel, 1986).

In the past decade, two educational movements have arisen to address these needs--Whole Language (Goodman, 1989) and Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1990)--both formulated upon democratic principles which emphasize respect for and development of the individual and of the group.

Judicious Discipline is a philosophy of education which provides a framework within which students participate actively in a democratic process leading toward the achievement of self-discipline. The framework balances the rights of the individual and the welfare of the group. It is based on a synthesis of law, education and ethics which not only allows students to learn their constitutional rights, but also teaches them when those rights will be denied. This synthesis also promotes an understanding of responsible citizenship in a democratic society (Gathercoal, 1990). Effective problem-solving, making responsible choices, and nurturance of the child's self-esteem are also central to the educational practice of Judicious Discipline.

Whole Language is a methodology for teaching and learning language in an environment in which students acquire language skills in an active process involving

reading, writing, listening, and speaking through an integrated, not a fragmented curriculum. Such a curriculum invites them to solve problems and make choices about the kinds of experiences in which they participate (Goodman, 1989). Children are encouraged to shape their own lives, actions, interests, and interact with others (Rich, 1985a).

Statement of the Problem

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the classroom environments of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline with respect to their commonalities and differences. More specifically, this research will address the following general questions:

1. What are the commonalities and differences among the instructional approaches, classroom climates, and social interactions in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline Classrooms?
2. What are the commonalities and differences between the teacher's role and student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms?

Significance of the Study

Piaget (1965) asserts that a child's learning of social-arbitrary knowledge (e.g., rules, laws, morals, values, ethics, and language) is dependent on the child's action on the environment and on interaction with other people. Wadsworth (1984) adds that if one agrees with Piaget's views, one can conclude that the authoritarian

model for the relationship between children and adults is inadequate. Authoritarian teachers need to discover ways to modify their behavior so that a major portion of their interaction with children can be as collaborators and "equals".

Interestingly, the classroom environments described by supporters of both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline are quite consistent with that advocated by Piaget. It is anticipated that the results of this research will assist elementary educators in their perennial attempt to foster a student's understanding of morals, ethics, values, and language. Specifically, it appears that the classroom atmospheres manifested in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms may provide a fruitful "backdrop" to accomplish the aforementioned educational objectives. However, in order to determine the usefulness of Judicious Discipline and Whole Language as effective educational approaches, their similarities and differences must be delineated.

Definition of Terms

Although Newman (1985) acknowledged, "I find myself in the uncomfortable position of being unable to tell you succinctly "What Whole Language is" (p.1), and Watson (1989) suggested that "most Whole Language advocates reject a dictionary-type definition that can be looked up and memorized" (p. 131), others have been more hopeful. Rich (1985b) described it as "an attitude, not methods" (p. 718).

Clarke (1987) described it as "a philosophy rather than a methodology" (p. 386) and Goodman (1986) suggested that many methods are possible within a whole language classroom. This study will define Whole Language as follows from Edelsky with the reservation that it is somewhat more a description of content. It is a qualitative definition 'per se':

Whole Language "includes a theory about the nature of language and language learning (not just reading), a philosophical position on education, and a political position regarding distribution of power (in schools and in the larger community)." (Edelsky, 1990, p.8)

Judicious Discipline will be defined as follows:

Judicious Discipline is a disciplinary style and philosophy based on the synthesis of law, sound educational practice and ethics.

It creates an educational and ethical perspective for school rules and decisions based on the Bill of Rights.

(Gathercoal, 1990)

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are the following:

1. Generalizations from the sample related to grade level, size, and location. All of the schools

selected are located in Oregon's Willamette Valley and clearly are not truly representative of the Pacific Northwest's population, much less the entire country's students in Grades 1 and Grades 4. This study would need to be replicated with other samples in other geographical locations.

2. The study is limited by the competency and experience of the teachers involved.
3. The researcher is the only observer. This could lead to a bias in data collection.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review was organized into two sections. The first section investigated the theoretical background of and the primary research on Whole Language. Section two examined the legal framework and research on Judicious Discipline.

The Psychological Basis of Whole Language

For the last 200 years, child language development has been a concern of scientific inquiry. The German philosopher Tiedemann, attempted to collect normative data on language acquisition in 1787. Physiologists in the mid-nineteenth century followed his lead (Mitzel, 1982). In the mid 1800's, the French Academy of Science in Paris received an increase in scholarly papers dealing with the origins of natural language and how these origins affected cognition (Riley, 1987). The first detailed chronicle of language development was published by Preyer in 1882 (Bar-Adon & Leopold, 1971). Darwin (1887) and other scientists were also concerned with language acquisition, since understanding the nature of language development in children was seen as a key to understanding the history of mankind itself. Language acquisition today is considered to be intrinsically related to cognitive development and to the culture that it helps to transmit from generation to generation in each society (Mitzel, 1982).

Through scholarly research, four basic theoretical approaches of language development have emerged. Generally, portions of each of these theories for language development have contributed to the psychological basis of Whole Language.

Behaviorist Theory

Behaviorists share a common belief concerning language development. They focus on the functions of language, on the observable and measurable aspects of language behavior, and the stimuli that evoke verbal behavior and language performance (Gleason, 1985).

The most widely known proponent of language as a learned behavior is psychologist B.F. Skinner. According to Skinner, all behavior is learned or operant. But, Skinner (1957) argued that language is a special case of behavior because it is reinforced exclusively by other organisms. "Any response which vaguely resembles the standard behavior of the community is reinforced" (Skinner 1957, p. 29). According to Skinner's theory, language learning is based on modeling, imitation, practice, and selective reinforcement. Language development is not rule governed but rather shaped by the contingencies of the environment (Owens, 1988). In addition, Skinner believed that the "how" of language use takes precedence over the "what" of language form. Thus, Skinner conceded that behaviorists should not study linguistic units (e.g., words and sentences per se) but should examine language as they would any other behavior--

searching for the functional units as they naturally occur, then discovering the functional relationships that predict their occurrence.

Skinner's theory of language development as a set of functional units made an attempt to explain a complex process within the environmental context in which that process occurs. In that sense, Skinner's research on language has influenced the sociolinguistic theory of language development (see pp. 12-16) which is an important component of Whole Language.

Psycholinguistic Theory

In contrast to the behaviorist approach to language development, the psycholinguistic theorists emphasize the importance of internal processes for language development. This approach assumes that language has a structure or grammar employed by language users to understand and create language.

The leading proponent of the psycholinguistic theory of language development was Noam Chomsky. Chomsky (1959, 1965) stimulated new directions in research on child language development with his claim that knowing a language does not mean knowing a finite set of sentences but rather the possession of an internalized set of rules (the grammar). This grammar allows the creation and interpretation of sentences, including many that have never before been uttered. Chomsky claims that language learning would not be possible unless the child were guided by some innate notions

about the nature of language in general. Chomsky insisted that children are born with an innate language acquisition device (LAD) which bestows on children information about sentence structure, deep phrase structure, and possible transformations (McNeil, 1970). The LAD is assumed to be a physiological part of the brain that is a specialized language processor. It allows children enough innate knowledge of language to speak (Chomsky, 1968). "Thus, the infant is "prewired" for linguistic analysis" (Owens, 1988, p. 39) for she possesses knowledge of the "basic grammatical categories and relationships and the fact that sentences represent on two levels--deep and surface structure" (Edmonds, 1976, p. 180).

Chomsky devised a transformational generative grammar (TGG) theory. He argued that every sentence has a surface and deep structure. The surface structure contains the phonological and graphical representations. The deep structure which resides in the brain, contains the basic meaning of the sentence. The bridge between the surface structure and deep structure is through transformational rules. By modifying and changing the deep structure, transformational rules create surface structure. (Chomsky, 1957).

Although Chomsky's research on language development was limited because it deemphasized the importance of the environment, social and cognitive growth, Chomsky's distinction between surface and deep structure was

significant to the development of Whole Language. Chomsky paved the way for the recognition that meaning does not lie in language itself but rather arises during the transaction between reader and text (Weaver, 1988).

Cognitive-Interactionist Theory

Whereas the psycho-linguistic approach is based primarily upon the work of Chomsky, the cognitive-interactionist approach relies heavily on Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development.

Piaget proposed a model of cognitive development placing language upon a cognitive base. Piaget pointed out that the functional use of language is limited by what already has been achieved in cognitive development.

According to Piaget (1967), sensori-motor operations are necessary for language development. Piaget reasoned that cognition is responsible for language development and that cognitive knowledge forms the basis for word meanings. Piaget (1964, p. 15) emphasized his position when he said, "Mainly, language serves to translate what is already understood; or else language may even present a danger if it is used to introduce an idea which is not yet accessible" (Piaget, 1964, p.15).

The work of Jean Piaget has significantly influenced the Whole Language movement. Piaget explored a major question with great implications for education: how people come to know concepts, ideas, and moralities. (Goodman, 1989). Piaget's research emphasized the importance of

allowing children to actively construct thought while organizing their world. Whole Language classrooms have adopted the notion that thinking children play an active role in learning, and that they learn language, both written and oral, in similar ways.

Sociolinguistic Theory

Seen from the sociolinguistic viewpoint, the task of children learning language is more complex than simply acquiring Chomsky's "linguistic competence" which includes only the ability to understand and produce grammatically correct utterances. They must acquire, in addition, "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1964), which includes not only phonological, syntactic, and semantic systems but the use and interpretation of language in different social contexts. The essential assumption of the sociolinguistic theory is that the acquisition of communicative competence is the result of interaction processes within a sociocultural context, and not merely the automatic unfolding of innate behavior (Saville-Troike, 1982).

The sociolinguistic theory of language development is centered on the notion that the structure of human language arises from the social-communicative functions of language in human relations (Bates & MacWhinney, 1979). This theory views language as a means to accomplish an end within the social-communicative context.

Theorists of the sociolinguistic theory of language development emphasize the social-communicative functions of

language. According to the sociolinguistic model, language use in communication is central to the linguistic process. Jerome Bruner (1975) summarized the relationship between structure and use when he said, ". . . meaning . . . cannot be judged in terms of grammatical rules, but rather in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the speaker's intention" (p.3).

Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, is a well known proponent of the sociolinguistic theory of language development. Vygotsky maintained that language develops through social interaction. In his book Mind in Society (1978), he observed that "every function in the child's cultural development appears twice on two levels. First on the social level, and later on the psychological level; first between people . . . and then inside the child" (p. 57). In other words, "first the child verbalizes on a social level, then language becomes internalized . . . Language is first used in an interpersonal context, then on an intrapersonal level (O'Keefe, 1983, p. 2).

In contrast with Piaget's theory that cognition alone develops language, Vygotsky has maintained that cognitive growth and language development occurs simultaneously through social interaction. Dialogue between adult and child is essential and, in Vygotsky's view, stimulates cognitive growth. Smith, Goodman, and Meredith (1970) similarly contend, "The environmental language is as real in

Vygotsky's view as the objects in the environment and is pivotal in the development of the child's thinking" (p. 115).

Vygotsky investigated the relationship between thought and language. To answer the question, "Which comes first, idea or word?" Vygotsky (1962) said,

"The relation of thought to word is not a thing but a process, a continual movement back and forth from thought to word and from word to thought. Thought is not merely expressed in words; it comes into existence through them" (p. 125).

An important concept in Vygotsky's sociolinguistic theory of language development is "the zone of proximal development" which he described as the distance between the child's developmental level and the potential level of the child. Vygotsky (1978) suggested that students be allowed to work and reason together because more advanced students can explain to their classmates how they grasped a concept in terms that directly address the difficulties the less advanced students are experiencing. Vygotsky (1978) asserted that "the lack of recognition among educators of this social process, of the many ways in which an experienced learner can share his knowledge with a less advanced learner, limits the intellectual development of many students" (p. 126)

The Whole Language movement has been significantly influenced by Vygotsky's research on language development. Yetta Goodman (1989) explains that Vygotsky aids Whole

Language educators in exploring the learning relationship between the individual student and the social context. Vygotsky's zone of proximal development emphasizes the important roles educators play in structuring the classroom environment so that a student is not required to learn in isolation but rather is supported in language and thinking development by others in the school environment.

A review of the literature indicates that the psychological basis of Whole Language has been influenced by four major schools of thought i.e., behavioristic, psycholinguistic, cognitive-interactionist, and sociolinguistic. In addition, Whole Language has been significantly influenced by the principles of Gestaltism.

Gestaltism is formulated on the principle that it is best to study something as a whole--a cognitive pattern. Prediction and insight are important attributes of Gestaltism. The child alone, nor the environment alone, but the child coming together with the environment accounts for growth and development. Experience is a transaction a person has with the environment (Bigge, 1982).

Whole Language educators encourage children to use insight and prediction during the reading process. (Goodman, 1989). Enlarged books, called Big Books (Holdaway, 1979) are utilized and ask children to predict "What comes next?" The child interacts with peers and teachers to construct language. Linguistic units are discovered from whole to part in meaningful context rather than in isolation

(Goodman, K., 1989). Children are engaged in meaningful experiences in order to promote conceptual development. In essence, Whole Language becomes a cognitive gestalt-- language is learned as a whole entity.

Primary Research Resources of Whole Language

Rosenblatt (1969) was the first to describe reading as a two-way transactional process between the reader and the text. Her transactional reading theory was developed from John Dewey's term, transaction: "a knowing is the transaction between a particular individual and a particular environment" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p.17)

Rosenblatt (1969) describes the reading process as a "whole situation" whereby the reader acts on the text and the text acts on the reader. She uses Dewey's term "transaction" to emphasize the contribution of both reader and text. In other words, the reader and text are aspects of the same transaction--the reader investigates the text and the text is activated by the reader in any reading event.

Rosenblatt (1978) explains that the transactional reading process involves not only past language experiences but also the present experiences of the reader. The reader's attention to the text activates elements in his experience that have become linked with verbal symbols. Meaning emerges from a relationship among the symbols as the reader senses them. The selection of responses by the reader depends on the expectations he brings from his life.

Thus, the main ingredient of the reading process is the reader. This suggests that print has different meanings in the transactions with different readers. Therefore, Rosenblatt (1978) contends that just as a "knowing" is a process of linking knower and known (Dewey & Bentley, 1949) so a text should not be thought of merely as an entity, but rather as an active process element during the transaction between a reader and a text.

Rosenblatt points out that if teachers understood the transactional reading process, they would discontinue looking mainly at the text and the author's intention and would instead pay more attention to the child's interpretation, to the meaning he desires to impart during the transactional two-way reading process.

Influenced by the work of Rosenblatt (1978), Whole Language has incorporated the notion that a transactional process is an intrinsic element in the classroom reading environment. For Whole Language teachers, the term transaction infers a rich and complex relation between the reader and the text (Yetta Goodman, 1989).

Lee and Allen (1963) laid a foundation for "Whole Language" through their concepts enunciated under the suggestive title of "Learning to Read Through Experience." Some of the basic premises of the Language Experience Approach to Reading were:

- (1) The communication skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing are closely interrelated;

- (2) Reading is completely interwoven with all the other language arts;
- (3) Reading is concerned with words that arouse meaningful responses based on the individual experiences of the learner;
- (4) Words have no inherent meaning;
- (5) Spoken words are sound symbols which arouse meaning in the mind of the listener;
- (6) Written words are visual symbols which, when associated with known sound symbols, arouse meaning in the mind of the reader;
- (7) Reading is the developing of meaning from patterns of symbols which one recognizes and endows with meaning. Reading arouses or calls up meaning.

It does not provide them. (Lee & Allen, 1963, p. 2)

Lee & Allen (1963), in their Learning to Read Through Experience attempted to integrate reading and other communication skills, (i.e., speaking, listening, and writing.) So have others. But their approach to reading and language arts emphasized more the use of the experiences of children, including their language experiences, in the educational program. One reason for this approach was the authors' underlying democratic philosophy and stance favoring an open system of education in the schools. Lee and Allen, moreover, saw the need for creative, self-directed programs in all curriculum areas, not just in the language arts.

A few of the important reading concepts made explicit in Learning to Read Through Experience were: 1) What a child thinks about he can talk about; 2) What he can talk about can be expressed in painting, writing, or some other manner; 3) Anything he writes can be read; 4) He can read what he writes and what other people write; 5) As he represents his speech sounds with symbols, he uses the same symbols (letters) over and over; and 6) Each letter in the alphabet stands for one or more sounds that he makes when he talks (Lee & Allen, 1963)

The experience approach to reading was formulated to promote the goals of a society which values creativity and divergent thinking. Learning experiences, the two authors maintained, should be selected which would generate productive thinking, allow freedom of expression, stimulate individuality, and value ingenuity to promote the attitude that reading is a lifelong experience which requires continually enlarged skills and knowledge.

Lee and Allen (1963) also suggested that teachers regularly and continually observe their children individually to discover where, in the various phases of child development each one was. They contended that such observations would reveal much about each child's instructional needs, self-concept and emotional maturity. Accordingly, some language experience teachers began to maintain records which provided an estimate of each of their students' development (i.e., strengths and abilities and

areas of needs.) They were also encouraged to keep this information up to date.

Many of the language experiences that Lee and Allen (1963) advocated are, in fact, required for effective communication in a democratic society, (i.e., sharing, discussion, summarizing, and developing speaking, writing, and reading relationships as well as reading critically and integrating and assimilating ideas). The development of language experiences placed the "thinking process" at the heart of the instructional program.

The main distinction between Whole Language and Language Experience is that the experience approach to reading and language arts did not develop a theory regarding the nature of language, language acquisition, or the reading process. The Language Experience approach was the most common approach in the 1950's through 1970's. Developed before Goodman's (1969) research on the reading process (Altwerger, et al., 1989), it did not emphasize a psycholinguistic model of the reading process. However, the experience approach did recognize that reading involves the arousal of meaning which is a precursor to Whole Language.

From a socio-linguistic perspective, Halliday (1973) explained the nature of language in functional terms. He contended that a child knows what language is because he knows what language does. Before entering school, a child has used language to satisfy intellectual, personal, and emotional needs. Each child has developed an internalized

system of language as a result of his/her experiences. By the age of five or six, each child's internalized language system is complex and closely resembles the phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantic adult language model (Anderson, 1984).

Halliday (1975) studied the language development of his son, Nigel. The order in which the functions were acquired by his son was: instrumental, regulatory, interactional, and personal at nine months; heuristic and imaginative at 15 months; and informative at 21 months. Halliday (1973; 1975) explains that a child who is learning language is learning how to mean and the meaning potential of language. In this respect, Halliday's approach is semantic: learning of language is the learning of a system of meanings for functional use.

The language functions (meanings) identified by Halliday (1973) include the following:

1. Instrumental - "I want" function; satisfaction of material needs.
2. Regulatory - "Do as I say" function; directed toward an individual.
3. Interactional - "Me and you" function; used by a child to interact with others.
4. Personal - "Here I come" function; used to express the child's uniqueness.
5. Heuristic - "Tell me why"; a child's exploration of the environment.

6. Imaginative - "Let's pretend"; a child creates his own environment.
7. Informational - "I've got something to tell you"; a means of communicating information to someone.

A child develops the seven functions in a developmental way, in stages over a period of time. During the early stages of language development, the models are used separately but as the child acquires a grammatical system, the functions become more integrated and will eventually include macro functions of the adult language (i.e., ideational, interpersonal, and textual). Ideational use expresses the person's experiences and is the most important component of meaning in the language system. Interpersonal is used in social and personal situations. Textual is used in real contexts and situations (Halliday, 1973).

According to Halliday (1973), teachers need to be aware of children's internalized language systems. Halliday contends that a child's difficulty with language in school is often a result of being expected to use language which is contrary to insight the child has gained from experience. Reading and writing tasks often fail to recognize a child's prior knowledge and functional uses of language. Therefore, a reason for a child not doing well at school may be a result of the school's expectations that a child use language in such a way that it serves no purpose for him/her. Halliday (1973) suggests that schools should

approach language learning from the child's own linguistic experience since language learning takes place at the deeper levels of a child's prior knowledge and cognitive processes. Language, in other words, is not learned independent of meaning or function. He contends that while learners are using language, they are learning language, through language, and about language. This notion has had a strong impact on the integration of language arts and other subjects in the development of Whole Language curriculum (Pinnell & Haussler, 1988).

Kenneth Goodman (1967) developed a psycholinguistic model of the reading process. The main goal of Goodman's research was to determine what happens when a reader reads orally (which he called a "psycholinguistic guessing game"). Yetta Goodman (1970) noted some key aspects of Goodman's (1965) research procedures:

"Six children learning to read have been followed since they were in their sixth month of reading instruction. They are now at the end of their fourth year. For each of them, twenty oral reading performances have been recorded during this period. About 2500 of the children's reading miscues (errors) have been analyzed thus far and at least that many remain to be analyzed" (Goodman, Y., 1970, p. 455)

Goodman used childrens' oral reading errors as a "window onto the reading process at work" (Goodman & Goodman, 1977). Goodman (1967) proposed that the number of semantical and syntactical errors indicated that some children can have problems reading individual words but still can grasp the meaning of passages. What has been

commonly called omissions, or substitutions Goodman called miscues. Insight into the reading process came from these miscues.

Goodman (1967) sought to refute the notion that reading is a specific process of letter identification, or word identification. Instead, Goodman found that reading is a selective process whereby a child uses language cues based on the his/her prior experience and expectations of language. As this information is processed, decisions are made to be confirmed, rejected, or corrected as reading progresses. Goodman's research has shown that efficient reading doesn't come from identification of all elements, but from selecting productive cues to produce guesses-"a psycholinguistic guessing game". It involves an interaction between thought and language as a process of constructing meaning. Goodman reasons that since children by the age of five or six have developed a grammatical model that resembles an adult language, the child has ability to utilize syntax, graphophonic, and semantic skills in the act of reading.

The major components of Goodman's (1975) psycholinguistic reading process are:

1. Cycles: optical, perceptual, syntactic, meaning
2. Cues: graphophonemic, syntactic, semantic
3. Strategies: predicting, confirming, correcting,
 comprehension

All of these components are integrated during the total act of reading. Goodman (1975) declares that reading is a process in which information is dealt with and meaning constructed continuously. Readers employ the cycles sequentially as they move through a story or text. Each cycle melds into the next in order for the reader to arrive at meaning. The reader uses language cues (i.e., graphophonemic, syntactic, semantic) and reading strategies (i.e., predicting, confirming, correcting, comprehension) to arrive at meaning.

According to Goodman (1975), if reading instruction is limited to drill on isolated linguistic units, the reader is unable to complete all the cycles in the reading process. In other words, the reader is prevented from applying his linguistic knowledge and prior experiences to arrive at meaning. To Goodman, there is no purpose for communication when letters and isolated words are given to children apart from meaningful context. The psycholinguistic view of reading suggests that small components are not the important part of reading. What is crucial to the reading process is that a reader understands what he has read and that what he has read has meaning.

Goodman's development of a psycho-linguistic reading process initiated a new way of thinking about reading "errors", and an insightful way of analyzing them (Weaver, 1988). His Taxonomy of Reading Miscues has been widely used in research. The 1973 version has been readily available in

Allen and Watson's Findings of Research in Miscue Analysis: Classroom Implications (1976).

The Whole Language movement has been significantly influenced by Goodman's (1967) scientific research. As a result of his work, teachers in Whole Language classrooms encourage children to arrive at meaning within a clearly understandable context. They do not arbitrarily try to instill meaning through out-of-context "drilling" on yet meaningless letters and words. A message that Goodman has given Whole Language teachers is to "keep language whole and involve children in using it functionally and purposefully to meet their own needs" (Goodman, 1986, p. 7).

Smith (1971) agrees with Goodman. He contends that a phonetic approach to reading is not necessary because children who become fluent readers do not learn to read on a letter-by-letter, word by word basis.

Smith (1971) considers reading to be an interaction between what the reader receives through his visual system (surface structure) and information that he already has available in his brain (deep structure). The author provides visual information--the ink marks on the page--and the reader provides non-visual information which is his prior knowledge of language. Smith describes non-visual information as a "theory of the world in our heads" which consists of an individuals' perceptions and insights which help him/her make sense out of the world. During the reading process, a child uses his non-visual information to

make predictions and sense out of print in order to arrive at meaning. Therefore, Smith insists that the argument concerning reading instruction is not really whether written language can be decoded into speech, but whether such decoding is necessary for comprehension. To Smith, reading is comprehension of meaning which does not lie at the surface of language but resides in the mind of the users of language. He believes there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the surface structure of language and meaning. Meaning is brought to language through prediction by eliminating unlikely alternatives. (Anderson, 1984.)

Smith (1971) has addressed the question of what children need to do in order to learn how to read. He contends that a child's ability to read texts will depend on a prior familiarity with written language which is gained by being read to. Through this process, children develop a functional sense of written language (e.g., books, magazines, and newspapers) because they see it has a purpose. In the same way, children will learn about literature by becoming familiar with the language of what they are expected to read. To Smith, learning involves relating the "new" to what is already known.

Smith (1971) suggests four conditions required for children to learn how to read: 1) access to meaningful and interesting reading material (ideally the child's own choice); 2) assistance where needed (and only to the extent that it is required); 3) a willingness to take the necessary

risks (anxiety increases the proportion of visual information a reader needs); and 4) freedom to make mistakes (p. 181).

Smith (1971) makes it clear that what makes reading easy for children is the facilitation of the use of non-visual information whereby the child is given the opportunity to apply his prior knowledge and experience of language during the reading process. Whole Language teachers have applied Smith's concept of non-visual information to learn how to read by giving children the opportunity to use their "theory of the world" to become fluent readers.

Kay Moss (1982) summarized research reports by Graves concerning developmental aspects of the writing process (Graves, 1979a; Graves, 1979b; Graves, 1979c; Graves, 1982; Graves & Calkins, 1980). These findings have been reported in the final report of the research project (Graves, 1981a). According to Moss, "Graves' research represents the largest single endeavor into the writing process of young children" (Moss, 1982, p. 10). Graves gathered information when children were actually engaged in the act of writing. Data were gathered from 16 children (i.e., eight in grade 1 and eight in grade 3) by the use of direct observations and video recordings. Moss (1982) summarized Graves' research reports as follows:

Revision

1. Revision occurs at different levels
 - a. During the pre-writing stage
 - b. On paper to revise content
 - c. Orally
 - d. Unconsciously to make sentences smoother
 - e. Deliberately, as child circles awkward phrases
 - f. Internally, without overt accompanying language
2. A child's revision patterns are shaped by a variety of circumstances:
 - a. Word stability (invented, transition, stable inventions, sight words)
 - b. Newness of the revision procedure
 - c. Audience response
 - d. Purpose of the writing
(Graves, 1979c)
3. Capacity for revision is demonstrated by a number of behaviors:
 - a. Revision in other media forms
(drawing and painting)
 - b. Ability to write a series of leads about the same subject
 - c. Demonstration of crossing out and arrows that show that words are temporary
(Graves, 1979c)
4. Revision is enhanced by
 - a. Writing about personal experiences
 - b. Choosing their own topics
 - c. Reading the products to peers
5. Fast writers revise larger units than do slow writers

Drawing

1. Drawing prior to writing is a rehearsal for text
(Graves, 1979a)
2. The use of drawing occurs at three levels in first grade children:
 - a. Prior to writing as a rehearsal
 - b. After writing
 - c. Drawing not necessary

Pre-ideation

Children advance from an inability to plan ahead to complete ideation at the story level.
(Graves & Calkins, 1980)

Focus

Children advance through the following levels of consciousness of problem solving:

- a. Spelling
 - b. Motor/aesthetic
 - c. Conventions
 - d. Topic information
 - e. Revision
- (Graves, 1982)

Resources

Children advance from complete self-reliance to reliance on outside resources for help with topic information and conventions.

Topic Choice

First grade writers develop a temporary barrier when selecting a topic area. Stages include

- a. No delay (Child draws then writes)
 - b. Short delay (2 minutes, child writes then draws)
 - c. Long delay (5-10 minutes, child aware of audience)
 - d. Little delay (aware of variety of choices)
- (Graves, 1979c)

Graves' research on the developmental writing process has significantly influenced writing practices employed by students in Whole Language classrooms. As Graves' research findings suggest, children in Whole Language classrooms are provided real purposes for writing, opportunities for audience response, freedom of choice in topics, and encouragement for writing about real experiences. Children are also encouraged by their teachers to focus on the message rather than its form (Moss, 1982).

Why the Process is called Whole Language

The language processes that humans use to communicate are speaking, listening, reading, and writing. All of these processes are interactive and learned interdependently. (Anderson, 1984).

At a very early age, a child has integrated the language processes into his whole being and everyday life within his culture. Before school age, the child has been immersed in the oral and written language processes. Charles Read (1975) points out that pre-school children have learned to print messages employing an orthography that is partly their own creation known as inventive spellings. This process has occurred with minimal instruction. The child has learned to use language cues to construct meaning, representing experiences symbolically with language (Rosenblatt, 1978). The child has also learned to construct meaning from print in meaningful contexts in the home and community (Goodman, 1975). These language processes have occurred naturally using individual language cues and cultural experiences to arrive at meaning. In short, the whole child has been immersed in the use and the development of language in a natural way in his culture. The child has developed and used language for a purpose and function (Halliday, 1975).

Anderson (1984) explains that when the child arrives at school, he usually faces a conflict in language learning. In reading and writing, the language systems are frequently

isolated (i.e., graphophonemic, syntax, and semantics), the language processes are fragmented (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and listening), and isolated language cues are used to teach language which serves no purpose or function for the child. In the school, language is often used by the teacher to talk about language rules. Thus, learning written language is often abstract, non-purposeful, and fragmented.

Whole Language is a socio-psycholinguistic process of language learning which involves a transaction between speaker and listener and writer and reader (Weaver, 1988). The text is the message encoded by the speaker/writer and acted upon or by the listener/reader. During any transaction, the child is allowed to use his/her whole language background which includes past experiences of written and oral language and individual language cues to produce guesses to arrive at meaning (Goodman, 1975). Learning to read the Whole Language way means that language users make use of their existing language competence and of the meaning context in which language processes function. They don't attempt to read by sorting out letters and words because such a process only substitutes abstract language elements for meaningful language. The same holds true for written language. In essence, Whole Language is learned from whole to part. The whole is always more than the sum of the parts and the value of any part is learned within the whole utterance (Goodman, 1975).

Christensen (1990) explains that Whole Language is a psycholinguistic movement and a philosophy of learning which stresses that language acquisition be integrated into the child's functioning in the environment. According to Christensen (1990), Whole Language suggests that reading be taught through use in meaningful situations. Whole Language emphasizes both the writing and reading processes. "In fact, it suggests that the two are really one" (Christensen, 1990, p. 3). Kenneth Goodman (1986) explains the foundations of Whole Language:

1. Language is used to communicate meaning;
comprehension of meaning or expression of meaning
is always a primary goal;
2. Writing is a language process; oral and written
language are very similar;
3. Language cuing systems interact in all four
language arts areas. They should not be
isolated;
4. Language usage occurs in authentic life situations.
This context contributes to success or failure
in reading or writing;
5. Life situations are of primary importance to the
meaning inherent in language;
6. Risk taking, motivation, and predictability of
text play important roles in learning to read and
write (Christensen, 1990, p. 3).

In Whole Language classrooms, children learn language because they encounter it whole, within meaningful contexts, and in meaningful situations. The processes of reading and writing, speaking and listening are learned in a holistic, natural learning environment contrasted with fragmented and traditional structured learning environments. Thus, the process of learning is referred to as Whole Language.

Whole Language Classroom Environment Research

Ribowsky (1985) examined the comparative effects of a code emphasis approach and a Whole Language approach upon the emergent literacy of 53 girls in two kindergarten classes in an all girls' parochial school in Brooklyn, New York. The year-long study used a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest nonequivalence group design.

One class, the experimental group, received a Whole Language approach. This approach to beginning reading focused upon the establishment of a natural developmental learning environment (similar to the home bedtime story situation) in which children and teachers shared meaningful literacy experiences gathered around a big book or experience chart. The learning environment was trusting and free from criticism and constant correction (Holdaway, 1979). The daily program of Shared Book Experiences used the following format (Holdaway, 1979, p. 72-73):

1. Welcoming activity: reading poems, chants, or songs; use of enlarged material (printed matter large enough for group viewing).

2. Favorite stories: rereading of stories, usually by request; unison participation; discussion of syntax.

3. Language activity: exploration of language through games, riddles, puzzles.

4. New story: introduction of new story for the day; words point to as they are read aloud; language experiences shared.

5. Independent reading: self-selection of old favorites to read; engagement in literary activities of choice.

6. Expression: art and writing activities; group drama (Ribowsky, 1985, p. 15-16).

The second class (comparison group) received a code emphasis approach to emergent literacy: Lippincott's "Beginning to Read, Write and Listen" program. This approach to beginning reading consisted of a highly structured teacher-directed program of alphabetic instruction. Children received sets of 24 letterbooks which contained activities related to the letters and reading skills emphasized. The focus was on auditory segmentation, grapheme-phoneme analysis and reinforcement of one or more traditional readiness areas such as colors, shapes or directionality. A teacher's guide for each letterbook specified the precise task to be accomplished as well as the exact words that must be used by the teacher as stimuli for each letter (Ribowsky, 1985).

The major dependent variable, emergent literacy, was divided into three subsets: linguistic literacy set, measured by the Test of Language Development-Primary Level (TOLD-P); orthographic literacy set, measured by the Book Handling Knowledge Task; and grapho-phonemic literacy set, measured by two subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Reading Instructional Test, Primary Level.

ANCOVA results for all three tests of hypotheses were supported at or below the .05 level of significance and indicated that a Whole Language approach was more effective than a code emphasis approach in fostering emergent literacy. Multiple regression analysis indicated no interaction between treatment and pretest measured ability except for one subtest in which the experimental group performed significantly better in relation to higher measured pretest abilities.

The results of the data analyses indicated that a Whole Language approach to literacy was highly effective. Ribowsky (1985) asserts that this study supports Holdaway's (1979) ethnographic research which indicated a high level of success with the Shared Book Experiences program--through quantitative analysis of Shared Book Experiences in comparison with a code emphasis approach. The kindergarteners in the Whole Language classroom attained emergent literacy within a developmental environment that concentrated on naturalistic and holistic learning. The instructional environment was informal and supportive.

Written language developed in the same way that oral language develops; through social interaction and for functional purposes. The children created their own systems of language through interaction with their peers, with adults, and with literacy materials presented. As a result, a child in the Whole Language classroom read literature and developed a sense of story. Reading became an activity of choice and reflected the child's sense of control over the literacy process. The students' backgrounds connected with learning that supports the view of literacy as a social process.

An important finding of this study was that the children in the Whole Language environment did not receive direct instruction of the alphabetic/phonetic principle (Ribowsky, 1985). The experimental group was never formally instructed in phonics but showed a higher increase of phonetic knowledge than did the code emphasis group. Children in the Whole Language classroom environment made connections between meaningful content of print and the alphabetic representation of sound and symbol. Ribowsky asserts that what is of critical importance is that all phonetic analysis undertaken by the experimental group was child-directed and text-elicited.

According to Ribowsky (1985), the Whole Language classroom environment provided the children with the opportunity to gain literacy at their own natural pace without the pressures of failure. The teacher in the Whole

Language classroom did not perceive the need to prepare the children for learning but provided them with high quality literary encounters. The children were aware of what they needed to know and directed their own learning to achieve literacy experiences.

Ribowsky (1985) contends the major findings of the study were: 1) that a Shared Book Experience, the school model of the home bedtime story, was a more effective program of literacy stimulation than a code emphasis approach; 2) the experimental group demonstrated significantly greater achievement in phonetic analysis without direct instruction, than the code emphasis group; 3) the kindergarteners attained emergent literacy within a developmental environment that featured naturalistic and holistic learning. Reading was seen as a socio-psycholinguistic process; bringing meaning to print was the primary approach to print; and 4) Literacy occurred in the Whole Language environment along developmental pathways unique to each child (Ribowsky, 1985).

Reutzel and Cooter (1990) conducted a study to determine the comparative effectiveness of Whole Language and basal reader approaches on children's reading achievement at the end of the first grade in four classrooms located in two diverse regions of the United States; Ohio and Utah. The comparison groups for this study consisted of 91 first grader subjects: 53 first-grade children in two Whole Language classrooms and 38 first-grade children in two

basal-reader classrooms. An ANOVA was performed on students' beginning-of-years scores on the Gates-MacGinitie-Reading Survey Test to assess initial group equality (Gates-MacGinitie, 1983). The results of the ANOVA showed no significant difference between the two groups at the outset of the study, $F(1, 90) = 2.40, p > .05$.

Reutzel and Cooter (1990) explained that the basal teachers used followed the district-outlined reading curriculums along with the adopted basal reading programs. The daily schedule began with scope and sequence reading skills lessons. Each skill lesson was explained by the teachers and was followed with the assignment and completion of worksheets to reinforce the lesson.

Reutzel and Cooter (1990) described the Whole Language classroom environment as being rich in print and print-oriented activities. The holistic teachers followed a daily reading routine, as outlined by Holdaway (1981). The routine was divided into five subroutines: (a) tune in, (b) old favorites, (c) learning about language, (d) new story, and (e) independent activities. The teachers used Big Books or the Shared Book Experience (Holdaway, 1979); Routman, 1988) to provide guided reading instruction in the Whole Language classrooms. The students also used several learning centers within the classrooms. A book center was used for children to read self-selected books. The books could be read independently or with read-along tapes or with the support of older children. At the writing center,

children worked independently or collaboratively on self-selected writing projects. A publishing, conferencing, and editing center was adjacent to the writing center. Another activity center in reading encouraged each child to work with another child reading words from the classroom word bank or reading Big Books or reading songs and poems copied onto large chart paper (Reutzel & Cooter, 1990).

In May of the 1988 school year, the end-of-year Gates-MacGinitie Reading Survey Test, Level A, Form 1 was administered to the student groups. Reutzel and Cooper used an ANCOVA as the primary data analysis procedure, as is common in nonequivalent comparison group designs (Borg & Gall, 1983; Cook & Campbell, 1979).

The results of the study found significant differences favoring the Whole Language classroom environment over the basal classes on total reading scores as well as on the vocabulary and comprehension subtest scores at the conclusion of first grade. Reutzel and Cooper (1990) explained that given the fact that standardized reading tests like the one used in this study tend to mirror traditional reading curricular constructs more closely than those taught in Whole Language classrooms (Goodman, K.S., Shannon, P., Freeman, Y.S., & Murphy, S., 1988), the conclusions of the study may be understated. Reutzel and Cooter (1990) alleged that the results of the study strongly suggest that a Whole Language learning environment is more

effective than basal programs in affecting first-grade children's reading achievement.

Kasten and Clarke, (1986) conducted an ethnographic study to examine the function of children's oral language during creative writing sessions in Whole Language classroom situations. The subjects for this study were seven fifth grade and seven third grade students. They were selected on the basis of teacher recommendations. Teachers were asked to include above-average, average, and below-average writers in their recommendations. Both free writing (journal writing) and structured writing assignments were observed. Kasten and Clarke (1986) made it clear that no attempt was made to influence the types of writing instruction or assignments which were occurring in the classrooms.

The procedures for the study used ethnographic style techniques. A researcher sat close to each subject in order to observe the subject in the act of writing and to observe the subject's face. During this one-to-one observation, the researcher copied verbatim the student's written text onto the manual observation form. Included in the notetaking by the researcher were all behaviors and language exchanges which took place involving the subject. Each observation lasted for the entire writing episode. Writing episodes lasted from 20-45 minutes. Analysis of the data consisted of examining each writing episode based on the codes developed by Kasten. The results of the codes were tallied

and analyzed for possible patterns. Tables were constructed to summarize principal findings.

According to Kasten and Clarke (1986), the findings of the study indicated that oral language plays an important role in the writing process in Whole Language classroom environments. The language observed during writing demonstrated the powerful learning strategy of collaboration. Kasten and Clarke (1986) explained that the language which accompanies writing not only is highly related to the writing process but facilitates valuable learning opportunities. Kasten and Clarke (1986) concluded that in Whole Language learning environments where sharing and talking during writing are encouraged, learning opportunities become more powerful and effective. Children need to be able to talk while they are writing in the classroom (Kasten & Clarke, 1986).

The results of this study indicate that writing in the elementary classroom is a dynamic and Whole Language process in which reading, listening, and speaking contribute to each student's writing. Analyses revealed that oral language provides students with opportunities to test ideas and sound out the appropriateness of particular words or phrases (Kasten & Clarke, 1986).

Slaughter, Haussler, Franks, Jilbert, and Silentman (1985) conducted an ethnographic study of kindergarten through grade two classrooms of various sociolinguistic contexts in which the students were developing oral and

written language. Nonparticipant observations were conducted in both regular classrooms and Chapter I small group classroom settings. A coding system was developed to assist in the analysis of protocol data regarding literacy events, oral language interaction, and evaluation occurring in classroom settings. Slaughter, et al., (1985) contend that for the most part literacy lessons must have functional meaning for the child if positive learning is to occur. The data showed how classroom environments and sociolinguistic context must be carefully planned by the teacher to facilitate Whole Language events and literacy learning. Slaughter, et al., (1985) suggest that educators take a more serious look at interaction and oral communication participant structures. In other words, oral language communicative skills of students might improve by changing the traditional dominant teacher stance when interacting with students. According to Slaughter, et al., (1985), the Whole Language approach towards literacy suggests that educators change the formal and non-functional approach to literacy instruction to a more natural learning environment. The results from this study suggest that the teacher must change in terms of "knowledge base, teaching techniques, attitudes and interactional styles" (Slaughter, et al., 1990, p. 45).

Tyler's (1988) research study investigated the effects of a Whole Language classroom on the text strategies of five retained first grade students in relation to other students

in the same environment. Tyler (1988) focused on the overall classroom environment developed by the teacher. Data were collected during a nine month period with observations twice weekly. According to Tyler (1988), the findings that emerged from the study support the Whole Language theory that an environment which provides opportunities for children to engage in reading and writing that is meaningful and serves a purpose will develop childrens' literacy skills. The research further indicated that a successful Whole Language classroom provides a secure environment for every student to take risks and grow as learners. Tyler (1988) found that students began to value and trust their own efforts as learners when their teachers also valued and trusted them. A Whole Language classroom that provides trust and many opportunities for learning is a place where each child can succeed at learning regardless of ability (Tyler, 1988).

Guilfoyle (1988) conducted an ethnographic study of a first grade classroom where the learning environment was structured by a teacher using a Whole Language philosophy. The focus of the study was on the instructional and social organization of the classroom and how it influenced the literacy learning of Yaqui Indian students. Data was gathered through being a participant observer in the classroom during three school years; formal and informal interviews with the teacher, students, parents of the Yaqui students, and staff members; examination of school documents

and records; a teacher-researcher dialogue journal; and the attendance of events in the school and community. The findings of Guilfoyle's study indicated that two factors, the social organization in a given classroom and the classroom's teacher interact together to create a social context that contributes to the quality of learning and participation in the Whole Language classroom (Guilfoyle, 1988).

Fennacy (1988) conducted a naturalistic study on the social and linguistic environments in two Kindergarten classrooms. One classroom reflected a traditional skills approach to literacy instruction; the other reflected a whole language perspective. At the beginning and again at the end of the school year, ten children from each classroom were interviewed and asked to engage in several literacy tasks. Field notes documented the classroom environments and literacy events throughout the year. Informal interviews with students and teachers were conducted and samples of student work were collected. According to Fennacy (1988), data triangulation and analysis of the children's literacy tasks revealed the following: 1) All of the children entered Kindergarten with knowledge about the function and form of written language. The range of understandings was similar in both classrooms at the beginning of the year; 2) The Whole Language classroom immersed children in meaningful written language experiences. The children were treated as readers and

writers; 3) The skills classroom engaged children in exercises designed to help them master letters, sounds, and words. The children were treated as if they had little literacy knowledge; and 4) All the children knew more about reading and writing at the end of the year, but the children from the Whole Language classroom had moved closer to more correct conventional writing, showed more evidence of sound-symbol correspondence in spelling, were more willing to write without seeking adult assistance, revised and edited more frequently during writing, and indicated a greater awareness of themselves as being instrumental in their own literacy learning than did the students from the skill-based classroom (Fennacy, 1988).

Bock (1989) conducted a study to answer the question, "How do readers who have experienced difficulty with reading and writing function in a Whole Language learning environment?" Six learners were identified as less proficient by using a combination of six qualitative and quantitative measurements of reading proficiency. A heterogeneous second grade classroom was selected that exemplified a Whole Language environment with regard to literacy learning. Qualitative data collection procedures were used to examine the social interaction and individual activities that the learners engaged in during their independent reading time. A combination of quantitative and qualitative instruments were used to collect information on reading process variables (Bock, 1989).

Bock (1989) explained that the findings from the study demonstrated the positive influences of a supportive community environment in facilitating literacy learning for developing readers. Student learning was nurtured through literacy experiences, shared meaning, and shared interests. The students benefited from peer and teacher support, practice in reading and writing processes, and involvement in the construction of literacy activities. Bock (1989) contends that the developing readers were purposeful and intentional in both their choices of literacy activities and participation. They selected meaningful books from a wide selection of topics and difficulties. The process-oriented instruction facilitated strategy development and "learning how to learn." Bock (1989) made it clear that the greatest implication derived from the investigation was that when children practice communicating daily in their interactions with peers, they become more competent socially and are able to focus their attention to a greater extent on reading and writing activities.

According to Bock (1989), the Whole Language environment acknowledges and encourages a child's uniqueness. The findings indicate that in a Whole Language classroom environment less proficient learners improve their understanding of the reading process, their understanding of the uses of cueing systems and strategies, and their ability to actively participate in reading and writing activities.

Rich (1985) explains that Whole Language classrooms function in a climate built on trust where students can practice and assume responsibility for their own learning. Decision making strategies are practiced by the children as they choose their own books and topics. They practice control over their lives.

Watson (1989) contends that because language is learned collaboratively as well as personally, students in Whole Language classrooms socialize with each other in the same way they do outside the classroom. Students talk with each other about their writing and books they have read as well as problems they are solving. Students help each other through partner and small-group work. Children and teachers talk about what is going on in their heads as they read and write. "The classroom itself is a strategy that promotes learning" (Watson, 1989, p. 137)

According to Goodman (1986), a Whole Language classroom incorporates a literate environment which includes all kinds of written language materials appropriate to childrens' interests and the curriculum (e.g., books, magazines, newspapers, directories, signs, packages, labels, and posters). In a Whole Language classroom, attention is focused on reading and writing processes which occur in a natural environment through group discussions, individual conferences, partner work, and during teacher strategy lessons.

Weaver (1988) has listed similarities among teachers in Whole Language classroom environments:

- (1) They find out about students' interests, abilities, and needs. And then they go an important step further. They use the information in planning curriculum;
- (2) They read to students or tell them stories every day;
- (3) They see to it that students have an opportunity to participate in authentic writing every day;
- (4) They see to it that students have an opportunity to read real literature every day (p.235).

The Democratic Philosophy of Whole Language

According to Smith (1989), democratic educators promote educational practices and philosophies that are democratic in nature and instill the basics of democracy in students. To Smith, Whole Language is an educational vehicle capable of doing both.

In an article on democracy in education, Gordon (1988) discusses Hannah Arendt's belief that the essence of freedom means there must exist a "public space" in which individuals can influence and be influenced by their peers. It is in this space that citizens are able to confront others' conflicting ideas. Gordon (1988) alleges that such a public space is not possible in the classroom. He supports this claim by saying: ". . . to enter the public space means to assume responsibility for one's words and deeds, and also for the principles by which one governs one's life" (p.55). He feels this is impossible for a student to do in a classroom because the "classroom is a place of learning--the pupils cannot assume responsibilities for the principles

governing their life in the classroom, since the teacher and the administration assume that responsibility" (p.56).

Because this public space is necessary for thinking which in turn is essential for democracy to exist, it would seem that a democratic classroom is not possible (Smith, 1989). However, this is not true because Whole Language is established upon democratic principles. The underlying philosophy of Whole Language establishes a public space in the classroom for students to become responsible learners and citizens. Whole Language and Democracy have much in common; both are belief systems (Smith, 1989). In the same way that Democracy exists because we believe in its principles, Whole Language exists because it is a belief system that receives its impetus in the classroom organization which is developed to enact the beliefs for which it stands (Altwerger, Edelsky, & Flores, 1989).

Smith (1989) alleges that underlying the beliefs of Whole Language and Democracy is the acceptance of being responsible for one's own actions and for achieving what is best for oneself as well as the majority. Whole Language accepts the notion that students are responsible for their own learning (Goodman, 1989). Whole Language teachers ensure that children have "ownership" of the program by creating a classroom environment whereby children can make choices and mistakes (Rich, 1985b). "To empower the learner, whole-language teachers do not select all the books to read or the topics to write about . . . in other words,

teachers do not do things for students that students can do for themselves" (Watson, 1989, p. 136) Children learn to accept responsibility for their own actions. Goodman (1986) explains that just as no one in a democracy should make decisions for others, so should the teacher in the Whole Language classroom not make learning decisions for the students (Smith, 1988). In addition, Whole Language teachers who want to empower students know they must empower themselves as well. Rich (1985b) states:

" Whole Language . . . can be seen as a political activity since a true Whole Language notion returns power where it belongs--to the children and teacher in the classroom" (Rich, 1985, p. 722).

According to Smith (1989), the principles of Democracy and the underlying philosophy of Whole Language encourage individuals to act for themselves. Individuals take responsibility for their own development, learning, and progress. The belief system underlying Whole Language maintains that learning cannot be forced or poured into the learner. Instead, knowledge is actively constructed in the environment through interaction with peers and teachers. Children make decisions and choices during the learning processes of an integrated curriculum. Whole Language classrooms provide a space for children to incorporate Vygotsky's notion that children should be allowed to discuss their "views, beliefs, interests and concerns with each other in the classroom". This "public space" in a Whole

Language classroom makes the learning environment meaningful for children (Smith, 1989).

Smith (1989) explains that democracy and whole language are belief systems that are based on the following similar principles:

- (1) take responsibility for one's life and learning;
- (2) value oneself and others equally;
- (3) afford to all people the same freedoms;
- (4) think and be willing to express beliefs and thoughts (p.4).

Rose (1989) explains that the very nature of Whole Language is democratic. In Whole Language classrooms, children have the freedom to choose their own reading texts and write their own stories. Whole Language teachers allow students to tell their stories in individual ways. They believe that children are developing their own sense of voice (Urzua, 1989). "Voice", says Donald Graves, "is the imprint of ourselves on our writing. It is that part of the self that pushes the writing ahead . . . take the voice away [and] . . . there is no writing, just words following words" (1983, p. 227)

John Dewey (1944) recognized that the major instrument of human learning is language which is learned through social experiences. He explained that language becomes the tool to develop a society's ideals, values, beliefs, and knowledge. But, Dewey realized that a way of life cannot be transmitted by language alone. Dewey thought that in a

democratic society the school should be established as a social community which would provide students with the experience of democracy in action.

Whole Language teachers value the social community in their classrooms. The classroom belongs to the community that lives there (Goodman, 1989). In this way, Whole Language classrooms become small democratic communities in which cooperation, decision making, problem solving and freedom are practiced and experienced in such a manner that students may eventually evolve into literate, effective adult citizens in a democratic society.

Judicious Discipline Research

McEwan (1987) conducted a study to assess the attitudes of teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels toward student rights and classroom management. This study was designed to analyze the effect that knowledge about Judicious Discipline had upon teacher attitudes toward student rights and behaviors in the classroom.

The sample for this study consisted of teachers from cooperating school district throughout the State of Oregon. Respondents consisted of all those teachers employed in elementary, middle, and high schools who attended workshops or inservice sessions designed to present information contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1990). The respondents represented a number larger than the 50 participants required as a baseline for statistical analysis (McEwan, 1987).

The instrument to measure teacher attitudes toward student rights and classroom management was constructed from two separate attitude inventories: the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, & Callis, 1952) and the Questionnaire on Teacher Attitudes (Menacker & Pascarella, 1983). The attitude inventory was field-tested and submitted to the Delphi Panel to establish content validity.

McEwan (1987) explained that trends manifested by analysis of means from elementary, middle, and high school teachers failed to indicate consistent differences at the .05 level among the three groups. According to McEwan, (1987) similar trends manifested by analysis of pretest and posttest results did not reveal significant differences at the .05 level. However, McEwan (1987) explains that descriptive data collected through interviews with respondents indicated high levels of interest and practical applicability of Judicious Discipline.

Bolden (1987) conducted a study to determine if students' school-related attitudes are significantly affected by teacher classroom discipline management based upon the principles contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1990).

The data relative to student school-related attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school students toward classroom management based upon Judicious Discipline was collected by means of a self report questionnaire. Workshops and inservice sessions were conducted by

Gathercoal to disseminate the concepts to administrators and teachers. The teachers involved in the study implemented these concepts into their classroom discipline management practice (Bolden, 1987).

According to Bolden (1987), eight hypotheses were tested to determine if there exists a significant difference in attitudes among and between elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and post-test scores. Four attitudinal scales measured students' attitudes toward the teacher, toward school, toward their classmates, and toward themselves.

Bolden (1987) reported that five hypotheses were found to be statistically significant: 1) There was a significant difference in attitudes toward the teacher among elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and posttest scores; 2) There was a significant difference in attitudes toward school among elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and posttest scores; 3) There was a significant difference in attitudes toward classmates among elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and posttest scores; 4) There was a significant difference in attitudes toward the researcher among elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and posttest scores; and 5) There was a significant difference in attitudes toward the teacher between elementary, middle, and high school students reflected in pre- and posttest scores (Bolden, 1987, p. 50-62).

Summary of the Review of the Literature

As stated in the introduction of this study, the school environment is the one place where the needs of children can be nurtured with the demands of society in mind. If the school environment is to help children grow and learn, then educators must start with children and respect their individuality. If democratic socialization is an important goal of education, it follows that we need types of classrooms that provide children the opportunity to learn how to solve problems, manage their own lives, develop talents, participate in group endeavors and be conscious of the needs of others in their society (Miel, 1986).

A review of the literature has shown that the underlying philosophy of Whole Language is respect for the individual child which empowers him to make choices and accept responsibility for his own learning in a holistic learning environment (Ribowsky, 1985; Tyler, 1982). In this environment, children learn language through socialization (Bock, 1989; Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1962) and independent literary experiences (Reutzel & Cooter, 1990). Oral language is developed through sharing, talking, and listening within a social context (Kasten & Clarke, 1986). Whole Language teachers are encouraged to change their traditional, dominant stance when interacting with students (Slaughter, et al., 1985). Slaughter, et al., (1985) findings correlate with Piaget's (1965) notion that authoritarian teachers need to discover ways to modify their

authoritarian role so that their interaction with children can be as collaborators and equals. In Whole Language classrooms, "teachers are asked to actively participate as co-learners; to coach, demonstrate, explain, and cheer children so they can more effectively develop their own writing . . ." (Altwerger, Edelsky, & Flores, 1987, p. 20). In a Whole Language environment, the focus is on meaning and not on the language itself (Goodman, 1986; Halliday, 1973; Rosenblatt, 1969; Smith, 1971) and authentic speech and literacy events (Goodman, 1986). Whole Language was described as a democratic process (Smith, 1989) that develops a child's sense of ownership (Rose, 1989) and a voice in the learning process (Graves, 1983; Urzua, 1989) with responsibility for one's learning (Rose, 1989; Smith, 1989; Watson, 1989). Whole Language is a philosophy of learning which "insists that beliefs shape practice" (Altwerger, Edelsky, & Flores, 1987, p. 15).

A review of the literature has shown that the underlying philosophy of Judicious Discipline is respect for the worth and dignity of the child (Gathercoal, 1990). This philosophy provides a framework for educational and ethical practices which contribute to a holistic learning environment. The principles of Judicious Discipline empower students to participate actively in democratic socialization by learning their constitutional rights as individuals and by learning when the needs of others necessarily impose limits on their own personal freedoms. Judicious Discipline

encourages educators to provide a student-centered learning environment whereby children can learn and develop attitudes of responsibility, voice their opinions, solve problems, make decisions, interact with peers, and most important learn how to become independent. A "student-centered" educator views any student contact as an opportunity to play in the growth and development of young people" (Gathercoal, 1990, p. 120). Judicious Discipline advocates that each individual student is to be respected, his self-worth protected, and his right to an equal education completed (Gathercoal, 1990).

A review of the literature shows that Whole Language is based upon a holistic classroom learning environment with the following characteristics:

1. Learners are encouraged to take risks and invited to use language, in all its varieties, for their own purposes;
2. All the varied functions of oral and written language are appropriate and encouraged;
3. The focus is on the meaning and not on the language itself, in authentic speech and literacy events;
4. The learning environment is a social community where each learner is respected as an individual;
5. Students learn in an environment that invites them to participate in all the activities and to

make choices about the kinds of experiences in which they participate;

6. Students see the potential in their experiences to solve their problems and to gain the knowledge they need as citizens in a democracy

(Goodman, 1986 p. 40; Goodman, 1989, p. 4).

The review of the literature has shown that Judicious Discipline provides a similar holistic learning environment as is described in Whole Language classrooms. This learning environment has the following characteristics:

1. Learners are encouraged to make choices, be responsible for their own actions, solve problems, and interact with peers;
2. Learners are encouraged to express their individuality and liberties;
3. Learners are empowered to govern and think for themselves;
4. Learners are accepted as citizens and given the opportunity to grow and learn in a democratic manner;
5. Learners are given the opportunity to make mistakes without fear of punishment. Mistakes are accepted as opportunities to learn;
6. Learners are encouraged to voice their opinion.

If we agree with Piaget's research findings that language and social-arbitrary knowledge is dependent on the child's action on the environment and interaction with other

people while organizing his/her world, then a classroom environment is needed which encourages interaction and supports socialization. It seems that the underlying philosophies and practices of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline together would provide the type of classroom environment that is conducive to learning regardless of subject matter. However, virtually no research exists that clearly specifies the relationship between the educational approaches of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline to classroom environment variables. Therefore, this study will examine the commonalities and differences of these two educational approaches.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The review of the literature related to Whole Language and Judicious Discipline clearly indicated that very little was known concerning the practices of and the relationships between the two approaches and classroom environment. Consequently, the task of stating narrow and definitive quantitative, testable hypotheses would have been quite difficult. More importantly, if such hypotheses were developed they would have been based primarily upon speculations with little or no empirical base. It was clear that the area under investigation here was a "new" line of research. As with all new lines of research, the first step was the performance of descriptive and/or correlational research (Borg & Gall, 1989). In particular, the initial task was to identify and describe those classroom variables that were inherent to Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classrooms. The selection of a "traditional" classroom observation instrument carries the same problems as with the selection of statistical hypotheses. Selection of the appropriate classroom instrument should be consistent with empirical literature which identifies those variables which are important to observe. The literature which has been reviewed provides no direction for the selection of an instrument with those variables of importance. For these reasons, a qualitative design as a non-participant observer

and/or ethnographer as described by Bogden and Taylor (1975) was deemed most appropriate.

Sample

Four classrooms were chosen for this study which included 1) two Whole Language classrooms and 2) two Judicious Discipline classrooms.

It was important that the teachers chosen for this study did in fact implement the philosophies and practices of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline. Therefore, a Delphi Panel was formed to arrive at a consensus on what constitutes the major attributes of Whole Language. The Delphi Panel consisted of the following: 1) a Whole Language Arts specialist from the Oregon State Department of Education; 2) two school district curriculum directors, Corvallis and Salem; 3) two teachers who were currently implementing Whole Language and who were considered experts in this field; and 4) two elementary school principals who were considered experts in Whole Language. Consensus was established as panel members were in agreement 80% of the time (6 out of 7 members) on each attribute of Whole Language. The major attributes of Whole Language were selected from current research articles in the Educational Researcher (1990): 1) Whole Language: A Research Agenda for the Nineties (McKenna, Robinson, and & Miller, 1990); 2) Whose Agenda Is This Anyway? A Response to McKenna, Robinson, and Miller (Edelsky, 1990); and 3) from research findings in the review of the literature. The researcher

did not mail a questionnaire of the major attributes of Whole Language because often times they are not returned. Instead, the panel members were telephoned and asked to indicate (yes or no) whether they agreed that the following attributes accurately characterized Whole Language:

1. Whole Language is not a set of methods and materials (Edelsky, 1990). Rather, Whole Language is an attitude (Rich, 1985), a philosophy, and a set of beliefs about education generally in a preferred [interactive] classroom environment and more specifically, a set of beliefs about the nature of teaching, language, and language learning (Edelsky, 1990).
2. Whole Language is a political position regarding the distribution of power (Edelsky, 1990). In other words, Whole Language empowers teachers and students to take risks and make choices about the kinds of experiences in which they participate (Rich, 1985).
3. A Whole Language classroom immerses children into a print-rich environment, replete with genuine meaning-seeking opportunities, capitalizing on the child's natural propensity for the acquisition of language (Goodman, 1987).
4. Whole Language is founded on the notion that language cuing systems (phonology in oral, orthography in written language, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics) are always present in any instance of language which are used to communicate meaning in authentic life situations (Altwerger, Edelsky, and Flores, 1987).
5. Whole Language views reading as a socio-psycholinguistic process, deliberately putting the social first (Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984) and a transactional process in which the text, infused with socio-historical particularities, is created by readers (Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984; Rosenblatt, 1985). In other words, each reader actively interacts with a text and brings to a given text a unique reconstruction of its meaning.

6. Whole Language teachers do teach spelling, punctuation, and so on; the question is when, why, and for what (Harste, Short, & Burke, 1988). From a Whole Language viewpoint, a skill should be taught when a particular child needs it for something else the child is working on (Edelsky, 1990).

7. A Whole Language curriculum integrates language arts and other subjects (Pinnell & Haussler, 1988) because while learners are using language, they are learning language, through language, and about language (Halliday, 1975).

8. Whole Language emphasizes the reading and writing processes and suggests that the two are really the same and should be taught through use in meaningful situations (Christensen, 1990).

9. Whole Language evaluation assumes that standardized tests are invalid measures of the reading process (McKenna, Robinson, & Miller, 1990). Whole Language evaluation asks the teacher to "stand back" to examine and evaluate in a continuous, ongoing, integral process through observation, interaction, and analysis with students as well as student self-evaluation and self-reflection (Goodman, 1989).

10. Do the definitions above describe Whole Language?

A classroom was designated as a Judicious Discipline classroom if: 1) the teacher's style of student discipline allowed children to exercise their constitutional rights and to understand why they lose those rights, if and/or when they lose them, and 2) students were allowed to practice self-discipline. Judicious Discipline classrooms were recommended by Dr. Forrest Gathercoal, the author of Judicious Discipline.

The sample was selected from elementary schools in grades 1-4. A sample included the same range of grade

levels in each type of classroom (i.e., Judicious Discipline and Whole Language). The teachers had a minimum of five years of teaching experience. Teachers with experience in Whole Language and/or Judicious Discipline were selected. Initial classroom observations validated 1) whether the teacher was implementing the philosophy and practices of Whole Language as designated by the Delphi Panel questionnaire, and 2) whether the teacher was implementing the philosophies and practices of Judicious Discipline as defined by Dr. Forrest Gathercoal.

Method

Three types of data were collected in this research: classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews. This section is organized with respect to these categories of data.

Classroom Observations

The specific qualitative approach that was used is derived from the field of social anthropology and has been referred to as micro-ethnography, anthropological field methodology, and non-participant observation (Lutz & Ramsey, 1974; Malinowski, 1922; Rist, 1973; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968; & Tikunoff, Berliner, & Rist, 1975).

During each classroom observation the researcher tape recorded all teacher and student verbalizations. At the same time, the researcher attempted to record all non-verbal occurrences and interactions between students and teachers and among students. The researcher recorded all notes

written on the blackboard, assignments, exercises, overhead transparencies, and each classroom physical plan. In addition, copies of handouts were obtained and included with the notes taken during the observation. The "camera metaphor" proposed by Tikunoff, et al. (1975) aptly describes the qualitative researcher's role during a classroom observation:

"The ethnographer makes an effort to record all that is said and done within the range of his visual and aural senses. This involves a constant writing effort in which the ethnographer notes the continuous flow of events as they unfold before his eyes and ears. Everything which occurs between two points in time is captured in literal narration fashion."

(Tikunoff, et al., 1975, p. 21)

The field notes taken during each observation represented a relatively accurate account of each classroom derived from a naturalistic setting. They were not haphazard notes and they strictly conformed to the specific guidelines for ethnographic field notes, as described by Bogden & Taylor (1975).

At the end of each observation, the tape recordings and field notes were transcribed into a legible form; any data which the author could not write down during the actual classroom observation were added. The complete notes were then typed.

Approximately ten weeks were allotted for data collection. Each classroom had a total of one and a half hours per week for a period of 10 weeks with a total of 60 hours of observation time. Observations included 15 hours

in each Whole Language classroom and 15 hours in each Judicious Discipline classroom. The observations were scheduled to provide an equal number of morning and afternoon sessions for each classroom.

Teacher Interviews

Each teacher was interviewed during the first two weeks of the study. The interview was approximately 30 minutes, consisted of open-ended questions, and was audiotaped. The audiotapes were transcribed after interviews and used for subsequent data analysis. The purpose of the interview was to gather information concerning instructional practices and the relationship between the teacher and students.

The core questions asked during the interview were the following:

1. Do you decide which books your students will read in your classroom?
2. What do you do if a student makes a mistake while he is reading or writing text?
3. If a child is reading or writing text, do you help him/her with new words?
4. Do your students choose their topics for writing and when they will write? How?
5. If one of your students misspells a word or fails to punctuate a story, what do you do?
6. What do students do with the stories they have written?

7. Do you allow your students to read and write together? If so, how and when?
8. Do you help your students with their schoolwork?
9. What would you do if a student became upset in your classroom and threw a book, started screaming, and swore at you?
10. Do you make the classroom rules or do you and the students make the rules? Explain and give examples of the rules.
11. What would happen to a student in your classroom who refused to do his schoolwork?
12. What would happen to a student in your classroom who deliberately destroyed a another child's schoolwork?
13. What would happen to a student in your classroom who hit someone else, took something that belonged to someone else, or talked while you were instructing a lesson?
14. What would happen to a student in your classroom who bowed his/her head and said a prayer during classtime?
15. What would you do if a student wanted to wear his/her hat during classtime?

Student Interviews

One high achieving and one low achieving student were randomly selected by the teacher and interviewed by the researcher. The teacher made random selections from lists

of high achieving and low achieving students which were created by the teachers and based on their language arts report card grades. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes, consisted of open-ended questions and was audiotaped. Audiotapes were transcribed after interviews and used for subsequent data analysis. The interviews were conducted toward the end of the study, during the seventh or eighth week. The purpose of the interview was to gather information concerning the student's role and relationship with the teacher in the various Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms.

The core questions asked during the interview were the following:

1. Do you make choices about the kinds of books you will read?
2. Does your teacher help you with new words when you are reading a story?
3. What does your teacher do if you make a mistake while you are reading a story?
4. Do you choose what you write stories about?
5. Does your teacher help you spell words when you write a story?
6. Do you help other students read books and write stories? Do they help you?
7. Does your teacher help you with your schoolwork?

8. What would your teacher do if during class you were so mad at one of your friends that you loudly called him or her a bad name?
9. Do you make the rules about how to behave in your classroom or does the teacher make the rules?
10. What happens if you make a mistake and break a class rule such as hitting someone, throwing something at someone, taking something that doesn't belong to you or talking when you should be listening?
11. What would happen if you didn't do your schoolwork?
12. What would your teacher do if you wore a hat during classtime?
13. What would your teacher do if you bowed your head and said a prayer during class time?

Researcher's Background

The researcher's background includes 14 years of teaching experience at the elementary and middle school levels. The researcher has taught graduate courses on Classroom Management, Judicious Discipline and Whole Language at Oregon State University, University of Portland and Boise State University.

The researcher worked closely with Dr. Dorris Lee, author of The Language Experience Approach to Reading, while earning a Master's Degree in Education at Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. The researcher also worked

closely with Dr. Forrest Gathercoal, author of *Judicious Discipline*, while earning a doctoral degree at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. The researcher is presently an elementary school principal at Kimberly Elementary School in Kimberly, Idaho.

Data Analysis

For each classroom, a set of descriptive data were produced (i.e., classroom observations, teacher interviews and student interviews). The combination of these three sources of data were referred to as the "data set" for each classroom. These data sets were used for purposes of analysis. Qualitative analysis of the data sets generated a pool of classroom variables which discriminated Whole Language and *Judicious Discipline* classrooms as well as identified those variables common to each instructional approach.

Data analysis consisted of three qualitative comparisons between paired data sets which are the following:

1. Whole Language (1) paired with Whole Language (2)
2. *Judicious Discipline* (1) paired with *Judicious Discipline* (2).
3. Similarities and Differences between Whole Language and *Judicious Discipline* classrooms.

RESULTS

Investigations of and analysis of the classroom environments of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline with respect to their commonalities and differences was the object of this study. A qualitative research methodology, one strictly adhering to the specific guidelines described by Bogdan and Taylor (1975), characterized this investigation and analysis. Hence, the researcher was responsible for the following tasks: making the essential classroom observations; conducting both teacher and student interviews; and making a detailed, systematic analysis of the findings.

During each classroom observation, the researcher recorded all teacher and student verbalizations. In addition, the researcher recorded systematic, "rich" field notes, not exact quotes, but notes which represented the "gist" of the situations. The researcher also recorded notes written on the blackboard, assignments, exercises, overhead transparencies, teacher and student mannerisms, and the classroom physical plan.

The field notes that were taken during each observation represent a relatively accurate account of each classroom period's activities. These notes were, in addition, "critiqued" as seen in comments written in the margins of notes indicating passages, sentences, and words the reader

thinks are important and for what reasons. The researcher critiqued the notes as the first step in analysis.

After collecting approximately three thousand pages of qualitative data which included classroom observations, student and teacher interviews, the researcher began a process of analytic induction. Reading through the data, the researcher identified common patterns between the data sets.

An initial analysis of three sources of data, referred to as a data set, (i.e., classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews) enabled the researcher to derive and operationally define four categories and/or trends apparent within Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms. Operational definitions of the four categories of classroom environments (as well as illustrative quotations which led to the derivation of each) are presented below. Pseudonyms have been used to protect the subjects' identities so that none of the collected information will embarrass or prove harmful to them.

Categories

Classroom Climate

Respect

Teachers and students show a courteous regard for a person's dignity and feelings. Teachers treat students fairly and recognize individual differences. Teachers and students show a high regard for constitutional rights.

What we are not going to do is we are not going to laugh at peoples' names. We are not going to do that. [The teacher held a conversation with the students in her class.]

Due process was the right to not have anyone search their things without their permission and also they had to be told [something] before they were given a [consequence]. That was real interesting for them because they are very used to having their rights taken away without due process. [During an interview, the teacher explained that her students understood the meaning of due process and how it applied in their classroom.]

We have a rule that says, "If you did not build it, then you may not break it down." [During an interview, the teacher explained the rules in her classroom.]

Democracy

Students engage in a democratic learning process demonstrated by voting, class meetings, and joint decision making. Students are given the opportunity to make choices and decisions.

Each group took a Compelling State Interest. All the groups went and [made what it meant] and then we decided if [they] covered them all. We took a vote. We decided which ones were best. [During an interview, a student explained how rules were made in her classroom.]

We have choices between writing on student of the week, [speak out about], and reading. We have those choices and we get to choose about our revisions and what to write, what kinds of revisions we use. [During an interview, a student explained the kinds of choices he made in his classroom.]

Let's vote on that. Raise your hand if that would be ok. [During a classroom observation, the teacher asked her students to vote.]

Trust

A sense of trust is demonstrated by positive criticism and/or comments, open communication, verbal communication, ethics agreements, disagreements and mistakes.

It is an issue of trust. If Jason wants to share it with us, it is because he trusts us with that information and we don't want to do anything that would damage that trust.

[During a classroom observation, the teacher explained that Jason did not have to share his middle name with the class.]

I'm not putting any limitations on the way they express themselves in writing. [During an interview, the teacher explained that children were given choices on how to express themselves in writing.]

I will show you what you will need to do [and how about if we can have an agreement that if I show you what to do now], you will do it in the morning. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an agreement with her students as to when an assignment would be completed.]

Self-sufficiency

Teacher encourages student accountability for acceptable behavior and ownership of learning.

You need to get your folder and decide if this is the best thing you've ever done, and then we'll publish it. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Let's take a look at what your goal was. [During a classroom observation, the teacher held an individual conference with a student.]

If you read during that time, you are a better reader now than you were before. If you didn't use that time to read, you need to think about that for tomorrow. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

Reinforcement

Teacher praises students for appropriate behavior and/or provides "stars".

The kids on the rug did a super job following. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

There is always a star given in the morning for remembering the three rules of the rug. [During an interview, the teacher explained how students earned stars in her classroom.]

Before we go on, I want to give out

awards and also a reminder to those who might be getting new ones. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

Teacher Instructional Strategies

Directives

Teacher provides materials, examples, structure, and/or directions; teacher states a problem and provides a directive to correct the problem.

We seem to have a problem. The paper at school is not for paper airplanes. Our paper is for other uses. I prefer that you bring your own paper. We can make paper airplanes at latch time. Please, no more airplanes today. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

Matt, if you can't talk in a quiet voice to her then you will have to leave and she will have to do it by herself because your voice is louder right now than what's happening over here. Thank you. [During a classroom observation, the teacher asked a student to be quiet.]

You'll have to listen and you'll have to be very orderly when you do this. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

Processing Information/Thinking Skills

Teacher promotes thinking skills through open-questioning, elaboration, active participation, hands on activities, reviewing, outlining, summarizing, generalizing, comparing and contrasting, guessing, predicting, and making sense.

Does it make sense that seven fifty eights would be 400 and something? Does that make sense to you? Why does it make sense to you that it would be around 400? [During a classroom observation, the teacher asked her students the above questions.]

Go on and try to figure out the words.
[During an individual conference, the teacher asked her student the above question.]

Do you think--this is a question for you--that Friday Entertainment should have a capitol letter? [During a classroom observation, the teacher asked her students the above question.]

Individual Conferences

Teacher encourages students, instructs or discusses problems and behavior on a one to one basis or in small groups.

Andy, could I see you? Have you been working on division this week? Have you started division? [During a classroom observation, the teacher asked a student to meet with her for an individual conference.]

Shay, if you want to learn this kind of music that is written down, this is a book that starts right at the beginning of learning that. And it shows you how to read the notes and how to play the songs. So, you start with this one. [During a classroom observation, the teacher met with a student on an individual basis.]

Ok Evelyn. Please bring all your things up. Show me your records first. [During a classroom observation, the teacher met with a student for an individual conference.]

Integration of Curriculum

Teacher integrates language arts, math, science, and social studies.

To form the shape of the butterfly, you need to start by understanding that there is a word that describes what the butterfly is. It is symmetrical. One side looks the same as the other side. In fact, they are almost congruent. Do you think they are congruent? [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above directions.]

In the news today, two words end in 'ing'. Let's see if we can find one of the words that end in 'ing'. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above directions.]

Ok, the groups that have finished figuring out their [Social Studies] wealth units, I need to see the banker up here with what you have figured out. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above directions.]

Transitions

Teacher provides smooth transitions between class activities.

I need clean desks and I need your attention. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above directions.]

Stop, look, listen. I'll wait until everybody is looking, [until] your eyes are looking at me. I have some new things to tell you about. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above directions.]

Ok, let's see who is ready. Well, Group 2 is ready. Group 1 is ready. [Teacher is writing stars on the chalkboard.]

Recognition

Teacher provides positive feedback for student response, work, and/or following directions.

Kevin, you did real well. Did you notice that on your state report that you got an A- 100%? You did very well. You gave a lot of information and I was really pleased. [During a classroom observation, the teacher met with a student on an individual basis.]

I like the way you are reading just as though you were telling the story. [During an individual conference, the teacher explained the above to a student.]

I must share this wonderful idea that Char just had and just told me. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Teacher's Role

Instructor

Teacher provides directions and/or clarifies directions for class and homework assignments.

I would like to have your attention so that we can talk about the direction we are going to go with these conflicts.
[During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

You may use crayons and markers. Raise your hand if you know what I mean when I say "may use crayon and markers?"
[During a classroom observation, the teacher asked her class the above question.]

I'm going to give you your job today. Your first job is to make a pattern sentence that fits the pattern. Does a dog fit the pattern? [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Process Teacher/Facilitator

Teacher facilitates the learning process through modeling and student input; teacher facilitates thinking skills, making sense, problem solving, independence, student accountability and ownership for learning and behavior, interaction and cooperation.

We need to think about how we help someone coming in feel comfortable. We need to think about that between now and Monday. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

The students would need to work that out between themselves. They would arrive at some kind of a workable solution. [During an interview, the teacher explained how problems were solved in her classroom.]

What would be the best thing to do with your time if you are finished? [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Coach

Teacher encourages and instructs students on an individual basis; teacher listens to what a student is saying, guides and fosters ideas, asks and answers questions.

I am a coach. I am on the sidelines in the classroom and not the focal point. They are the focal point. [During an interview, the teacher explained her role in the classroom.]

I felt this is one your best things I have read that you have done and it could be because you were really excited about it and you knew what you wanted to do. [During an individual conference, the teacher explained the above to her student.]

Get me your plan and I will help you. [During an individual conference, the teacher explained the above to her student.]

Monitor

Teacher checks on student progress and understanding through observation and moving spontaneously about the room; teacher maintains a student portfolio with anecdotal notes; teacher perceives readiness and learning rates of students.

Yes, that everyone could be up to the second chapter by Monday morning. How realistic is that? Raise your hand if you think that would be no problem for you. Ok, great. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Please raise your hand if you need a little more time to write on your paper. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

I'm doing a little check up. Did you put your name on the paper? [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Manager

Teacher manages schedules, time, dates and materials for assignments and projects; teacher keeps students on task; teacher checks and marks off assignments. teacher assigns grades.

You are the only one in your class that hasn't finished typing their story. So, when you go to the library at lunch time, why don't you type a bit on your own. Let's meet back here at 1:00 so we can put your book together. [During a classroom observation, the teacher met with a student on an individual basis.]

I am going to call everybody's name and all I want you to tell me is if your book is finished or not finished. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

We won't really have time to do that right now. So, if you will put that some place on your table in a neat stack, we will have it later in the day. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above to a student.]

Student's Role

Instructor

Student provides directions and/or clarifies directions for an assignment; student acts as a teacher and provides examples for concept development.

Does everybody remember that we are changing the banner to buttons? [During a classroom observation, a student made an announcement to the class.]

Today, we are having music. Today, we are going to computers. [During a classroom observation, a student explained the above to the class.]

This is the discount game. You cover all the squares with coins. I'll cover a couple of them. [During a classroom observation, a student explained the above directions to the class.]

Process Learner/Independent Learner

Students think, process, analyze, compare/contrast and research information; students ask questions, make observations, choices and decisions to solve problems and make sense; students act as independent learners.

If you are really stuck, she will explain it to you. Otherwise, you are supposed to keep trying to figure it out. [During an interview, a student explained the above.]

If it was really bad, then the teacher would do something, but if it isn't, the two people would solve it between each other. [During an interview, a student explained the above.]

I think this year is a better adjustment at school because this time instead of something on the board or having to miss a recess-maybe you think that might not help you-and if you think something else is going to help you better than that, you are thinking of it, even if it didn't hurt that much, it would be helping you. [During an interview, a student explained the above.]

Peer Teacher

Students collaborate, interact, and coach each other in the learning process. [During classroom observations, the following conversations ensued between students.]

Student: Oh, here's one. Is this what you were looking for?

Student: Yep. That's the kind I've been looking for.

Student: I will read you my story, ok?

Student: OK.

Student: This is my cover. We are supposed to be revising.

Student: I liked the part where she sings.

Student: You liked which part?

Student: Where she likes fat, chubby things and where she is singing.

Evaluator

Students evaluate and correct their own schoolwork. Students evaluate, provide feedback and correct their peers' schoolwork.

When I am conferencing with a child and he/she is reading to me, the best thing to do is nothing. This gives the child the opportunity to self-correct. [During an interview, the teacher explained the above.]

Shay and Tom are ready to check each other's papers. [During a classroom observation, the teacher explained the above to a group of students.]

How could you check to find out if it's true? [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to the class.]

Manager

Students keep records, manage materials and learning centers. Students are responsible for various classroom management jobs.

Can I do the lunch count now? [During a classroom observation, a student asked to take the lunch count.]

Oh we forgot. Suzie has to announce the weather. Thank you for reminding me. She fixed it all nice and we'd better let her announce it. [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Will the inspectors give us a report on how we did this morning? [During a classroom observation, the teacher made an announcement to her class.]

Qualitative Comparisons

Data analysis consisted of three qualitative comparisons between paired data sets which are the following:

1. Whole Language (1) paired with Whole Language (2)

2. Judicious Discipline (1) paired with Judicious Discipline (2).
3. Similarities and Differences of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline.

Again, the purpose of this procedure was to determine similarities and differences with respect to classroom variables, the teacher's role and student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms. Illustrative quotes and findings are presented below. Pseudonyms have been used to protect the subjects' identities so that none of the collected information will embarrass or prove harmful to them.

Whole Language (1) (Rue-First Grade) paired with Whole Language (2) (Caster-First Grade)

Classroom Climate

Respect.

Both first grade classrooms emanated a climate of respect wherein: 1) teachers and students showed a courteous regard for other people's dignity and feelings; 2) the teacher treated the children fairly and recognized individual differences; and 3) the teacher and students showed a high regard for the constitutional rights of others.

The following conversation between Caster and a student demonstrates the emphasis on respect for other people's feelings:

Caster: "How do you think it is making

Mary feel when you don't want
to lend her your glue?"

Student: "It will hurt her feelings."

Caster: "Talk about that a little while."

While a child was reading a story out loud to his peers and became stuck on a word, another child got up from the rug to help him. Mrs. Caster responded, "You know what I like about what you did? I like that they waited patiently when Suzie helped Peter out with his story."

When Mrs. Caster was listening to a student read a book, another child in the class came up to her and asked, "Can I read this [a story] to the class?" Mrs. Caster said, "Yes, but not now. Maybe at the time that we do our book review. That might be a nice thing to do. But right now, John and I have to be busy." Then Mrs. Caster made the following announcement to the class:

"Excuse me boys and girls. When Mrs. Caster is reading with someone, it is polite to let Mrs. Caster read with that person. John and I are having too many interruptions now. So, you know what your job is now. So, it will be nice if you did that job right now. John and I need to do our job."

Mrs. Rue also treated children with respect and dignity. As Mrs. Rue was working with a student on a project, another student in the class came up to her with a question. Mrs. Rue spoke to him privately:

"Excuse me, can I talk with Steven? He is here doing a special thing with me. Thank you."

After Mrs. Rue asked a student if his name was on his

paper, the child responded "Yes." Mrs. Rue replied, "Sam, I am sorry. I thought that was a speck. I didn't realize that was your name." The child looked up at Mrs. Rue, smiled and said, "Thank you."

When a child was working at his desk and dropped a box of crayons onto the floor, Mrs. Rue made the following announcement to the class:

"Oh, I feel like helping him pick up his crayons. It's awful to have to pick them up by yourself. Let's help him."

Several students and Mrs. Rue helped the student pick up his scattered box of crayons off the floor.

It was interesting that both first grade, whole language teachers respected childrens' feelings when considering consequences for inappropriate behavior.

Mrs. Caster explained what she would do if she saw a child take something that did not belong to him:

"Usually, I don't confront the child on stealing. I want to give the child a chance. So, usually what I do is I talk about it missing or I let the child who [owns] the missing object tell that whatever is missing is important to that child and that it needs to be returned. So, I just say, 'If you know where it is, I would like you to return it to my desk or to the child.'"

When asked what she would do if a child screamed and swore at her or another child in the classroom, Mrs. Rue responded:

"Oh gosh! Hugs. Get them back under control. A lot of times they've lost it. They have just lost it and there is no rationalizing

with them at that point so you just need to hold them, and calm them and talk to them quietly."

Mrs. Caster explained that a consequence for inappropriate behavior is:

"Usually, it is some kind of cooling down time where you think about what you have done and how it has hurt somebody else and then perhaps you have a [conversation] with that student to apologize."

When I asked Mrs. Caster's student during an interview what would happen if she broke a rule in the class, she responded:

". . . she [teacher] might say that you don't do that in the class because it hurts other people's feelings . . ."

In both classrooms, the teachers made a point to recognize childrens' individual differences. During the student interview, Mrs. Caster's student explained:

"If we have math that is hard for somebody, hard for the people, then she [teacher] says we will do something else and then some of us say yes and some of us say no and then she has something else and then the people that said no say yes and that's good because its an easier job."

Mrs. Caster said during an interview that "children learn through experience." When the researcher asked her if there was a right or wrong experience for her students, she replied, "Not at all. The same experience will be different for one child than it is for another because children bring different things to that experience."

Mrs. Rue explained during an interview that some children are more easily distracted than others. Therefore,

she considers individual differences when evaluating failure to complete schoolwork "on time." Mrs. Rue explained:

"Kids get distracted. They are just little kids. They are not doing it on purpose. It's just like Peter. I love Peter but he doesn't accomplish much. He isn't here often. He has a lot of other things going. I don't punish him for not doing the work. He doesn't understand what he is supposed to do yet."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue what she would do if a student misspelled a word or failed to punctuate a story, she responded:

". . . it depends on the child. When a child is ready for punctuation, we work on punctuation. [With] Monica Jackson, we deal with apostrophe's. I have other kids that don't have the conception of what a sentence is. So, there is no point [in their] dealing with punctuation. When the child needs' it . . . when they are ready for it [we'll take it up.]"

Mrs. Rue also explained that she takes individual differences into account when a child is reading:

". . . it depends on each individual child. You have to look at what they are doing. Some kids, if I interrupt what they are doing, they will lose self confidence. I would tend less to interrupt that child than someone who is more secure."

Not only did both first grade whole language teachers and students demonstrate a respect for other people's feelings, they also showed a high regard for the constitutional rights of others.

Both teachers emphasized the importance of respect for other people's property in their classrooms. When both

teachers were asked during an interview what would happen to a student who destroyed another child's schoolwork or property, each teacher responded with the following:

Caster: "I think that probably an apology is in order for one thing. This happens a lot of times. The thing that comes to mind is that this happens during a free choice kind of time where someone is building something and then someone destroys it. The first thing is that we have a rule that says, 'If you did not build it, then you may not break it down.' So then we would discuss the rule and then perhaps that child would be responsible for helping the other child rebuild it."

Rue: "I guess the two kids would talk it over . . . talk to the person whose work he destroyed and how it makes you feel and how would it feel if that happened to you. We had some real problems with that at the beginning of the year and so we sat down with two kids and because one of the rules we have in our classroom is that you never destroy anything that you didn't do or didn't make . . . blocks . . . it doesn't make any difference what it is. Then they decided they wouldn't like having their own things destroyed."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, a student approached her with a problem she was having with another student destroying her hairdo. The following is a conversation between Mrs. Rue, the student, and classmates:

Student: "Mrs. Rue, everybody won't leave my hair alone. Janet keeps on pulling on it."

Rue: You know why? It's really beautiful. Should we make an announcement to everybody? It's such a beautiful

hairdo, I really would like to do that too. So, I can understand why they are doing it but it will mess it up if they keep doing it, won't it? OK, we will talk to them about it before break."

Mrs. Rue walked over to the piano, chimed a bell, and made the following announcement to the class:

"We are going to stop now. Jenny has asked me if we could make an announcement to the class before break recess. So Jenny, would you like to explain to them what is bothering you?"

Jenny said, "Everybody is playing with my hair."

Mrs. Rue asked Jenny to turn around to show the class her hairdo. Mrs. Rue responded:

"Jenny has a really interesting hairdo today with a braid in the back. I told her I would really like to touch it. It just looks like the thing to do but if we all keep touching it, by the end of the day Jenny's beautiful hair is going to be all falling out. So, she would appreciate it if you would just look and enjoy her new hairdo but please don't touch it. Ok, I understand why you wanted to do that. It just looks like a neat thing to touch. But, Jenny asked us not to. Ok."

Mrs. Rue demonstrated respect for the student's feelings as well as a high regard for the student's constitutional right of privacy and personal property. This is demonstrated further during an interview with Mrs. Rue when she explained what she would do if a student became upset in her classroom and threw a book. She responded:

"Throwing things is one of the rules we have in here that you can't do. Usually, I talk to them about why they threw it. Were they angry? What else can they do with their anger besides that? They

need to show respect of someone else's property. If the book didn't belong to them, they shouldn't throw it."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue for an example of the rules in her classroom, she responded:

"The rules are the idea that everyone has the right to be heard, everyone has the right not to be hurt in here. They need to be able to feel safe in the room, and so the rules are in that vein. Everyone needs to feel safe. They need to be able to talk and give their opinions."

When asked what she would do if a student stopped what he was doing in class and said a prayer, Mrs. Rue responded:

"I think he has the right to do that. Whatever the lesson is it can't hurt it to have a thirty minute time-out for him to do something that is making him feel better, if that's what he is using the prayer for."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue what she would do if a student wanted to wear his hat all day at school, she said, "So long as it is not distracting, I usually don't bother with it." Mrs. Rue explained further what she would do if a student came to school wearing something that had language on it that she didn't approve of:

"If the language was unacceptable for school, unacceptable four letter words for people in society, I would probably talk to the parents about the appropriateness of what should be worn to school. I don't stop them. That is a personal thing. I have never bothered with what someone wore unless it was distracting to the classroom, whether it's beads, a hat, or a sweatshirt. Kids can wear it if the parents accept it. I don't judge people's clothing."

During an interview with Mrs. Caster, she explained what she would do if a student wanted to wear his or her hat during class time:

". . . sometimes these hats are really important to these children and that doesn't bother me. So, I would allow them to wear the hat as long as it was not interfering with what they were doing or with someone else. I have a word that I use in the classroom all the time. It is called a distraction. So, all of these things such as hats, bracelets, and all kinds of things that kids bring to school are called distractions. At the point they become a distraction, I ask them to put them in their pockets."

Democracy.

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, the children practiced a democratic learning process through joint decision making and by having opportunities to make choices and/or vote on a daily basis.

During an interview with Mrs. Caster, she explained how she thinks children learn:

Caster:	"I think they learn by experience . . . through experience."
Interviewer:	"So, you allow your children to have different kinds of experiences in your classroom?"
Caster:	"As many as I can. Sure. That's the whole ball game. And, they need to be wide and varied and child centered."

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, the morning began with Literacy Stations. Mrs. Caster explained:

"All of those stations [Literacy Stations] are based on reading, writing, listening,

and speaking. At those times, there are different kinds of writing that the children do. Sometimes, it is bookmaking, the post office, writing letters, notes, and messages. They are choosing their topic at that time."

During a student interview, Mrs. Caster's student explained the kinds of choices he makes in his classroom:

"Sometimes I choose the writing station or the chalk and sometimes the listening station . . . sometimes blocks and sometimes the rice station and sometimes a puppet show."

Another student in Mrs. Caster's classroom explained that her teacher was fair because:

". . . she lets us decide on what books we want to read and she lets us choose books on the rug . . ."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Caster's classroom if they make choices about the kinds of books they read, the student replied, ". . . we can say yes or no if we want the book or don't want the book . . . if we don't want that book, we ask her if we can take the one that we want and then she lets us usually."

The children were given an opportunity to make choices as to what kind of stories they wanted to share with the class:

Caster: "John, you have a choice today.
You can choose either the story
that you wrote or the letter that
you wrote to [me]. You
may choose either one that you want."

The children in Mrs. Caster's classroom were also given an opportunity to make choices and vote regarding times to complete projects. After the students had been working on an art project, the following class conversation ensued:

Caster: "I know you love working on these pictures, but our time for this job is up. We will need to decide on a time to finish this project. Raise your hand if you can think of a time to work on this project, to get it finished. Sue looks like she has an answer."

Sue: "You could put the timer on for more time."

Caster: "Okay. Does anyone else have another idea when this job could be done? Ron?"

Ron: "Use your free choice time."

Caster: "You could use your free choice time if you would like to. That was a good idea too."

Student: "Tomorrow morning."

Caster: "I was wondering if somebody was going to say that. Suppose Mrs. Caster gathers these up now and those of you who still have work to do could come and get them at work time in the morning. Would that be agreeable?"

Students: "Yeah."

Caster: "Raise your hand if that's agreeable with everybody. [Children voted yes.] Of course, if there is somebody who would like to use their free choice time this afternoon, they may."

Student: "I can't do it that time."

Caster: ". . . So when's the best choice for you, Suzanne?"

Suzanne: "Ah, morning."

Caster: "Morning time, okay."

Mrs. Caster explained that the children in her classroom know how to vote:

Caster: "We do a lot of voting. They know how to vote and we count the votes and tally them. It is integrated with math. They know about the concept of voting. They have learned to abide by what their peers have decided."

One of Mrs. Caster's students said during an interview, "The teacher let's us vote."

Although the children in Mrs. Rue's classroom did not practice a formal voting procedure as did the children in Mrs. Caster's classroom, the children were given opportunities to make choices. In the morning, Mrs. Rue said, "It's time to get started. We have two songs that the children wanted to sing this morning." After the children were done singing, Mrs. Rue explained, "Choose what you want to do before we get started. Big Books will be on the rug, if you would like to read with me."

Some of the children read alone, with a partner, or in a small group. All of the children chose what they wanted to read and with whom. Two children chose a spot to read under the coat rack. Others chose to read at their desks, a table, or at the teacher's desk. One small group of children chose to read the Big Book out loud with Mrs. Rue. At the same time, two students were recording their story with a tape recorder.

The students in Mrs. Rue's classroom were also given the opportunity to make choices regarding publication of their stories. When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue what the students did with their stories, she replied, ". . . we keep a folder of all their stories and when they have a number of them, they go through and order them as far as which is their best and why and then they choose [one] for publication."

Often in Mrs. Rue's classroom, many activities would be

going on at the same time while children would be making a variety of choices.

Rue: "Give me five minutes. There are different choices. You can finish your illustrations for the author's tea. You can make characters for Alice in Wonderland. Raise your hand if you are not going to work on Alice in Wonderland? Do you want to work with someone or by yourself? Does someone want to make the white rabbit? With someone or alone? Who wants to do the Queen of Hearts? What do you want to draw?"

Trust.

A sense of trust was demonstrated between the teacher and students in both first grade, whole language classrooms shown by positive comments, open communication, and student voice in the learning process with joint agreements made between the teacher and the students.

Often, Mrs. Rue would make positive comments to students:

"You got it. That was right."

In addition, Mrs. Rue encouraged positive comments from parents:

Rue: "We send home one packet a week with work, notes, etc. I have asked parents to write a positive comment. It can be something they have done over the weekend or something they are reinforcing at home. I ask them to write positive things . . . I wanted to be able to read out loud what a parent has said positively about their child so that every other child in the classroom hears it. So that they can feel good."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue to describe the

classroom environment in her first grade classroom, she replied, "As open as possible. I want my classroom to be as open as possible. Someone said that my classroom seems like a dance studio. It's got to be kid-like."

In the same way, Mrs. Caster described the classroom environment in her first grade classroom; "I think it is open-ended. It is really center based."

Mrs. Caster also made positive comments to students demonstrated by the following conversations between Mrs. Caster and two students.

Student One: Caster: "Let's see what you wrote Jenny."
 Jenny: "My favorite part."
 Caster: "Oh, that is very good."

Student Two: Caster: "How we doing?"
 Student: "Good. I'm doing it in pencil and then crayon. So, if you [I] make a mess up, you [I] can erase."
 Caster: "Oh, good thinking."

In both first grade whole language classrooms, the students had a "voice" in the learning process. During an interview with both teachers, they explained the following:

Caster: "I feel they [students] have a voice. There is nothing that we don't talk about. I think they feel very free to open discussion on anything. I am not telling them how to express themselves. I'm not putting any limitations on the way they express themselves in writing."

Rue: "They have a right to express opinions. We change things during the day depending on

what the majority of them are feeling like in that day. I think they feel pretty open to be able to tell me most anything that they want to. They change my curriculum constantly. They make decisions on what the thematic unit is going to be, how long it is going to be by their interests. My curriculum revolves around what they are interested in."

A sense of trust was demonstrated by joint agreements made between the students and the teachers in both whole language first grade classrooms. Before explaining a "job" to her students, Mrs. Caster made the following agreement with them:

"Mrs. Caster will show [you] this job. I will show you what you will need to do and how about if we can have an agreement that if I show you what to do now, you will do it tomorrow morning at break time. How's that? Let's vote on that. Raise your hand if that would be ok. [Children raise their hands.] Is there anybody who would rather do the work now? There isn't anyone. So, it's 19 to 0."

During an interview with Mrs. Rue, she explained that children made agreements regarding the respect of other people's property:

"They set up a contract where they agreed that they would attempt to do certain things. They set up the consequences if they didn't adhere to the contract. They signed the contract."

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, the teacher and students made a joint agreement regarding classroom rules:

". . . at the very beginning of the year, I have a time when we have a class

that is totally devoted to deciding that we have to have rules. We talk about why we have to have rules. Then we decide on no more than five rules that the class can agree on that are necessary in order to run a smooth classroom. Then we decide the rules that will keep our classroom from being chaotic."

During an interview with one of Mrs. Caster's students, the following conversation ensued:

Interviewer: "Do you make the rules or does the teacher make the rules in your classroom?"
 Student: We made them.
 Interviewer: You and the teacher made the rules together?
 Student: "Yes."
 Interviewer: "How did you do that?"
 Student: "Well, she had a chart and she had a felt tip marker and we raised our hands and we said rules that needed to be kept in in our classroom. We sat down on the rug and did it."
 Interviewer: "Do you know the rules in the classroom?"
 Student: "They say to make seconds count, and let the teacher teach and the kids learn, and stay on task. That's some of them."

In contrast, Mrs. Rue explained how the rules were made in her classroom:

"Most of the rules are teacher generated but we talk about them all as a group and what we need to have happen in the classroom to make things go smoothly. I probably make 75% of the rules and they [students] help me talk about them . . . what we need to make things go well."

Self Sufficiency.

Mrs. Caster encouraged student accountability for behavior and ownership of learning. When I asked Mrs.

Caster what would happen to a student that refused to do his schoolwork, she explained:

"We have already established by the rules that the reason we are at school is to learn, and that their job is to learn. So, the choice is 'Would you like to do it now or would you like to do it at some other time of your choosing.'"

Mrs. Caster explained "the responsibility is theirs [students'] for learning." When the researcher asked her to give examples, she responded, "I think everything that I do, I try to make them responsible for the learning . . . for instance, giving them choices and making them responsible."

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, the children were responsible for evaluating their work at the literacy stations. Mrs. Caster explains:

". . . they have a paper they fill out that tells which station they are going to. They plan which station they are going to and then at the end of the time, they have five minutes or so where they evaluate their work at the station which means they tell what they did, who they worked with, etc. They write it on paper. They have a folder. They are accountable for what they do at that station. They tell if they liked it, what they did, if they are finished."

When Mrs. Caster was getting ready to read a story to the children, some of the students were moving chairs from one side to the other and getting into their crayon boxes. The following conversation shows how Mrs. Caster held children accountable for their behavior:

Caster: "What happens when people are moving their chairs around from one side to the other?"

Student: "We can't hear the story."
Caster: "It is very distracting, isn't it? When I look around, I see a lot of distractions and it makes Mrs. Caster wonder if you really want me to read this story."
Student: "We do."
Caster: "How could I know that you really want me to read this story? What could you be doing that would tell Mrs. Caster that you really want to listen to the story now that it is story time?"
Student: "You could just sit in your chair."
Caster: "Do you think now is a good time too be finishing your work?"
Student: "No."
Caster: "Probably isn't. Ok, do you think we are ready now?"

When a student was going to share a story to the class, Mrs. Caster asked the students, "What would make a ready audience?" A student responded, "If you are ready with your hands." Mrs. Caster explained:

". . . if you are ready with your hands and they are not bothering anyone, then you are ready. What else makes a good audience? Carrie?

Carrie said, "You're ready if you are not playing with a book or anything." Mrs. Caster replied, "Yes, if you are not playing with your book and you are looking at the person who is going to read."

Mrs. Caster encouraged students to be responsible by saying, "Please show by your behavior that you would like to have partner reading."

When students handed in their written stories to Mrs. Caster, she would tell them:

"If you are finished with your story, what is Mrs. Caster going to ask you to do?"

A student replied, ". . . to make it better." Mrs. Caster responded, ". . . do one thing that makes it better."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, students were also encouraged to be accountable for behavior and their learning. During an interview with Mrs. Rue, she explained:

". . . from the very beginning, they come in and have to read a board in order to figure out what goes on in the morning. Every morning they come in and read that. It reminds them to do something. It's their own responsibility. They have responsibilities and jobs they are supposed to take care of in the morning and that is one that is supposed to be on their own."

During the morning session, a child brought his work to Mrs. Rue. She said, "Are you finished with it?" The child answered, "No." Mrs. Rue responded, "Then you need to look at the board at number three."

When Mrs. Rue found some books and paper that had been left on the rug at the front of the classroom, she made the following announcement to the class:

"Okay, somebody was here on the rug and left a pile of stuff. It would be great if you would come get it. [A child went to the rug and picked up the things on the rug] Thank you, Jessie."

After the children were finished with silent and partner reading in the morning, Mrs. Rue explained the following to the class:

"We had some really nice reading going on. If you read during that time, you're a better reader now than you were before. If you didn't use that time to read, you need to think about that for tomorrow."

When Mrs. Rue called the class to the front of the room to sit on the rug, many of the children were chatting with their friends. Mrs. Rue explained:

"Now, I have people chatting with friends. If the person sitting next to you is not going to be a good work partner for you, I'll give you a chance to move. So, by not moving, you're telling me that the people sitting around you are really going to help you this morning."

Reinforcement.

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, the children were given stars and awards for appropriate behavior. This is demonstrated by the following conversations with her students:

Conversation #1

"Ok, let's give stars for our morning and then we will start silent reading. As I call your name, stand up. [Names of the students were called off.] People who are standing did this side of the board. [Rue went to the star chart and gave the students a star.]

Conversation #2

Rue: "Ok, who can read all this with the editing I did at the bottom? This one is a tuff one. Jane, would you like to try?"

Mary: "After you have done your morning

job, write your name on the map on the rug. Write in one state only."

Rue: "To receive your star, you have to have your name on the map and it needs to be there only one time. So, let's see how many people were able to follow that instruction." [Rue calls off names and puts a star on the chart.]

Mrs. Rue then made the following announcement to the class regarding stars:

"Please don't leave the rug because you have a chance to earn a second star in just a minute. The second star is for how well you remembered the rules of the rug."

During another morning meeting with the students on the rug, Mrs. Rue explained:

"I will offer a star to everyone who knows the rules of the rug. I will offer a star to everyone who follows the rules."

Mrs. Rue also gave awards for "being a good student" as shown by the following announcement to the class:

"I'd like to start the morning off by giving out the awards that were earned last week . . . we had a lot of them. Sam just got his fifth award . . . the fifth award is a phone call home from Mrs. Rue. So, I'll be trying to get a hold of you tonight at your house and just talk to you. It's really exciting to have so many people doing a good job for helping our class and that's what the awards are for . . . being a good student."

For students who did not follow the rules of the rug, they did not earn a star. This was demonstrated by the following conversation between Mrs. Rue and three students:

Rue: "Girls, come here. Which rule did you have trouble with?"
 Students: "Number three."
 Rue: "No, it was stay where you start. Rule #1. You need to stay where you start . . . let's try to work on that."

In contrast, the students in Mrs. Caster's classroom were given stars only to shape smooth transitions between activities. After Mrs. Caster's students were done with a math project, she made the following announcement to the class:

"Boys and girls, that signal means that we must put our things away neatly back into the tub and the person in charge puts the tubs away. Mrs. Caster is going to count to ten because we must get ready for P.E. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, . . . I will be here [at the chalkboard] to put a star up for those that are ready. Who is ready? I see that group three is ready. [Mrs. Caster put a star on the chalkboard for group three]

If the groups earned five stars, then they were given an extra recess break:

Student: "Do we get to go out for a break?"
 Caster: "Oh, that is a good question."
 Student: "Most of us are tied."
 Caster: "That's right. That means we are doing pretty well on getting ready. I think our next thing to do is to work on staying ready."
 Student: "I am worried about us getting a star."
 Caster: "I think that it is real important that if we earn it that we should get it."

Teacher Instructional Strategies

Directives.

Mrs. Caster provided directives and structure for effective instructional strategies:

"Boys and girls, you'll have to be very orderly when you do this. You may bring your card and your folder."

Mrs. Caster used a timer for activities:

"Okay, I'm putting my timer on now. Ten minutes is going to be a lot of time if you keep working."

After Caster had explained directions for a math project, she realized the students were having difficulty with the activity:

"I think I'm going to change that direction. That was bothering a lot of people . . . I'm going to say only seven of each color."

Before Mrs. Caster's students started reading, she gave them the following directive:

"Everyone will sit at their own table until it's time for partner reading and then you may change."

When one of the students did not follow the directive, Mrs. Caster explained:

"John, do you remember this is the time we read by ourselves and then when it's partner reading time, when the timer goes off, then you can do partner reading."

When Mrs. Caster's students were starting a writing project, she explained:

". . . the only way you can get finished is if you get started. If you are having a hard time getting started with your story, come and get your picture paper and start with that. Sometimes, if you draw the picture first, it helps a little."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, three students were getting costumes on for a play. Mrs. Rue explained:

"May I have your attention from the children who are not in the play today? If you are not in the play today, stay over at the other side of the room."

When it was time to take the lunch count, Mrs. Rue explained the following to a student:

"Susie, we are going to take the lunch count now, so, I am going to ask you to stop that."

Before the students started a spelling lesson with Mrs. Rue, she provided the following directions:

"I'm looking for a paper with names on the paper and pencils down. While the other kids are getting their names on their papers, I want to tell you something about today's spelling. You're going to be asked to write a word, the correct way."

Processing Information/Thinking Skills.

Mrs. Caster and Mrs. Rue promoted the processing of information and thinking skills through open-questioning, elaboration, active participation, hands on activities, reviewing, summarizing, generalizing, comparing and contrasting, guessing, predicting, and making sense.

While Mrs. Caster was reading The Ugly Duckling to her students, she gave them an opportunity to actively participate, ask questions, and make generalizations:

Caster: ". . . the ducks snapped at them, and the hens pecked at him, even the girl who brought the feed kicked him aside with her foot."

Student: "Ouch, that's mean."

Caster: "That is mean . . . that's not very polite. How do you think that duckling feels?"

Student: "Sad. [He] probably wants to run away. I think the people are treating him like their horse."

At the end of the story, Mrs. Caster asked:

Caster: "What did you learn from the story?"

Student: "It taught us that even though that we're ugly, it doesn't mean that we can't have pretty friends. And it taught us that even though we are girls and even though other people are boys, we can still have [be] friends."

Caster: "Does anyone have another idea?"

Student: "It doesn't matter what we look like if we treat each other nice."

Caster: "It doesn't matter what we look like does it."

The students in Mrs. Caster's classroom engaged in activities that encouraged guessing and making predictions. Before Mrs. Caster started reading a book to the class, the following conversation ensued:

Caster: "Let's look at the cover and title page. Is this a real or make believe story?"

Student: "Make believe."

Caster: "How do you know it is a make believe story?"

Student: "A pig doesn't wear a bow tie. A pig doesn't go on picnics."

After Mrs. Caster finished reading the story, she said, "Does this story teach us . . . no matter who or what you are . . . just to be yourself?" A child responded, "I have something to tell you about the zebra. No other animal would have stripes. They are not a horse. They are their own type of animal. They do what they want to do."

After reading The Chick and the Duckling to her students, Mrs. Caster asked, "Is there a pattern in this story?" A student replied, "The chick copies the duck . . . all of the things she does." Mrs. Caster then asked, "What are the words he [author] uses when he makes the pattern?"

A child said, "Me too." Mrs. Caster replied, "Me too, said the chick. What happens at the very end?" A child responded, "Not me." Mrs. Caster then asked, "How does the pattern change at the very end?" A child replied, "Not me."

After the students were finished with the story, Mrs. Caster and the students engaged in the following conversation:

Caster: "Ok, on page 109, there is a word that means I am. Read until you find it. What word means I am?"

Student: "I'm."

Caster: "I'm . . . let's see. Let's write that down. [Caster went to the chalkboard and wrote I am.] Is that ok?"

Student: "No."

Caster: "What's wrong?"

Student: "It has to have an apostrophe." [Caster wrote I'm]

Caster: "What happened to that word?"

Student: "They took the a out."

Caster: "They took the a out. Here it says I am. Here it says I'm. They took that away and then what did they do with that a?"

Student: "Put in . . . [student paused]"

Caster: "That is called an apostrophe. It is the same shape as a comma, isn't it?"

Student: "Yes."

Caster: "They took that away [a] and scrunched that word together and made one word out of two words. It says, I'm. Ok."

When the researcher asked a student what Mrs. Caster would do if he made a mistake while he was reading a story, the student replied, ". . . she says go and try to figure out the other words. Say blank and go on with that sentence. Then go back to the sentence."

During an interview with Mrs. Caster, the researcher asked her what she would do if a student misspelled a word or failed to punctuate a story. She explained the importance for a child "to make sense" during the writing process:

"I am not as concerned about punctuation and spelling as I am about fluency and to create meaning with their writing. I don't want to interrupt a thought. I think that when you stop them to do that, you are losing fluency and meaning."

Interestingly, when the researcher asked Mrs. Rue the same question, she explained the following:

". . . during writing, they tend to make less mistakes about meaning. They make up what it is they want to say and it makes sense to them."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Caster what she would do if a student made a mistake while he was reading, she explained:

". . . usually nothing. When I am conferencing with a child and a child is reading to me, the best thing to do is nothing which gives [the child] the opportunity to self correct. I ask them to guess and go on."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue the same question, she explained the following:

"It depends on the mistake. If the mistake is one of meaning, if it doesn't make sense with the word they put in, then I correct them because meaning is what we are after. Otherwise, I keep the flow going and I do the teaching at the end of the reading session."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, the children were also encouraged to actively participate, elaborate, guess, identify patterns, make predictions, and generalizations. During two morning sessions, the following conversations took place:

Conversation #1.

Rue: "Now, yesterday you predicted sun. Would you like to look out the window and find out [if] your prediction was correct?"
 Student: "It's sunny."
 Rue: "So Mary did a better job predicting today than the weatherman."

Conversation #2.

Rue: "Washington, heart, Lincoln, Washington. Carrie has chosen a really tough pattern. The reason it's tough is because it starts and ends with the symbol. You guys are good at patterns. Could you figure out the pattern to here please? [Students study the pattern]. If you think it's going to be Lincoln, raise your right hand? If you think it's going to be a heart, put your hands on your head. Okay, let's say the pattern and see if you guys are right."

During a morning math session, Mrs. Rue explained:

Rue: "Now, yesterday, we had been here ninety-four days. What number comes after ninety-four?"
 Student: "Ninety-five."
 Rue: "Ninety-five. Okay. Nine sets of ten and five extra. I'm going to ask you a different question today. I want to know how many people it's going to take to get ninety-five. You have enough fingers to show me the answer. How many people do I need to get ninety-five fingers? Now, think a minute [pause]. [Ten

children went to the front of the classroom]. Everybody has a set of ten. Okay, so if we were counting, we would have 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100. [The class counted in unison]. John, could we just have five of your fingers? There we go now, let's try again."

After Mrs. Rue was finished with the activity above, she asked:

Rue: "How many hands do I have to have to get one hundred fingers?"
 Student: "We can't do that."
 Student: "We can't do that."
 Rue: "Yes, you can. How many hands do I need?"
 Student: "Ninety-billion."
 Rue: "What do you think Richard?"
 Student: "Ah, ten?"
 Rue: "What do you think Sue?"
 Student: "Twenty."
 Rue: "Alright, twenty hands."

Individual Conferences.

Both whole language, first grade teachers instructed, encouraged or discussed problems with students during individual conferences.

When the researcher asked Mrs. Caster to explain the writing/editing process in her classroom, she replied, "The teacher and the child [edit] together at the individual conference . . . I can do a lot of teaching on an individual basis . . ."

The following conversations demonstrate Mrs. Caster's instructional strategies and encouragement during an individual conference:

Conversation #1:

Caster: "Are you enjoying that book?"
 Student: "Yes."

Caster: "Ok, let's read the title first."
 Student: "The Big Bear."
 Caster: "Ok." [The child began reading the book.]
 Student: "We eat the honey."
 Caster: "Does that make sense . . . What do you think that would be?"
 Student: "We had . . ." [The child paused.]
 Caster: "Could it be had?"
 Student: "We ate our honey."
 Caster: "Ok. Nice job. Want to try this one?"

Conversation #2:

Caster: "Shall we read this one again? That was the one you were practicing so hard on."
 Student: "Happy Birthday Hannibal!"
 Caster: "Good for you."
 Student: [The child reads the story]. "We have a birthday. We're so glad. Let's see how many . . ." [The child pauses].
 Caster: "Do you remember one way to tell what a word is . . . to figure out a word?"
 Student: "He has had . . ."
 Caster: "He has had . . . good. It looks to me like you have been reading and practicing."
 Student: "I read the book all the way."

When a student was having a difficult time writing a story and drawing a picture, Mrs. Caster held an individual conference:

Caster: "David, what was your favorite part of the story? Let's look here and see which part you liked the best. That will give you an idea."
 Student: "I liked the turkey one."
 Caster: "Oh, the one where he thought it was a turkey egg? Who said that? Do you remember who said that."
 Student: "Yeah!"
 Caster: "Alright, that is a good thing to draw your picture about and write your story about."
 Student: "I don't know how to draw a chicken."
 Caster: "There is a picture right there. Try . . . just do your best."

Mrs. Rue also held individual conferences with

students. When a student was finished writing a story, Mrs. Rue helped her extend the writing project:

Rue: "Now, you have your very own story about parties. You can make a book of your own. Now, if you had your own party, what else do you have to say? Would you have anything to eat besides the cherry cake?"

Student: "How about ice cream?"

Rue: "So, you might add on to the story and write the ice cream. What kind of ice cream would you have?"

Student: "Vanilla."

Rue: "You might write the ice cream is vanilla. If you had a party, who would you invite?"

Student: "My friends."

Rue: "You could write lots of things. You could write a whole book about parties."

When a child was attempting to learn how to play the piano, Mrs. Rue explained:

"This is a book that starts right at the beginning of learning that. And it shows how to play the songs. So, you start with this one. They want you to start with middle C and middle C is this note here. See how they look like they walked up a ladder. So, you go . . . [Rue demonstrates]

I just played what that said. If you look at that, I bet you could figure that out too."

The child responded, "Do I start here?" Mrs. Rue said, "You start on these two black keys." The child began playing the piano by himself.

Mrs. Rue also held individual conferences with students who had a difficult time following rules:

Rue: "Doug, what can you do if somebody is talking and sitting next to you?"

Student: "Remind them to be quiet."
 Rue: "You can remind them of that.
 Your problem was talking out many
 times. I was trying to do something
 with the map here and you just kept
 yelling. You forgot to think that
 there were twenty one other kids in
 here whose names were on that map too.
 It's really hard for me to deal with
 the rest of the groups when you did
 that. Okay . . . [pause] but thank you very
 much for helping Carrie this morning.
 You did an excellent job."

When a student was having a difficult time listening,
 Mrs. Caster held an individual conference:

Caster: "What do you have to remember
 to do Sarah?"
 Student: "Be quiet."
 Caster: "You have to remember to stay
 quiet so that I can talk to
 you. That's an important part
 too."

Integration of Curriculum.

Both first grade teachers integrated language arts,
 math, science, and social studies.

The structure of the day in Mrs. Caster's classroom was
 established to integrate the curriculum. [See Appendix A]
 During an interview, Mrs. Caster explains how she integrates
 the curriculum in her classroom:

". . . literacy stations are based on
 reading, writing, listening, and
 speaking. At those times, there are
 different kinds of writing and reading
 that children do. Then at another time
 we have what I call developmental
 stations in which they are curriculum
 based-math station, science center,
 blocks, building kinds of things,
 painting [art] . . ."

Often times, Mrs. Caster integrated math with language

arts. During one activity, she gave the students unfix cubes and asked the children to do the following:

- Caster: "Would you please make a train of seven? Make a train of seven with two colors. Can you tell me an equation?"
- Student: "Four oranges plus three blacks equals seven."
- Caster: "Right. This is the way I'll write it. [Mrs. Caster wrote an equation on the blackboard.] Four orange plus three blacks equals seven unfix cubes in all. Is that right?"
- Student: "Yes."
- Caster: "Okay, let me do another one and see if you can help out. Remember, I have to make it seven long and I have to use two colors."

After the students and Mrs. Caster made another train with seven unfix cubes, she asked, "Can you make up a story that goes with this? Two students explained the following:

Student 1:

"My father was a bird catcher and he caught four bluebirds and he caught three blackbirds."

Student 2:

"I had three strawberries and four beans in my garden."

Mrs. Caster responded, "Please write the equation on the board. [The children went to the chalkboard and wrote their math stories].

Math and reading were also integrated during the morning exercise with the calendar:

- Caster: "Okay, I'd like to hear everybody saying it. [The children counted

how many days had passed in the month and then said the days of the week as the teacher pointed to the dates. The children then read the days of the week.]

Thank you. Here we go."

Students: "Friday. Yesterday was Thursday."

Caster: "Tomorrow is . . ."

Students: "Saturday."

Mrs. Rue also arranged the daily schedule to integrate the curriculum. [See Appendix B]. During a science lesson, she integrated language arts with science. Mrs. Rue gave the children a paper muffin cup filled with powders, i.e., sugar, salt, baking powder and plaster of paris. Mrs. Rue then wrote the following directions on a chart for the children to read:

Name

Mix each mystery powder with water.

What happens?

Do any powders get hard?

Add iodine. Something happens.

After the students read the directions, Mrs. Rue explained these directions:

"I'm going to do one experiment with you and then we're going to break up into small groups. You are going to record [write] what you see happen. Tell what happens. These are some of the things you might see happen. Do any powders get hard? Do you feel any heat? Do they disappear? What happens?"

During a morning session in Mrs. Rue's classroom, she integrated science with patterning:

Rue: "What should you expect to see on the 21st when you look up in the sky?

Student: "Full moon."

Rue: "A full one? If you are doing the pattern, you come up with a full moon here. Remember, this is a

pattern. The moon goes through a pattern. What do you think Mary?

Student: "Right half."

Rue: "Ok, let's see. Full moon, left half, new moon, right half. Full moon, left half, new moon, right half. Full moon, left half, new moon, right half. It looks like those kids were right. This should be the right half. Hopefully it is nice weather so you can see it."

During the morning session on a subsequent visit to Mrs. Rue's classroom, she brought a cartoon to share with the students about the moon:

Rue: "I have a cartoon I want to share with you today because when we were keeping track of the moon, one of the important things we needed to remember was this day, February 6th. That's today. And did anybody see the moon this morning?"

Student: "Yes."

Rue: "Sue, what did it look like?"

Student: "Half."

Rue: "Tell us about the sky you saw this morning. She drew a picture of it this morning to show us the colors that she saw."

After the student described the sky to the class, Mrs. Rue explained:

Rue: "In the cartoon, the little girl asks, 'When there's only half a moon, where does the other half go?' Sue, where does the other half go?"

Student: "It's shadow shines on it."

Rue: "It is still there you think?"

Student: "Yes."

Rue: "The moon's not sliced in half with a knife?"

Student: "No."

Rue: "Anybody else have more information?"

Student: "It is in shadow."

Both Mrs. Rue and Mrs. Caster integrated music with

language arts. Songs were written on large charts and used by the whole class or individual children to read and sing along.

However, there is a major difference between Mrs. Caster's and Mrs. Rue's classroom schedule in the area of spelling. While both first grade teachers agreed during their interviews that children should be given the opportunity to read and write for meaning, Mrs. Rue structured a time during the day to work on auditory training of the alphabet sounds. Mrs. Rue explained:

"You have to be able to hear the sounds to be able to spell. Not to read but to spell. And so, the McCracken spelling program seemed to be the most logical one to teach sequential sounds without getting locked into spelling tests where you study the words. There is no testing situation. It is just a lesson on auditory training so they can hear what is in that word. So, they can write it. I felt it was really necessary to add that element in."

In contrast, Mrs. Caster did not structure a formal time of the day for auditory training of alphabet sounds. Instead, Mrs. Caster's instructional strategies for auditory training was done in context, within poems/charts/words during individual conferences or with small groups. However, Mrs. Rue also instructed children on auditory training, in context, during individual conferences and with small groups.

Transitions.

Mrs. Rue and Mrs. Caster provided smooth transitions

They provided signals for the students when new activities were going to begin.

Mrs. Caster used a timer to signal children for a new activity:

"[The timer goes off]. Ok boys and girls. That was the timer and now it's time for partner reading. I will count to five and see who can find a partner by the time I get to five."

Since the children in Mrs. Caster's classroom sat and worked together in groups, she gave stars to groups that were ready for the next class activity:

"Ok, let's see who is ready. Well, Group one is ready. [Mrs. Caster wrote stars on the chalkboard for each group that was ready for the story].

In the same way that Mrs. Caster used a timer to signal for the next class activity, Mrs. Rue played the piano or chimed a bell as a signal:

"Oh my, I am still missing a bunch of children for morning opening. I'll play another verse."

Mrs. Rue would often write directions on the chalkboard to get ready for a new activity. When it was time for the children to go to lunch, Mrs. Rue wrote the following on the chalkboard:

"Sit in your chair. If you are hungry, put your head down."

Then Mrs. Rue said, "Let's see if the whole group can line up quietly."

Often times, Mrs. Caster prepared children for the next activity by giving examples of what she expected:

"Ok, what's the next job? Group four and Group five are ready . Their table is nice. They have a work space in front of them. They're ready for the next job."

Many times, Mrs. Rue prepared students for a new activity through relaxation techniques:

"Ok, we had a real exciting recess but now we are back in the classroom and we need to remember what our job is here in the classroom. So before we start Science, we are going to relax and focus. I want you to take a nice deep breath. Breathing is quiet. Hold your breath. Blow it out. Hold your breath. Blow it out."

Recognition.

Mrs. Caster gave positive feedback for student response, work, and/or following directions. During an integrated writing and math activity, Mrs. Caster made the following announcement to the class:

"I am happy to announce that these boys did their job. They did five stories with five equations. Thank you."

After a group of students sang a song in the morning, Mrs. Caster replied, "They sang the whole song. Thank you very much. It was lovely." Often times, Mrs. Caster made positive comments during individual conferences:

"I like the way you are reading just as though you were telling me a story. You did a very nice job."

During a measurement activity, Mrs. Caster said to a student, "Sam, that is good thinking. I am glad that you are thinking about that. That is very good."

Mrs. Rue also made positive comments to students as demonstrated by the following examples: 1) "Thank you. You did a nice job"; 2) "You did really well"; 3) "You did wonderfully well"; 4) "Those pictures are outstanding"; and 5) "Look at those great spaces. It makes it easier for Mrs. Rue to read it."

Teacher's Role

Instructor.

Mrs. Rue provided directives and/or clarified directions for class assignments.

During a science activity, Mrs. Rue explained the following directions:

"You're going to need to listen real carefully to directions . . . We are going to try to cause a chemical reaction. Before you pour the powder, you put water in the cup first. Then you pour the powder in and then you take a stick, one stick for each powder. You are going to mix it up."

Mrs. Caster also provided directions for class assignments:

"Your first job is to cut out and paste on to the farm. The second part is to label what is on your farm. Please put your name on the paper."

During class activities, both teachers would often clarify directions with students. Before Mrs. Rue's students started a writer's workshop activity, she asked, "Ok tell me again what you are working on." During a math activity, Mrs. Caster said, "Stop, look, and listen. What's your first job? What's your second job?"

Mrs. Rue clarified directions through student feedback:

"Raise your hand if you already know what it is you are working on today."

In the same way, Mrs. Caster clarified directions with students before they started a coloring project:

"You may use crayons and markers. Raise your hand if you know what I mean when I say 'may use crayons and markers'. Raise your hand if you need us to tell you what it means."

Process Teacher/Facilitator.

Mrs. Rue and Mrs. Caster facilitated the learning process through modeling, accepting student input, promoting thinking skills, making sense, problem solving, promoting student accountability and ownership of learning and behavior, and through promoting interaction and cooperation in the classroom.

During an interview, Mrs. Caster explained what her role is during the writing process:

"I am kind of the guide. I am a model for them. So, when I write something, they are watching me write. I am talking about what I am doing constantly. For instance, we have a time during the day that we call Daily News. They tell me what's happened and we make it into a newspaper that is used for reading material. When I am doing that, they are watching me. I am modeling that we need to put a period, a capital letter, a question mark or something like that. I think that is my role, to call that to their attention."

During an individual conference, the following conversation ensued with Mrs. Caster and a student:

Caster: "I am going to read it for you
John and you watch me." [Caster
reads the sentence]. But on the
way back, he saw . . ."
Student: ". . . a red car."
Caster: "Good."

For a math lesson Mrs. Caster modeled an equation for the student's understanding:

"I want to show you something. Here's my raisin bread and I am going to make up a story. This bread has seven raisins in it. I'm not hungry so I'm going to cut my bread into pieces and I'm only going to eat part of it. If I take this part away, I will have a math problem. I am going to make an equation that matches my story. Seven raisins take away three, how many raisins are left?"

Mrs. Caster facilitated the learning process through student input and thinking skills. Rather than giving a direct answer for a student's question, Mrs. Caster encouraged the students to apply thinking skills. After Mrs. Caster read a story to the class, a student asked for the meaning of "hypnotized." She replied, "That's a good question. What does it mean to be hypnotized?" A child responded, "You get real sleepy." Mrs. Caster responded, "Ok, what happens to you while you are hypnotized?" There was silence, a pause and then a child replied, "There's kind of a word . . . I saw on T.V. . . . kind of like a word and when you say that . . . [pause]." Mrs. Caster responded,

"There's a special word that you hear and then you stop being hypnotized."

Often times, Mrs. Caster asked her students to solve problems regarding misbehavior. During an interview with Mrs. Caster, she explained what she would do if a student became upset and threw a book, started screaming and swore at her:

"... if there were two involved in that problem, I would ask them to talk it out, to decide how to solve the problem rather than throwing something. I think they need to develop a way to have another choice, another way to solve the problem."

Mrs. Caster sought to improve the childrens' problem solving skills in other areas of the curriculum. During a math activity, she held the following conversation with her students:

Caster: "We have lots of unifix cubes. Everyone is going to get some. Raise your hand if you know a good way to figure out how everyone in here is going to have two different colors".

Student: "We can talk to each other and agree."

Caster: "That's a good way. Do you think it's really a good idea to have everybody up there all at one time? [Unifix cubes are located on a shelf in the classroom]."

Student: "No."

Caster: "Will that help? [Pause]. What's wrong with that?" [Pause].

Student: "It's not polite."

Caster: "It's really not polite. Suppose you want the same color, then what?"

Student: "If you both have the same colors, you could say there's two colors that we both have. How about we

take a color from the middle and then they [each] have two colors too. How about we have [give] one of the colors that we want."

Caster: "So, each would give one color instead of having two colors that you wanted. Good idea. Ok, I am going to be watching how you are going to figure out who gets what color and everyone is happy."

When a student shoved another student in Mrs. Caster's classroom, she went over to the two children and said, "That doesn't help, does it? Find a place and see what you can do to solve your problem."

Mrs. Caster encouraged children to be accountable for their learning and behavior. She explained:

"[that in] I think everything that I do, I try to make them responsible for the learning. For instance, giving them choices and making them responsible. So, if they realize that I'm not responsible for what they read for their choice, I'm not responsible for fixing what needs to be fixed. That is their responsibility."

During a math activity, the children were measuring strings of paper clips. A child came up to Mrs. Caster and said, "He messed it [string of paper clips] up." Mrs. Caster replied, "Fix it [pause] and then get back to your project."

During a writing activity, a child asked Mrs. Caster, "Will you write our names on this?" Mrs. Caster responded, "How about you write your names on that. I think [that] it would be a good idea for you to write your names on that."

While Mrs. Caster was holding individual conferences, she stopped and said, "I need to stop. Give yourself a

checkup [to the class]. At reading time, what do you need to be doing?

During an individual conference, Mrs. Caster explained to a student that ". . . this is a time when you have to figure it out."

Mrs. Caster facilitated cooperation and interaction among her students. During an interview with Mrs. Caster, she explained:

"My job is to help these children become independent learners. I think it is important for them to learn to cooperate, to learn from each other. I am the facilitator of that learning. I do a lot of it by modeling and creating experiences to allow them to have the time. The atmosphere has to lend itself to that. So, I think that if I provide the atmosphere and I do some modeling and I give some choices, you see it happening and unfolding."

When a student brought a book for sharing, Mrs. Caster made the following announcement to the class:

"Today Mary brought a book that she would like to review for people who would like to read it. Let me see if we have an audience for Mary who has brought this book to review for you. [Mary shared her book with the class]."

During a math activity, Mrs. Caster explained:

". . . you will be working with a partner. Tell a story to your partner, then the partner will record the equation onto the paper."

After Mrs. Caster's students completed writing assignments, they shared them with the class. When a student was finished reading his story to the class, Mrs.

Caster asked, "Will you please call on somebody else to respond to your letter?" A child replied, "She had all the parts of the letter." Mrs. Caster responded, "Please call on somebody else to read next."

During the morning opening, Mrs. Caster stated, "I am looking for teams of readers." Groups of students took turns reading and singing chart stories.

When a student was having a difficult time with a pattern in a story, Mrs. Caster made the following comment to the class:

"Raise your hand if you would like to be Suzie's helper and get together with Suzie to think one up. [Hands go up.] Suzie, choose somebody to help you."

Mrs. Rue also acted as a process teacher/facilitator in the classroom.

During a Science activity, Mrs. Rue modeled how to draw a chick as the children drew a chick at their desks:

"Go to the top of the yolk. Make a head with a big pointed beak, then you take your pencil and draw a line down the middle of the beak to show that it opens and closes."

When the students were studying chemical reactions, Mrs. Rue modeled how mix powders as the children observed:

"Now, in chemistry, sometimes real exciting things happen. Okay, I'm mixing it up. Now we're going to look at what happens. Is the powder still white?"

Mrs. Rue also facilitated the learning process through

student input and thinking skills. Often times, Mrs. Rue would ask students to figure out and/or solve a problem. When Mrs. Rue's students were playing a math game, she explained:

"Ok, you have to figure out a way for these guys to be neighbors. Now, my suggestion is that the three is way over here on the other side of the town. Let's cross it out. Do you see? Is there a three close to these two? What else do you need to make six?"

Mrs. Rue also encouraged the students to problem solve and be accountable for their learning and behavior. When a group of students were planning a play, she said, "What you have to decide is what part you want to do. Get together and talk . . ."

During a writing activity, Mrs. Rue explained the following to a student:

"You need to write what you did last weekend so Mrs. Rue can write [back] to you. What are you going to tell Mrs. Rue?"

When a student asked Mrs. Rue, "Is this ten . . . 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10?" Mrs. Rue replied, "That's right. You didn't have to ask me. You counted it and found out it was right all by yourself . . . didn't you? You are doing a great job Mary."

When a student handed his work to Mrs. Rue, she said, "Remember how you were supposed to tell me if they were all right?" The student replied, "Yes."

Mrs. Rue facilitated cooperation and interaction in the classroom. When a student asked Mrs. Rue to help her read the morning directions on the board, she replied, ". . . ask John who has already read it to help you. Find someone who has already read it to help you."

When a student didn't understand how to play a computer game, Mrs. Rue asked another student the following:

"David, can you tell Suzie what you are doing because she would like to do this game [but] she hasn't had much time with the computers. Could you explain to her what you are doing?"

After David agreed to help Suzie, Mrs. Rue said to her, "So, watch David and see if you can figure out how to play it."

During an interview with Mrs. Rue, she explained the role of the teacher:

". . . what happens in each time block is sometimes decided on when it is happening. When I look around the room and look at kids, I'm trying to think about what it is that each child needs to learn next. [My] role is to facilitate learning. My job is to look at each individual child and figure out where they are as far as their academic growth and emotional development and to get them to go as far with it as they can. But, I don't feel that I am an authoritarian in the classroom."

Coach.

Both teachers encouraged and instructed students on an individual basis, listened to students, guided and fostered ideas, asked and answered students' questions.

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, a student was having difficulty with an assignment. Mrs. Caster said, "Bring your pencil and paper over here John and I will help you out."

During an individual conference, a student was trying to figure out a sentence. After several attempts, Mrs. Caster said, "I will read with you this time."

During a writing activity, a student accidentally ripped his paper. Mrs. Caster asked, "Can we work this out? I think we need to get the tape and fix that and then you can go on with your project."

When a student was having difficulty with a measurement activity, he said to Mrs. Caster, "I can't make it long Mrs. Caster." Mrs. Caster replied, "Oh, it doesn't have to be that long Sam. You can make it as long as you like." The child responded, "I can't make it long." Mrs. Caster replied, "Try. It can be as long as you like Sam. It doesn't need to be as long as Mary's."

During an interview with one of Mrs. Caster's students, he explained how his teacher helps him:

"She explains how to do what kind of stuff that we do. If we did a puppet book, she would help us. She explains it so that we understand better."

Another student explained during an interview that "if you raise your hand, she [Mrs. Caster] will come over and help you."

Mrs. Rue also coached her students during the learning process. When a student was having difficulty with a writing project, Mrs. Rue said, "Josh, do you need some encouragement over there? I want you to do the best job you can."

During the morning session, a child asked Mrs. Rue, "How do you do this? What do I do on here?" Mrs. Rue replied, "Oh, nine is kind of a big number isn't it? So, we are probably going to have to start with one that has the most dots in it."

When the students were working on a science project, Mrs. Rue said, "Nobody has decided that they can't do it . . . you are willing to try . . . and that is really important when you are a scientist."

While a student was writing and illustrating a story, the following conversation ensued:

Rue: ". . . this looks like a Tyrannosaurus Rex. Is that what that is?"
Student: "Yes."
Rue: "Is this an alligator kind of dinosaur?"
Student: "No, that's the kind of guy that has three horns."
Rue: "Oh, a Triceratops."
Student: "Yes."
Rue: "Alright, if you need some ideas for dinosaurs, I have a whole section of dinosaur books."
Student: "Where?"
Rue: "If you would like me to get them out for you I will."
Student: "Yes."
Rue: "Ok." [Mrs. Rue went to the cupboard to get dinosaur books for the student].

When a student was writing a story, Mrs. Rue said, "Brian, you know what? I would like to get you a longer pencil. It's really tough to write with a pencil that is so very little."

Monitor.

Mrs. Rue and Mrs. Caster checked on student progress and understanding through observations, moving spontaneously about the room, sometimes filling individual student portfolios with anecdotal notes.

During an interview with Mrs. Rue, she explained:

"Some days I just sit in the corner and write down anecdotal records of everybody and what they do during that period."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue how she determines the needs of her students, she responded, "If I want to get an assessment of them [for reading], I might choose a book they have never read before. I listen to them read one to one." Mrs. Rue then explained, "Every morning they read the board and I watch what they are doing. I keep anecdotal notes on all the kids."

Mrs. Caster also monitored student progress through observation and writing anecdotal notes. She explained, "I keep portfolios for each child . . . that's what we are calling them now . . . sometimes, I will just talk to them to find out how they are doing."

Both teachers moved spontaneously about the room to check on student progress. When a student was working on a writing project, Mrs. Rue stopped and said, "What you need

to do is start writing some sentence patterns so you can practice them. You can write 'a doll' or you can write 'the doll'. What I would like you to do is write a sentence about the doll then check with me in just a minute."

When Mrs. Caster's students were working on a math activity, she went over to a group and said, "How are we doing here?" A child responded, "Good." Mrs. Caster replied, "It looks like you are ready to measure. Make an estimation and then measure that."

During a writing activity, Mrs. Caster circulated in the classroom. She observed that many students did not understand the assignment. The following conversation ensued:

Caster: "What do you have to put at the end Mary?"
 Student: "Put a period."
 Caster: "Yes, if you are ending your sentence you have to put a period there. What else do you have to put at the end of a letter . . . if you are writing somebody a letter?"
 Student: "You have . . . [pause]"
 Caster: "Just a minute Mary. I want to be sure everyone hears this. Are you listening class? Please listen to Mary."
 Student: "You have to say good-bye."
 Caster: "Oh, you have to say good-bye. How do you say that at the end of a letter?"
 Student: "You say from and write your name."
 Caster: "Yes, what other things do people say at the end of a letter?"
 Student: "Love."
 Caster: "Yes, they say love and a comma and write their name."

During an interview with Mrs. Caster, she explained how she assists her students with their schoolwork:

"I circulate around the room and if there is a child that needs help or wants a conference or something like that, I will stop. If it's writing, I will have him read what he has written. I will hold a conference and we will discuss what is going on no matter what the subject was."

Manager.

Both first grade, whole language teachers managed schedules, times, dates and materials for assignments and projects, kept students on task, checked and/or marked off assignments.

After a timer had gone off in Mrs. Caster's classroom, she said, "I am going to put on more minutes for finishing up."

Later in the day, when the timer went off, she explained:

"Boys and girls, that signal means that we must put our things away neatly into the tub and the person in charge puts the tubs away."

During a writing project, Mrs. Caster announced to the class:

"Please raise your hand if you need a little more time to write on your paper."

When students were finished with literacy stations in the morning, Mrs. Caster checked on their assignment:

"I'm doing a little checkup. Stop, look, and listen. Did you put your name on the paper? [Do] good checking on yourself."

After the students had completed a cut and paste

project, Mrs. Caster explained to the children what to do with their assignment:

"Be sure that you glue it [paper] on so it doesn't get lost. When we pick up the papers, [be sure] everything is together . . . all the parts are together."

In the morning, Mrs. Caster checked on the students' choices for literacy stations:

"I am having a literacy station check up. Raise your hand if you can tell me what you have already chosen."

Before recess, Mrs. Caster said:

"Remember, I want to know who you worked with. You may bring me your farm paper and then you may go to break. This is [done] very orderly."

When students were getting ready to go to lunch, Mrs. Caster explained to the students what "ready" meant:

"Be thinking of what ready means . . . [pause]. It means not touching anybody. It means getting stuff ready to go."

Mrs. Rue also acted as a classroom manager before a project or new activity began:

"Okay, it's time to stop. Think about a couple of things before you move. One, put your work in a place so that you can find it tomorrow. If it isn't finished, put it back in your folder. If you have felt pens, be sure they are put away with the lids so that we can use them again."

Before dismissing the students for recess, Mrs. Rue explained:

"As I pick up your paper, you may go right out to recess because we are quite late."

Mrs. Rue managed assignments by checking them off at completion. As the students were writing in their journals, Mrs. Rue explained the following to a student:

"I'll go ahead and initial here, but then you have to write a little bit more about what you did last weekend. Okay?"

Mrs. Rue asked another student during journal time, "Are you done with your journal? Did you get this signed off? Are you all finished up?"

Mrs. Rue kept the students on task in the classroom. While a group of students were singing a song to the rest of the class, Mrs. Rue announced:

"Oh, I have to stop. Some people have forgotten what it means to be part of the chorus or part of the audience. If we are part of the chorus, what do we do? Sam?"

Sam responded, "We sing." Mrs. Rue then asked, "If we are part of the audience, what do we do? Diane?" Diane replied, "Listen."

Student's Role

Instructor.

The students in both first grade classrooms sometimes acted as instructors. When the students were getting ready to work on an art project in Mrs. Caster's classroom, a child raised his hand and gave the following directions to the class:

"Outline with markers and color in with crayons."

Mrs. Caster replied, "And why do we do that?" The student responded, ". . . because if you color in with markers, you get a big hole in the page."

During the morning opening, Mrs. Caster announced the following to the class:

"We'll wait for the teacher. Are you ready to be teacher?"

A student, who was holding a large magic wand replied, "Yes," and then proceeded to direct the class to read and sing a chart story as he pointed to the words with the wand.

During Daily Oral Language, Mrs. Caster's students read, "who wants to hide?" Mrs. Caster asked, "Who knows what's wrong?" The following conversation ensued:

Student: "It needs a capital "W".

Caster: "Oh, would you teach us why it needs a capital "W" please."

Student: "Because it's at the beginning of the sentence."

Caster: "Thank you so much for your real good teaching."

During a math activity, Mrs. Caster said to a student, "Let me see. Stand up George. Be the teacher. Show [us] the equation you are going to use."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, the students also acted as instructors. For example, the students were given the opportunity to bring an object from home to share with the class. They brought their objects in brown paper sacks which had clues written on them. When it was a student's turn to share, he acted as the teacher. A student began the session by reading the clues:

"I have two clues for you . . . you wear it on your hand and wrist."

After the students in the class made guesses, the student who was sharing explained the rules which needed to be followed to look at the contents:

"You ask me [first] and [then] you can put it on."

During the morning opening, the students in Mrs. Rue's classroom often acted as instructors. When the students were working on pattern reading, a student was at the front of the class leading:

"Bunny, bunny, parasol, bunny, bunny."

Mrs. Rue said the following to the student who was in charge; "Decide wherever you want to stop and see if you can keep the kids together."

The students in Mrs. Rue's classroom also had opportunities to lead songs:

"Okay, may I have your attention please. Carrie is ready for us. Now, Carrie would like to start our morning by singing "One Light, One Sun." She chose that song for the morning."

When the students were working on their morning assignments, Mrs. Rue said to a student, ". . . you be the teacher and explain that to them."

Process Learner.

The students in Mrs. Rue's and Mrs. Caster's classroom analyzed information; students asked questions, made observations, choices and decisions to solve problems and make sense of the results.

When a student in Mrs. Caster's classroom had been working on a writing activity, the following conversation took place:

Student: "Mrs. Caster, I made a mistake."
 Caster: "How did you do that?"
 Student: "I made the chicken look too big."
 Caster: "Well, what are you going to do?
 It's going to be a problem isn't it?"
 Student: "Ugh-huh."
 Caster: "What do you think you could do about it? Why don't you think about that for a minute and then come tell me what you decide to do."

A few minutes later, the student went to Mrs. Caster and said, "I could start over again." Mrs. Caster replied, "Start over again . . . well, that's a choice. If you want to do that, that is a lot of work, but if you choose to do that, it would be fine."

During a reading conference with Mrs. Caster, the students processed information to figure out words:

Student: "The little man jumped. He liked to jump."
 Caster: "Ok, he jumped high."
 Student: [Pause . . . the student is trying to figure out the words].
 Caster: "Does it look like this one?"
 Student: ". . . jump . . . [pause] . . . I can't jump. I like to sit."
 Caster: "Very good problem solving."

During another reading conference, a student was reading an old fashioned rhyme:

Student: "Pussycat, pussycat, what did you there?"
 Caster: "Does that sound alright? You have a funny look on your face. This book is an old fashioned rhyme."
 Student: "Well, I kept saying that over a

couple of times because it didn't make sense and then I thought it made sense after awhile."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, the students processed information, asked questions, made observations, choices and decisions to solve problems and make sense.

After Mrs. Rue had modeled how to mix powders for a chemical reaction, she said, "Someone observed that the powder disappeared. That's called dissolved." Then Mrs. Rue asked, "What happened to the powder that disappeared? Write down what happens."

For another science activity, Mrs. Rue had eggs in an incubator in the classroom. The students were asked to compare/contrast differences between the development of a chick at ten days with a chick at seven days:

Rue: "This is the drawing for day ten. Look very carefully. Some very big changes have happened. This is my old drawing of day seven. I want you to look at these two and tell me what are the changes that have happened for day ten. What are the things that are different now?"

Student: "The heart isn't showing and there is a beak growing."

Rue: "Two good observations. Does anybody else see a difference?"

Student: "The yolk is lower than the other one."

Rue: "Excellent. Can you tell me why the yolk is smaller? What is happening to make the yolk smaller?"

Student: "He's eating it."

Rue: "Is there any other change that you notice?"

Student: "The color . . . one is light and one is yellow."

Rue: "Ah, why do you think this chick is colored yellow?"

Student: "He is growing feathers."
Rue: "As of today, if we cracked that egg open, we would find the baby chick' has started to grow his feathers. So, when you go to your desks today, you are going to need something different because we have been the skin with pink. What three colors of crayons do we need?"
Student: "Red, yellow, . . . [pause] . . . and orange."
Rue: "And orange for the yolk."

The students in Mrs. Rue's classroom also processed information during the reading process. When the researcher asked Mrs. Rue why she thought students tend to make fewer mistakes in meaning during writing, she replied, "Because they make up what it is they want to say and it makes sense to them."

Peer Teacher.

In Mrs. Caster's classroom, the students collaborated, interacted and coached each other in the learning process.

During reading time in the afternoon, Mrs. Caster said, "I want to see everyone busy reading. Remember the rules for reading. You read the first part alone and the second part with a partner." As the children were reading, Mrs. Caster held conferences. As she was working with two students, she said, "Now, which story are we going to read?" The students discussed the question among themselves and replied, "You Can Too." Mrs. Caster responded, "Oh, we all agree."

When two students in Mrs. Caster's classroom were working on a writing project together, the following conversation took place:

Student 1: "Okay, you do five and then I'll do five."
 Student 2: "No Mary, you've got to write."
 Student 1: "I'll tell you what to write on it."
 Student 2: "No, you don't have to do that. I have to write it here . . . [pause]"
 Student 1: "Now my turn to write."
 Student 2: "Here, I'll put your name down."
 Student 1: "Okay, you get your's ready."
 Student 2: "I did the first one."
 Student 1: "How do you do that?"
 Student 2: "On this one you've got to circle it."
 Student 1: "I know what to do."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Caster during an interview if students help each other edit, she explained:

"There is a lot of peer teaching going on. Children do help each other. They do it together as a cooperative effort."

In Mrs. Rue's classroom, the students also acted as peer teachers. After the morning opening, one student said to another student, "At writer's workshop, do you want me to help you?" The second child responded, "This is writer's workshop. I'll help you. Ok?" The first child began to read his story, "I'm going to make you baby airplanes. I like you." The second child went to his desk for crayons, came back and helped the first student illustrate his story by drawing an airplane.

The students in Mrs. Rue's classroom often helped each other to build objects. While two students were building a castle out of blocks, the following conversation took place:

Student 1: "I'm making this one for a door right here but there's a magic key and then you can open it. Right?"
 Student 2: "Yeah."

- Student 1: "This is the thing you have to have to open it . . . it works for the bad guys, if they have a key."
- Student 2: "Yeah, they also have a magic key. This is a door. See, it's a trap . . . if the bad guys ever . . . "

Evaluator.

In both first grade classrooms, the students evaluated and corrected their schoolwork and/or provided feedback for their peers' schoolwork.

When the students were getting ready for an auditory spelling lesson, a student handed out papers to all of the children. At the end of the lesson, Mrs. Rue explained:

"We are going to correct these together so you can catch the sounds you missed. John is going to write the letters on the chalkboard. If you missed something, fix it now."

While the students were completing their morning assignments, Mrs. Rue said, "Ok, Jennie is going to check your paper and if there is something wrong, she will let you know and if not, she will put a big star at the top and put it on the square table."

The students in Mrs. Rue's classroom evaluated and edited their stories. When a student was done writing a story, she took it to Mrs. Rue who said, "You're sure this is the best?" The student replied, "Yes." Mrs. Rue responded, "I'll type this into the computer for you so you can start editing."

During a math activity in Mrs. Caster's classroom, the children evaluated their work. After the students had

written math equations in groups, Mrs. Caster asked, "How could you check to find out if it's true?" A student replied, "We could help each other count them."

After the students were done with the morning session, Mrs. Caster asked, "Will the inspectors give us a report on how we did this morning?"

When the researcher asked Mrs. Caster during an interview what she would do if a student made a mistake while he is reading or writing text, she explained:

"When I am conferencing with a child, and a child is reading to me, the best thing to do is nothing which gives the child the opportunity to self correct."

Manager.

In Mrs. Rue's and Mrs. Caster's classroom, the students acted as managers. When the students were working on a writing activity, Mrs. Caster said, "If you are the person in charge today, would you get the markers please from your table."

After the students were done reading, Mrs. Caster explained:

"The person in charge needs to put the books back neatly into the box where they belong."

During the morning opening, Mrs. Caster asked, "Jane, what is the last job?" Jane replied, "The sentence." A student, whose job it was to read the sentence responded, "Today is Friday, February 8, 1991. We are going to play musical chairs." After the sentence had been read, Mrs.

Caster said, "Oh, we forgot. Suzanne has to announce the weather . . . she fixed it all nice and we'd better let her announce it."

During the morning opening in Mrs. Rue's classroom, she said, "Let's go over the jobs again. Jan is in charge of letters. Mary will feed Goldie. Jason, the calendar job is still for you." Jason pointed to the board and read, "Yesterday was Sunday, January 23, 1991. Today is January 28, 1991." Another child got up and put markers in the calendar. Mrs. Rue then said, "I'm going to sit over here and let Jennie do her job [Jennie has a magic wand. She is reading the "Today Chart" to explain what the children were going to do for the day].

After the students had started their morning assignments, a student went to Mrs. Rue and said, "Can we do the lunch count?" Mrs. Rue responded, "Oh, absolutely, do the lunch count." The student counted the children for hot and cold lunch and took the count to the office.

Judicious Discipline (1) (Anderson-Fourth Grade) paired with
Judicious Discipline (2) (Oliver-Fourth Grade).

Classroom Climate

Respect.

Mrs. Anderson and Mrs. Oliver showed a courteous regard for other people's dignity and feelings, treated the children fairly, recognized individual differences and showed a high regard for the constitutional rights of others.

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained what she would do if somebody took something that belonged to someone else:

"We just had this happen. Mary had come to me and said that Suzie has taken my pencil. I said, 'Have you talked to her?' Mary said, 'Okay, I'll talk to her.' I said, 'I think that people might be able to hear us and I think we should do this at a different time.' So, they came at lunch time. It was decided between the two of them that Mary would meet Suzie at the store this morning and Suzie would buy her some pencils. They talked about friends and who all knew about this and talked about in the future, what do we need to do and Suzie's feelings so that everybody doesn't dislike her."

Mrs. Oliver also demonstrated respect for a student's dignity and feelings when she explained what she would do if a student became upset in the classroom, threw a book and started screaming:

"I would go to them and say, 'Do you want to go outside and talk about this?' [After] we went in the hall and if it looks like this is going to take a long time, I would say, 'You know, I really do want to talk to you about this. But, my whole class is needing attention too. Do you think you could wait? Do you want to wait out here or do you want to go back in your classroom?'"

A student in Mrs. Oliver's class explained what his teacher would do if during classtime he called one of his friends a bad name:

"Well, she [Mrs. Oliver] would take you in the hall and talk to you about it and what happened and that kind of stuff."

When Mrs. Oliver placed students in cooperative learning groups, she considered the needs and feelings of

her students. She gave the following explanation to the researcher during an interview:

" . . . by getting to know them [I find] who needs a certain kind of person with them and who needs a friend and who would be a good friend for someone and so I might put them together so a friendship might develop."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, she had a "Speak Out Board" for the students. She explained its purpose and the rules that the children were expected to follow:

"That is for their opinions. They can write anything as long as it isn't hurting someone's feelings."

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Oliver's students if his teacher was fair, he replied:

"Yes, because she gives you lots of chances and lets you think of consequences and when you don't get something done right . . . she would help you out."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver how she helped her students, she responded, "Anyone that came up to me and said, 'I am having a problem with this', I would sit down with them and help them."

Another student in Mrs. Oliver's class explained why she thought her teacher was fair:

"Well, I think she is fair because she . . . it's hard to explain . . . let me think . . . [pause] . . . I think she is fair because she let's you think about what you have done. She gets a consequence to fit what you did. Like if you threw something at somebody, she wouldn't say, 'You don't have recess for one year' or something like that. She gets a consequence to fit the crime."

When the researcher asked the student who decides the consequences, she replied, "You do, you do it. She let's us think about it. If you need help, she [Mrs. Oliver] will help you with it."

Mrs. Anderson also treated children with respect and dignity. During a conversation with her students, she explained what would happen if a new student enrolled in the classroom:

"We need to think about how we would help someone coming in new feel comfortable. It has taken us awhile to get to know each other. We need to think about that between now and Monday. I have this feeling that we might be getting a new student."

When I asked her what she would do if a student swore at her, she replied:

"I would go over and whisper in their ear that this is a courteous issue. 'You need to be courteous to other people.' I would tell them that we need to talk about it and when would be an okay time. If the manner was alright and the place was okay, then we would go ahead and take care of it right there. If it wasn't, then I would arrange a time and place and talk to them about manners."

During an interview, Mrs. Anderson explained what she would do if a child started screaming in the classroom:

". . . if there is activity in the classroom and I can get the child to calm down right there, then I would do that. If it's quiet in the classroom and the students need to be able to go on and this will be very disruptive to them, then the child and I would meet outside of the classroom. I would ask him if he needs time to calm his mind and muscles or if he needs time to work through [the problem].

A student in Mrs. Anderson's classroom explained during an interview what would happen if a student broke a rule in the classroom:

"She [Mrs. Anderson] would talk to us out in the hall."

One of Mrs. Anderson's students explained why his teacher was fair:

". . . she gives us equal chances to go up to the front of the class and things like that. She treats us with respect and thinks of other people's feelings."

When a student went to the front of the classroom to give a report, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"People who come to the front of the room deserve everyone's attention. There shouldn't be anything else going on."

Another student in Mrs. Anderson's class explained why his teacher was fair:

"Well, she let's us pick things and we just have a lot of fun. She is nice to us and she helps us with stuff. She treats us really good."

When the students in Mrs. Anderson's class were working in groups for a social studies project, she made the following announcement to the class:

"How many teams are ready? [The students raised their hands]. Ok, we need to draw our order. It is only fair that we draw. It wouldn't be fair for us to go 1,2,3, 4,5 . . . that wouldn't be fair. So, we need to draw our order."

When I asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's classroom how he treats his peers, he explained the following:

"I think I treat them fair, not to get in fights and be friendly. But, I don't think she [Mrs. Anderson] cares too much if I was mad at somebody and didn't talk to them because that is really not her business and stuff, unless it was a problem."

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Anderson's students how other children in the classroom treat him, he replied, "They show respect for me. They are friendly and don't get mad at me and don't yell at me. They offer to play with me or they talk to me and stuff."

Mrs. Oliver showed a high regard for student's constitutional rights. During an interview, she explained how she taught her student's about their constitutional rights at the beginning of the school year:

"We talked about the United States, how and why the Revolutionary War was fought, and we talked about what was important to those people over 200 years ago. That was the process. We used history first and then we went to what it was like today and that it would be the same thing in the classroom. Everyone had a right not to have someone going through their desk without asking them. The kids loved doing that, telling examples of search and seizure, giving examples of freedom of speech. They loved doing that."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver what kind of history she talked about for search and seizure, she explained the following:

". . . the British taking arms, going through houses, coming in and taking food. Basically, we did a lot with the Revolutionary War and when the Constitution was made."

Mrs. Oliver explained due process to her students this way:

"Due process was just that they [students] had the right to not have anyone search their things without their permission and also they had to be told something before they were given a consequence. That was real interesting for them because they are very used to having their rights taken away without due process. I think that was real important for them."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver if she explained to her students how they lose their rights, she explained:

". . . like if their freedom of speech infringed on somebody else's right or the group right then they would be given due process and then their right would be taken away."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver what she would do if a student wanted to wear his hat during classtime, she explained:

"We have decided that it was alright to do that. They can wear what they want. They can wear it in the classroom. As a class, we decided that was alright. That would be their right to wear it, unless it was disturbing someone else."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom demonstrated an understanding of their constitutional rights and how they applied in the classroom shown by the following conversation between the teacher and students:

Oliver: "Who can give me an example of search and seizure?"
Student: "If somebody didn't have a pencil and they are sitting next to you, you just can't get in and get their pencil out of their desk and take it."
Oliver: "That's right. Mary?"
Mary: "Sometimes, like a little toy, you can't come and take it away from them and put it on your desk without a warning."
Oliver: "What do I have to do?"

Mary: "You have to tell them, warn them first. For instance, if Sally was playing with her pen, you would go, 'Sally, please put that pen up and don't play with it.' For a minute, she put it up and then she takes it back out and she starts playing with it again. You have the right to take it away from her, for a little bit."

Oliver: "Okay. Sam?"

Sam: "If Kathy said that red tights were illegal, they [the police] just couldn't walk into your house and arrest you. [They have to] give you time. They would have to tell you red tights were illegal and give you time to get rid of all your red tights."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class also understood how they lose their constitutional rights. The following are student responses to Mrs. Oliver's questions on the Compelling State Interests:

Oliver: "Due process, what does that mean?"

Student: "Have to have a warning."

Oliver: "Tell me about Health and Safety."

Student: "If you punch people, that is not being safe."

Student: "Throwing food."

Student: "If you were sick and sneezed on people, that wouldn't be safe for others."

Student: "Going down head first on a slide."

Oliver: "Tell me about Property Loss or Damage."

Student: "Can't just take something. [You] have to ask."

Student: "Bending an encyclopedia."

Student: "If you go over to someone's desk and break the lead or pencil."

Oliver: "Legitimate Educational Purpose, can you give examples of that?"

Student: "Not having stuff at school, then you can't learn. No scissors or glue."

Student: "Glasses for reading, gym shoes."

Oliver: "Serious disruption, what is that?"

Student: "Someone gets up and belched."

Student: "A fight."

Student: "Fall over a chair during a spelling test."

Oliver: "Yes, a serious disruption is something that disrupts everyone's learning."

Mrs. Oliver showed respect for individual differences and a child's dignity by giving the students an opportunity to choose consequences for their behavior. This is demonstrated by the following conversation between Mrs. Oliver and her students:

Oliver: "How do we decide consequences?"

Student: "We think of things that will help us learn."

Student: "If we did something wrong, we would make up a consequence for ourselves."

Student: "If you are talking during reading, you would go out into the hall and decide on a consequence and what is going to happen."

Student: "If you are not doing anything in group share, then we would think of a consequence."

Student: "In this school, you have your rights and choose your consequences."

Oliver: "Do you feel mad when you make consequences?"

Student: "No."

Oliver: "When the teacher makes the consequences?"

Student: "Yes."

Mrs. Anderson also showed a high regard for student's constitutional rights. When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson what she would do if she knew someone stole something, she replied:

"I would talk to the student. I would ask him why they think I need to talk to him. I would ask him what happened. Tell me in your own words because sometimes they have permission to take it, sometimes they didn't. I just want to hear the student's side of what I saw. If they took it, then I would talk to them about the need of other people to feel their property is safe and that their need is far greater than their need to take it and so you need to return it. If

it can be returned with no one knowing, then that is fine with me. But the student needs to know that I know they took it, that they know they took it and that people's property is to be respected."

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Anderson's students to give an example of the rules, he explained the following:

"Stay out of other people's desks and leave their property alone."

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained that nothing would happen to a student that bowed his head and said a prayer:

". . . because the students in my classroom know they have freedom of religion. The students in my classroom are allowed to pray whenever they want to."

Mrs. Anderson also explained what she would do if a student wanted to wear his hat during class:

"The children can wear hats in my classroom because it is an expression of their freedom of expression. They understand that they have a right to wear whatever they want to."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's classroom what his teacher would do if he wore a hat during classtime, he replied, "Our teacher doesn't really care. A lot of people wear hats."

Democracy.

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the children engaged in a democratic learning process demonstrated by voting, class meetings, joint decision making and making choices.

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained

that her classroom was democratic in nature by stating the following:

"I believe that the class should be able to be a democratic process and I believe in the uniqueness of childhood and so each child needs to be respected in the classroom."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's classroom made choices. To celebrate one of Mrs. Anderson's student's birthday, she made the following announcement to the class:

"Sunday is going to be an important event in a person's life in this room. There is going to be a birthday. So, we are going to take the last five or six minutes for a game of Eric's choice."

Because the students in Mrs. Anderson's class had requested to work on multiplication, the following conversation ensued:

Anderson: "What have we heard lately in this room?"

Student: "Some of us want to work on multiplication."

Anderson: "Right, they wanted to work on multiplication. So, this game will help them do that."

When the students in Mrs. Anderson's classroom had finished an art project, she held this conversation with her class:

Anderson: "I have had several questions today about the Art entries. I want to ask you what you would like to have done with the ones we are not taking? Could I see hands with suggestions of what to do with them?"

Student: "Give them back to the people."

Anderson: "Give them back to the people and not put them up anywhere?"

Student: "Yes, and that way they can do what they want with them."

Anderson: "Okay, Suzie, what do you think?"

Suzie: "Maybe we could have an Art Fair and we could put them up around the room?"
 Anderson: "Okay. Jake?"
 Jake: "Like let them have a choice to put them up in the commons or bring them home."
 Anderson: "Their own choice?"
 Students: "Yes."
 Anderson: "The people who take theirs back, I'm guessing don't want them displayed and the ones who are leaving them up here I'm guessing do want them displayed. Is that right?"
 Students: "Yes."

Mrs. Anderson also gave her students an opportunity to make choices regarding their behavior. When the researcher asked her what would happen if a student caused a disruption while she was giving a lesson, she explained the following:

". . . they have a choice and the choice is to calm down, get themselves back into control or they might choose some time out of the classroom. They would make the choice."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's class also made choices regarding which books they would read in the classroom:

"During the reading time, they decide. I give them choices and they choose the ones they are going to read. I choose them from the District Core Literature. They have a choice and choose."

One of Mrs. Anderson's students explained choices for reading this way:

"When we have reading, there are three books and we can pick one book and when we are done with that book, the teacher gets more books and we can pick from those."

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Anderson's students what kinds of choices he makes in his classroom, he explained the following:

". . . to make a choice to stay in during recess or not, to read certain books, to choose what

to write about. When she [Mrs. Anderson] reads out loud, we can choose to listen or we can write letters to people. We have a note board and we can draw and do any board work."

During an interview, Mrs. Anderson explained the choices students made with stories they had written:

"They can do a variety of things with them. They can have them published and put into books and the books go into the library. [They can] give them as gifts, put them into book form and give them to their parents. A publication might be a poster or it might be an ad they put in the school advertising. Something that might be happening in the school. [It might be a] newsletter that is going to go out for student council. It could be a letter they have sent to a pen pal in New York. There is a variety of ways that it can be published."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's class made choices about the topics for writing. Mrs. Anderson explained:

". . . they have a list they started at the beginning of the year which is called an authority list. They are topics they feel competent to write about. If they get stuck, they can go to another authority list and choose a topic to write on."

Mrs. Anderson and her students held class meetings to solve problems and make decisions. When the researcher asked her what she would do if a student took something that belonged to someone else, she replied:

"I may not know who took it and no one may know who took it. If that is the case, then what we do is we have a classroom meeting and talk about stealing. We talk about our feelings and thoughts about stealing, and what we think might make people steal something, and if somebody steals something, we talk through the problem solving process of how you return something to somebody and

make it right for someone if you took something from someone. So, if there is no way to know who it was, then it becomes a whole class discussion."

Mrs. Anderson explained what would happen if wearing a hat in the classroom became a distraction:

"Well . . . we would stop and talk about it as a whole class and talk about the right he has to wear it but that the class has a right not to be distracted. I wouldn't do the talking. We would go into a class discussion. We would determine a time, place, and manner to talk about it."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's class practiced voting to make various decisions in the classroom. When the students came back from recess, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"Okay, I need for you to vote on something. How many of you want me to read "Zucchini Warriors [Mrs. Anderson reads the prologue to the students] or "Ten Kids, Ten Pets?" [Mrs. Anderson reads the prologue to the students. She counts the votes from raised hands. (These books are both young readers choice award books)] Okay, Ten Kids, Ten Pets."

Mrs. Anderson explained that her students practice voting in Student Council:

"We have a Grade Four and Five Student Council. They form the agenda. They run it on a Robert's Rules [of Order] which would probably make Roberts turn over in his grave. But, they give it their best shot which calls for motions, seconds, voting, and a call for a question. That sort of thing."

Mrs. Oliver also engaged her students in a democratic learning process in the classroom demonstrated by voting,

class meetings, joint decision making, making choices and making decisions.

After a student had completed writing a story, Mrs. Oliver asked, "What would you like to do with this?" The student replied, "I think I will make it into a book." Mrs. Oliver replied, "I think a book would be an excellent idea."

During an interview with one of Mrs. Oliver's students, he explained the kinds of choices he makes in his classroom:

"We choose what kind of lunch we want. During free time, we have choices between writing on Student of the Week, Speak Out About and reading. We have those choices. We get to choose about our revisions and what to write and what kinds of revisions we use."

Another student explained "choices" in this way:

"When you have free time, you are allowed to talk and if you want to read during free time. If you draw, you can write notes to people using the picture and then you can write down Student of the Week, Speak Out About and we can go to the bathroom."

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Oliver's students if she made choices about the kinds of books she reads at school, she replied:

" The author because I want to find an author that writes really good books and the kinds of subjects I like such as horses and stuff like that."

Mrs. Oliver explained during an interview that during reading time:

" They are all reading in their library books, their choice on the library books."

When the students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom were done writing stories, she explained:

"They determine if they want to go public or not. They have written their stories and gone through the whole process and then they decide."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students were given an opportunity to make choices regarding consequences for their behavior. During an interview, Mrs. Oliver explained what she told her students at the beginning of the school year about consequences:

"Every child is different and you all have things that will help you remember better. You know better what will help you remember something than I do. So, it is much better if you decide yourself what the consequence is and what will help you remember the rule. What is going to help you remember not to do this again? Think about that."

Mrs. Oliver encouraged her students to make choices and decisions through class meetings. When a student had shared with the class that his friend had shot a cow with a Beebe gun, Mrs. Oliver explained the following during an interview:

"I have real trouble with that. I will bring it up tomorrow in a class meeting. I want the students to be able to talk about that and realize that wasn't funny for someone to shoot a cow for no reason at all. I won't enter into it a whole lot but I want them to be able to talk about that. Usually, it comes up that there are two sides. Someone says 'That is really cruel.' Someone else would say 'Well, I go hunting with my dad.' [I] let the students talk about it."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class practiced voting

and joint decision making. The following is a conversation between Mrs. Oliver and her students regarding Student of the Week:

- Oliver: "How do you think Student of the Week is going?"
- Student: "We have too many things about the Student of the Week."
- Oliver: "How many of you think that is a concern? [The children raise their hands.] Okay, so what would you say is the solution? [Mrs. Oliver went to the chalkboard to write the students' suggestions.]
- Student: "Write only two things about Student of the Week."
- Student: "Write only one thing about Student of the Week."
- Student: "Let's use different colors of paper."
- Student: "I have a suggestion . . . cut the paper shorter and not so long."
- Oliver: "Okay, then you can fit more on the paper."
- Student: "We will write only twice."
- Oliver: "I wonder if we set a limit there won't be a problem."
- Student: "Use straight lines and shorter paper."
- Student: "Write on the front and back."
- Oliver: "Okay, so we have four different ideas. [Suggestions have been written on the chalkboard i.e., limit of two, limit of one, cut shorter, shorter with limit of four.] Okay, let's vote on it. [The children vote with a show of hands.] Okay, it looks like shorter with a limit of four."

After the children voted on the best way to handle Student of the Week, they wrote their comments about Sam and placed them on the Student of the Week bulletin board.

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Oliver's classroom what his teacher would do if he wore a hat during classtime, he replied, "It's okay to wear hats in the classroom. We voted on that."

During a class conversation between Mrs. Oliver and

her students, she asked, "Who can tell me about ethical concerns?" A student explained the following:

"We voted on it. You won't say people's names out loud. [The teacher will not say a child's name out loud if he/she is misbehaving] [You will] treat people the way you want to be treated."

At the beginning of the school year, the students in Mrs. Oliver's class practiced joint decision making and voting to establish classroom rules. A student in Mrs. Oliver's classroom explained the process:

"Each [cooperative learning] group took a Compelling State Interest. All the groups went and [decided] what it meant and then we decided if they covered them all. If just one covered them all, then you picked that one. If two covered them all, then we took a vote. We voted. We decided which ones were best. We voted on what we thought was good for our classroom."

A student from Mrs. Oliver's class explained the kinds of rules they have:

"We made some of them together. We are going by the Bill of Rights. So, a lot of our rules are going by the Bill of Rights."

The rules in Mrs. Anderson's classroom were also based on the Compelling State Interests. Mrs. Anderson explained how the rules were made:

"Since this is a brand new school, we have brand new rules. The rules that we have in our school were borne by a team of teachers. The rules were based on the Compelling State Interests. We were all in agreement on our guiding principles. Our guiding principles talk about a democratic process for students. So, we formed four rules based on the Compelling

State Interests. We presented them to the students and the parents as school rules for our building. I asked the students if they thought we needed other rules in the classroom other than those four rules that we have for the school. They didn't think we needed any other rules in the classroom. So, we don't have classroom rules, we have school rules."

Trust.

A sense of trust was demonstrated between the teachers and students in both fourth grade classrooms shown by open communication and a student voice in the learning process with joint agreements made between the teacher and the students.

The teachers encouraged a classroom environment conducive to open communication. In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, there was an announcement board for the students to share information. After the students returned to the classroom after lunch, she made the following announcement to her class:

"The announcement board is for you to share notes or bits of information. So, if you have something you want to tell somebody, then you need to write it at an appropriate time of the day and put it over there [bulletin board]."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, she had a "Speak Out About Board." She explained it in this way:

"I'll just put something up on the board and sometimes students have something they would like to put on the board. So, there is a topic and anytime they have free time, they can go up and write."

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the students engaged in an activity called, "Question of the Day." Questions were

pulled at random from a question box at the end of the school day. The question during my classroom observation was "What is your middle name?" The following conversation took place between Mrs. Anderson and her students which demonstrates the importance of trust in the classroom:

Anderson: "I'll start and then it will make it easier for you. Trust me. I always disliked my middle name. Ellie is my middle name. Who wants to go next? Marie?"
 Marie: "Renee."
 Student: "James."
 Student: "Charles."
 John: [. . . pause . . . the students started to giggle.]
 Anderson: "You guys, hold on. This is not a finger pointing, embarrassing kind of thing. It is an issue of trust. If John wants to share it with us, it is because he trusts us with that information and we don't want to do anything that would damage that trust. If he doesn't feel he can trust us, then that is something we need to think about."

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she recalled a conversation she had with a student who hadn't turned in his assignments. This conversation demonstrates the importance of trust in Mrs. Oliver's classroom:

"'Josh, why haven't you gotten anything done?' He said, 'Well, the electricity went out and mom said you could call if you don't believe me.' I said, 'That's okay, I believe you. Are you concerned about this?' He said, 'Yes.' He said that he was going to do them this weekend and I believe him. Sure, he will."

The students in both fourth grade classrooms had a

voice in the learning process and made joint agreements with their teachers and/or peers.

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained how students have a voice in her classroom:

"The students in my classroom vote on things all the time. They have their opinions and give reasons for their opinions and all of that."

When I asked Mrs. Anderson to give an example, she explained:

"I can give an easy example and that is the school district allows three parties a year; one for Halloween, Christmas, and for Valentine's Day. I believe that everything in school should be a learning situation. So, I had the students plan the parties. The first party, I gave them structure and they planned the party. The second party they planned the structure and the party. The third time, they planned everything. The first two times, I sent home news about the party to the parents and the last time they gave me information to put on the computer to type out and send home."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom a sense of trust was demonstrated by joint agreements made between her and the students. When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver what she would do if a student wanted to wear his hat in the classroom, she replied, "As a class, we decided that was alright." Mrs. Oliver then explained what would happen if the hat became a disturbance:

"There was one time, [when a] boy played with his hat which was really irritating to me. So, we met. I said, 'That is really bugging me.' He said, 'Oh.' I said, 'What could you do not to do that?' He said, 'I'll just try.' But, he just played with it. So, we met again and I said, 'I can't handle that. That

distracts me. Every time I'm reading, I look up and I lose my place. I just can't have it.' He said, 'Well, how about if I don't wear it when you are reading?' I said, 'Oh, that would be great.' That was it."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students made agreements regarding ethical concerns. During an interview, Mrs. Oliver explained:

"The students came up with lists of things, how they wanted other students to treat them, their ethical concerns. They put it all down. It took us about two days to do this. It all came down to treating each other the way they wanted to be treated. The Golden Rule is what they decided. That was their ethical concern and they all signed it. Mine was, what they wanted from me was they didn't want to be singled out. They didn't want me to say anything to them personally in front of other people. They really don't want me to do that. What I worked out with them was I would say minus ten. We have a signal. I say minus ten and then everybody that is doing what they are not supposed to be doing will just sit back and nobody will be singled out."

During a classroom observation in Mrs. Oliver's classroom, she said "minus ten." My critiqued notes read, "As far as the researcher can tell, the misbehavior has been self corrected."

Self Sufficiency.

Mrs. Anderson encouraged student accountability and ownership of learning. During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained:

"They do as much that can be done. Bulletin boards that need to be put up, they help with or they do themselves. Whatever can be done by a student is done by a student. Whatever decisions can be made by students are made by students. They have much authority."

The following conversation demonstrates how Mrs. Anderson encouraged a student to take ownership of his learning:

Anderson: "Is that your best work?"
 Student: "Well, kinda, but it's not my best that I can do. I don't think it is the best I have ever wrote. It is kinda boring."
 Anderson: "What could you have done about that?"

During a morning work session, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

Anderson: "What would I have seen the most responsible student in the class do when they finished reading the Chapter? Sam?"
 Sam: "Read a book of their choice."
 Anderson: "What would I have seen a student do?"
 Student: "Work on unfinished work."
 Student: "They could have worked on other things that need to be done."
 Anderson: "Okay, what I am hearing from you is that it is not responsible to work on a drawing that is not connected with any of your school work if other school work is not done. Is that what I am hearing?"
 Students: "Yes."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's class what his responsibilities were in the classroom, he explained:

"To keep your area clean where you sit. You have a responsibility to behave and to listen to people and to get your work done. [When] I didn't get my work done, she [Mrs. Anderson] had me do it for homework. I think that was fair because that is my responsibility to do it. We have talked about our rights and the things we can and can't do."

Mrs. Oliver also encouraged her students to be self-

sufficient. During an interview, she explained what would happen if a student swore at her:

"I just go through the process. 'What do you think you need to do to make that right?' With any problem, it is always putting the responsibility back on the child. The student says what it is they need to do."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Oliver's class what would happen if he broke a class rule, he replied, "You make up your own consequence . . ."

Another student in Mrs. Oliver's class explained his answer for the same question:

"You have to think of your own consequences. What will happen if that happens again."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom were encouraged to take ownership of learning by writing individual goals. At the beginning of an individual conference, Mrs. Oliver said, "I notice that one of your goals is to write in your journal three times. Let's take a look. [Mrs. Oliver looks at the child's records.] Three times, excellent."

Reinforcement.

Although both fourth grade teachers made positive comments to their students, neither one of them provided the students with stars or extrinsic awards.

Before the students started playing a math game in Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the following conversation ensued:

Student: "Do we get a prize if we win?"
Anderson: "No, you win. That's what you get, winning."
Student: "We get the satisfaction of winning?"

Anderson: "Yes, you get the satisfaction of winning."

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained why she did not give her students stars:

"It needs to be intrinsic. The kids need to feel 'I have done a good job.' For me to just put stars on means that I am telling them that they are good and that they did a good job instead of them feeling 'I have done this.' For instance in writing, I don't really go into 'This is a wonderful job.' It's more 'Look at this part. What did you like about this. What did you like about that? Where do you see work that needs to be done?'"

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver to explain how her students demonstrated intrinsic value for their work, she explained:

"When I see students working and I can pay attention to what a student and I are doing at my table, not be worried that there are ten children that are not reading, then I think that is intrinsic."

Teacher Instructional Strategies

Directives.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson provided materials, examples, structure and/or directions for an assignment and stated problems with a directive to correct problems.

When it was time for the students in Mrs. Oliver's class to take a math timing, she gave the following directive:

"Okay, we need to go back to our seats. We are going to take that timing real quick. It is about five minutes until we read. So, quickly go back and sit down. Put your name on the front and then turn it over."

When Mrs. Oliver's students were getting ready to go to the library, she explained:

"In the library, remember you don't to bring your folders and things because we're going to have all next week to work in the room on the folders that I gave you and any information here in the room. Any books that you bring from home stays to be used in the classroom. The information in the library you want to use because it is your time in the library."

Mrs. Anderson also provided directive for her students. In the morning, Mrs. Anderson explained the following to her students:

"Class, if I can have your attention this morning? Yesterday after school the fourth and fifth grade teachers met and decided that it would probably be a good idea for us to have one more session about issues that were brought up and discussed about the film on Wednesday. So, Mr. Johnson is prepared to go ahead with the discussion with the boys and Mrs. Riley and I will hold a discussion with the girls."

Before the students started an art project to make a butterfly, Mrs. Anderson provided directions and an example for the students:

"Okay, now, the way we are going to do them [butterflies] closely the same is by starting with a pattern. This is going to be the pattern for our butterfly. The white paper. [Mrs. Anderson shows the students the white paper.] You want to draw the body. [Mrs. Anderson models how to draw the body of the butterfly.] This is going to be the body of my butterfly on the inside. When I open this up, if I cut out this shape, I am going to have a two sided butterfly . . ."

Processing Information/Thinking Skills.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson promoted the processing of information and thinking skills through open-questioning, elaboration, active participation, hands on activities, reviewing, summarizing, generalizing, comparing and contrasting, guessing, predicting, and making sense.

Before Mrs. Oliver began the morning writing session, she provided her students with an example of a writer and encouraged them to ask questions and make generalizations:

- Oliver: "I have something to share with you today. They found an original manuscript of Huckleberry Finn. [Mrs. Oliver shows a newspaper article to the class.] He spoke in a non-educated manner. He didn't have good grammar and he didn't write correctly. He was angry at the publishers because they wanted to correct his work. You know how we do editing? You edit each others and then you come to me and I help you edit to make it just right. When you edit, you're the boss and you decide what stays and what goes. Well, he was angry because he didn't have any say with what was going on.
- Student: "Why when he was dead?"
- Oliver: "This was when he was living. Just recently, his granddaughter found his manuscript, parts that were never published. The adventures describe a black slave, and white boy. When he wrote, he used a pen name. He started it in 1876 and worked on it for a couple of years, then the well ran dry, so he put it away. What do you think he meant?"
- Student: "He ran out of ideas?"
- Oliver: "Just like you, he would re-write, re-write, and re-write."

After a student read a rough draft on biking to Mrs. Oliver, she encouraged him to expand the story by asking the following questions:

"Is there a day that you like to go biking more than others? Did you have to have permission? How high is the ramp? Does it go up to your knees? Tell me, what happened? Did you fall? Did John fall? How do you jump? Do you pull up on your bike? How do you know how to pull up? You can ask questions. How, when, what, and why? Tell me about that. Is it real muddy and wet? When you go through the swamp, do you get muddy? This is when you go to John's house. Do you go down Oak Lane? I think that would be a good idea to tell us that. [The student shares a webbing with Mrs. Oliver.] Maybe you want to make another wing about trails and swamps. Why do you have to walk with John? That would be real interesting to the reader."

While a student was reading a final draft to Mrs. Oliver, she encouraged him to change the spelling and elaborate the story in order to make sense:

Student: "Pete went to the store. As soon as it got dark, the farmer became lonely with no wagon around. Just a plain old town."
 Oliver: "Is this like a store that you buy things in?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Oliver: "Okay, that is spelled wrong. [Oliver circles the word.] Did Pete go from store to store?"
 Student: "No."
 Oliver: "So, no one was on the streets. Maybe you should add in there, so that people would know, that there was no one on the streets and then it would make a little more sense."

The following conversation between Mrs. Oliver and a student demonstrates how she encourages her students to make sense during the writing process:

Oliver: "Who said that?"
Student: "Well, said Garfield?"
Oliver: "Okay, but who said, 'Oh yea, superwoman.'"
Student: "Garfield."
Oliver: "Oh, okay. You don't need to say that because he is saying this whole thing. You wait until he finishes talking to say 'Who said that.'"
Student: "Which is right here."
Oliver: Alright now, let's see if it makes sense. So, start here again.
[Student reads the story.] Okay, so then you needed a new paragraph here, didn't you?"
Student: "Yes."
Oliver: "Okay, that is pretty clear to me. Let's go ahead."

After another student had read her story to Mrs.

Oliver, the following conversation ensued:

Oliver: "Now, who is thinking that?"
Student: "I am."
Oliver: ". . . you have a lot of thoughts there and it seems like something someone would be thinking. Now, try and put some periods in so that it makes sense."

While the students were working on a math lesson, Mrs. Oliver circulated in the classroom to help students with their assignment. She sat down with a student and held the following conversation:

Oliver: "Okay, now what you do is try to make it make sense.
[Mrs. Oliver demonstrated a step by step procedure for the division problem.] I think what you need to do is decide what type of jars there are? How can you figure that out?"
Student: "Five times six equals thirty."
Oliver: "Good. Try that. Okay, read it again."

Mrs. Oliver began a math lesson by reviewing a lesson from the previous day:

"Yesterday, we were working on two digit multiplication. Let's do a review of yesterday. Twenty times two hundred equals? You do it on your paper. We will do it one step at a time. [Mrs. Oliver models the process on the chalkboard.] I'll make it really hard this time. This is a real challenge. Try it in your head. Okay, here we go. Twenty times three hundred. [A student said out loud, 'I think I am going to have heart failure.'] Don't say it until I snap my fingers. Think."

During a class discussion on the Amendments and the Compelling State Interests, Mrs. Oliver encouraged her students to process information to make generalizations:

Oliver: "Who can tell me what the Compelling State Interests have to do with each other? Why did we have to study these [Amendments] and these [Compelling State Interests.]

Student: "Because the Amendments. . . [pause]

Oliver: "This is tough. Sandra?"

Sandra: "The Amendments are something that other people can't do to you and the Compelling State Interests are something that you have to do to other people."

Oliver: "Okay, remember we have a balance here, don't we? Sally?"

Sally: "They fit together. Property Loss and Damage goes with Search and Seizure. They are kinda the same."

Oliver: "How do they fit together?"

Sally: "They both mean not to take anything."

Oliver: "Okay, now it's our right not to have someone search or take our things, right?"

Students: "Yes."

Oliver: "Okay, now you have to give up your right if you do something to cause damage to the rest of the group or to somebody else. Jenny?"

Student: "The Amendments help your own self so you won't get in trouble. You can write anything as long as it doesn't break one of the Compelling State Interests."

Mrs. Anderson also encouraged her students to think and process information as demonstrated by the following conversation during a class meeting:

- Anderson: "If you are asked an inappropriate question, what could you say? Think about the ladder of success. Think about the eight ways to say no. Think about what you know about standing up to someone that is asking you an inappropriate question. What could you say?"
- Student: "You could say that 'I feel uncomfortable when you ask me things like that.'"
- Anderson: "Okay, that is one thing you could say."
- Student: "Some kids are always saying things to me. I told them to stop that and I have walked away but they still do it."
- Anderson: "What if you told them it is none of their business?"
- Student: "I have."
- Anderson: "What else could you do if that happens to you?"
- Student: "Tell your parents."
- Anderson: "If you have tried to stand your own ground and express how you feel, then you could talk to an adult or a friend to get some help."

During a math lesson on multiplication, Mrs. Anderson encouraged her students to think and process information to make sense:

- Anderson: "Does it make sense that 7×58 would be 400 and something? Does that make sense to you?"
- Student: "Yes."
- Anderson: "Why does that make sense to you that it would be around 400? Can you do some estimating with these numbers and tell me why an answer of 400 makes sense to you? Mary?"
- Student: "Because 7×50 would be 350."
- Anderson: "Okay, so are you saying that it would be at least 350 because 7×50 would be 350 and then 8×7 is another 50 and so that would be close to 400?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, so you need to think through the reasonableness and you need to take time to play the game and allow your partner to talk through the reasonableness of their answer they get on their calculator because you can make mistakes with calculators."

When the students in Mrs. Anderson's class were working on an art project, she encouraged them to compare and contrast:

Anderson: "Can you see some differences between moths and butterflies? [Mrs. Anderson shows pictures of each.]

Student: "Some of the moths have longer tails and longer bodies.

Anderson: "So, the butterflies have smaller bodies?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, what else do you see?"

Student: "The moths have long wing shapes."

Student: "Their wing is shaped rounder."

Anderson: "We don't see long tails like this on the butterfly. So, we want to keep that in mind. We are doing butterflies and not moths."

After all the students in the class had read the first chapter in their reading books, Mrs. Anderson encouraged her students to compare and contrast the main characters and to make generalizations:

Anderson: "What do you know about Claudia by where she has chosen to run away to? Think back about to My Side of the Mountain and Sam was running away. Where did he run to?

Student: "The mountains."

Anderson: "To live what kind of life?"

Student: "Out in the wild."

Anderson: ". . . real primitive. What does Claudia want to run away to?"

Student: "The city."

Anderson: "Okay, the city. What are some differences that you can think of between Sam and Claudia?"

Student: "Claudia is more likely to get noticed."
 Anderson: "What makes you think she will get noticed?"
 Student: "The city and it's a school day."
 Student: "Comfort was very important to Claudia."
 Anderson: "So, you are saying that comfort was important to Claudia and it wasn't to Sam? Do you think Sam would be comfortable with the kind of running away that Claudia is planning to do?"
 Student: "No, Sam went to a place where it was quiet. He was running away from the big city."
 Anderson: "Okay, and she is running to the big city. Are you saying Claudia wouldn't be comfortable in what Sam ran away to?"
 Student: "Yes."

During a social studies activity, the students were asked to make generalizations of what colonists needed to survive:

Anderson: "What are some of the things that colonists needed to survive?"
 Student: "Water."
 Anderson: "Was water included in the simulation?"
 Student: "No, food."
 Anderson: "In the food would there be water?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Anderson: "What else is required for a colonist to survive?"
 Student: "Shelter."
 Anderson: "Was there a place for food or a place to be protected?"
 Student: ". . . a house for staying in to be protected from the weather."
 Anderson: "Was there anything in the simulation that you don't think they had to have?"
 Student: "Guns."
 Anderson: "Okay, why don't you think they had to have them?"
 Student: "You don't have to trade with the Indians."
 Anderson: "Would they have been able to be okay without guns?"
 Student: "No."
 Anderson: "What could they have used instead?"
 Student: "Bow and arrows."

Anderson: "So, a weapon of some kind would been necessary?"
Student: "Yes."

Both fourth grade teachers encouraged their students to make sense during the reading process. When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver how her students figure out new words, she explained:

"Anyway they can. There are a whole lot of different ways to figure out a word. Anytime they have trouble with a word, they write the word on a 3 X 5 index card and I have a high school student who works with them in the hall. They write down the page number the word is on so they can look back and then read around it. What does that word mean?"

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained what she would do if a student made a mistake while reading text:

". . . before I have them read anything out loud to me, I have them read it to themselves silently. And I usually have them read only about 100 words at a time. So, they read first before they read to me and then they read it out loud. If they read it out loud and they make a mistake, I ask them a question about what the story was saying, if they understood what the story was saying. If it's a word and it didn't lose context, I may not stop them at all."

During an interview with one of Mrs. Anderson's students, he explained what Mrs. Anderson would do if he made a mistake while he was reading a story:

"She would normally have us reread that part."

Individual Conferences.

Both fourth grade teachers instructed, encouraged or discussed problems with students during individual

conferences. Mrs. Oliver explained during an interview that her students "conference with me once a week and they conference with my aide once a week." Mrs. Oliver described what happens during an individual conference:

"The way I do it is I ask them questions about what they are reading. My aide does the literary skills where she finds out what the main character is and what the point of view is and the setting. I have different skills that I teach in the mini lesson."

The following is a conversation between Mrs. Oliver and a student during an individual conference:

Oliver: "Your records have been kept well. You have read a lot. Do you have a vocabulary card?"

Student: "Yes, but I didn't get any words."

Oliver: "Tell you what, why don't you tell me an if-then situation. If something was different, how would it change the story?"

Student: "If Ellen didn't pretend to be Ann Marie's sister in this book, the German soldiers would have taken Ellen away because Ellen was Jewish. Ann Marie was Danish. Ellen stayed with Ann Marie and her family. So, that would have changed the story completely. There wouldn't have been a story."

Oliver: "How do you like this book? Does it give you some insight of what it would have been like to be Jewish during the second World War?"

Student: "Yes, it would be horrid."

Oliver: "Do you understand the prompt for this week?"

Student: "No, I don't."

Oliver: "Okay, compare and contrast characters. You are supposed to take characters from two different books or two characters from the same book and then you want to compare and contrast them. Draw a grid, compare and contrast the characters."

Mrs. Oliver also held individual conferences with students to solve behavior problems. When a student was

rummaging through a box of materials, the following conversation ensued:

Student: "I am trying to find something."
 Oliver: "I realize that but you know you had problems before with property."
 Student: "I know but . . ."
 Oliver: "Come talk to me for a second."
 [Mrs. Oliver takes the student to a private corner for an individual conference.]

When a student was having a difficult time with a math assignment, Mrs. Oliver met with the student individually:

Oliver: "John, could I see you?"
 John: "Yes."
 Oliver: "Have you started division?"
 John: "No."
 Oliver: "I think the best thing for you then is for me to get you the two's flash cards. The answer is on the back. Put them in order first. Try to remember what those facts are."

When a student was having a difficult time with a social studies project, Mrs. Oliver held the following conversation:

Oliver: "How are you doing?"
 Student: "I am having trouble."
 Oliver: "What you want to do here is you want to say that you are going West from Elmira to Tillamook. You want to put directions in it so people will know which direction to go. Otherwise, they might go the opposite direction. So, put these directions every place you change."

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained why she holds individual conferences with students:

"I meet with my students on a one to one basis frequently. When I do that, it seems that's the way problems are solved and errors are corrected . . . "

When a student was having a problem making a cover for her book, Mrs. Anderson met with the student individually:

Anderson: "What happened? What is it that bothers you about it?"

Student: "I don't know."

Anderson: "We could put it on the other side of the page. Do you want some heavy railroad board or do you want to laminate this?"

Student: "Railroad board."

Anderson: "Okay, take it to the library and they will help you with the cover."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson what she would do if a student refused to do his schoolwork, she replied:

". . . if someone said they refused to do their work, then I would have a private conference with them and try to find out what the problem is. Why they don't want to do their work. Why they feel like they can't do their work. I would get at what is behind this problem and then we would work from there. If they can't do it, if they are angry about something outside of the classroom, then I would tell them that those things happen in a lifetime and that the best thing for them to do is to get really involved in what is going on at school. If it is a school issue, we would talk about the importance of school and that we are at school to learn and talk about when I could expect to see their work."

Mrs. Anderson also held individual conferences to listen to a student's story in order to help in the writing process:

Anderson: "Why don't you write the 'Dear' and leave the name blank and we will add the name in later."

Student: "Can I read my story to you?"

Anderson: "Yes."

Student: "My book is about when my dad was a little boy. My book is called My Dad and the Cougar. [The student reads her story to Mrs. Anderson.]

Anderson: "What made you think about writing the story?"

Student: "Well, my dad told me about it and I wanted to have something to write about."

Mrs. Anderson also met with students individually when they had a problem with behavior. When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's classroom what his teacher would do if during classtime he became so mad and angry that he called another person a bad name, he explained the following:

"Well, she talks to them about not to do it again and some other stuff. Usually, she would make you apologize to the person."

When a student was having a problem deciding what to work on in the morning, Mrs. Anderson held an individual conference:

Anderson: "Ron, would you come here please?" [Mrs. Anderson whispered to the student.] Do you have work to do in your packet?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, work on that first."

Integration of Curriculum.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson integrated language arts with math, science, and social studies. During an interview with her, she explained the close relationship between reading and writing:

"Reading and writing are very close. [They] should be taught together. They are so much the same. You use them both in each one of them. It only makes sense to have the two together."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class worked on weekly social skills. They kept a tally each time a student

practiced the skill. The social skill for the week of my observation was "Thanking Other People." The following conversation demonstrates an integration of math and language arts, i.e., speaking, listening, reading, and writing:

- Student: "You will need your calculators and tally. [Two student council members are in charge at the front of the classroom.]
- Student: "What do you have? What did you get? [Student council members are asking peers for their tally count. The students are using calculators to add up tallies.]
- Oliver: [Mrs. Oliver rings a bell.] Sit down please. Did you reach your goal?
- Student: "We weren't even close."
- Student: "We didn't even make it."
Our goal was 1,961."

The student council members then explained to the class that the goal was "Thanking Other People." They explained:

"Every time you thank someone, put it down on the tally sheet."

Mrs. Oliver went to the chalkboard and elicited examples of "Thanking Other People." She wrote the examples on the board. The following conversation ensued:

- Oliver: "If you see people thanking, say 'Thank you.'"
- Student: "People encouraging other people."
- Oliver: [Mrs. Oliver wrote the example on the chalkboard.] "Okay, so you would hear it. What you should do first is decide when they are going to make a tally mark. Who would do it?"
- Student: "The person who receives marks down the tally."
- Oliver: "How do you feel about that? What is your opinion?"
- Student: "Whenever thank you is said, both mark it down."

Student: "Both people mark it every time."
 Oliver: "Okay, if I hear it or give it, I mark it down."

Mrs. Oliver also integrated the language arts with social studies:

Oliver: "Yesterday, we talked about Mountain States. What is a geyser?"
 Student: "It has water and steams."
 Oliver: "Tell me about that."
 Student: "I went to Yellowstone National Park. I saw the geyser. It gets wet on you."
 Oliver: "Who knows something else about geysers?"
 Student: "They can erupt like a volcano. The water going down has a smell like rotten sewers."
 Student: "Now, I remember something. The geyser erupts every ninety minutes."
 Student: "Some geysers just bubble up."
 Student: "I remember going to Yellowstone National Park with my dad. They are incredibly big to see."
 Oliver: [Mrs. Oliver shares a picture of Yellowstone National Park with her students.]
 In your group, discuss what you would like to do in Yellowstone National Park."

Although spelling was integrated with the writing process in Mrs. Oliver's classroom, she also taught spelling separately with a spelling book. Mrs. Oliver explained her frustrations about spelling during an interview:

"I do a terrible job at spelling. It is out of the spelling book. I dictate sentences and they write the sentences down. It doesn't work. I have been reading articles and things to change my spelling. I am wrestling with how to teach spelling without [spelling books.]"

The following conversation between Mrs. Anderson and her students demonstrates how she integrated spelling with social studies:

Anderson: "There are two things that you need to understand about the spelling test. You need to be sure that all the states

in the front are in the right place. You need to double check that. What the test next week will be is you will get a blank map and you will need to correct and spell the name of the state on the front. You won't need to put anything on the back. You will spell the name of the state on the state."

Mrs. Anderson also integrated math with science.

During a science lesson, Mrs. Anderson asked her students the following questions:

Anderson: "Okay, so this is the size that your butterfly will be when it's finished. Do you think it is going to be a rectangle?"

Student: "No."

Anderson: "But, to form the butterfly, you need to start by understanding that there is a word that describes what the butterfly is. It starts with an 's.'" Does someone know what that word is?

Student: "Symmetrical."

Anderson: "Right, it is symmetrical. One side looks the same as the other side. In fact, they are almost congruent."

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "How many of you think they are congruent? [Students raise their hands.] How many of you think they are just close to being congruent? [Students raise their hands.] Okay, what keeps you from thinking they are congruent?"

Student: "I don't think that any animal could be perfect like that."

Anderson: "Do you think that you are congruent? You have two feet, two arms, two legs, two eyes, and two nostrils. Do you think that if you drew a line right down the middle of your body that one side would be exactly the same as the other side?"

Students: "No."

Mrs. Anderson integrated math, language arts, and social studies. The social studies assignment for the day was for each cooperative learning group to read their diary

situations [result of simulation]. One student from each group took turns reading their diaries to the class:

"I am very disappointed that many people were slaughtered. I think we should take care of those Indians."

After the students shared their diaries, Mrs. Anderson asked, "Has Group One figured out their wealth unit?" A student replied, "No." Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"Okay, the groups that have finished figuring out their wealth units, [the students have used calculators to add up wealth units] I need to see the banker up here with what you have figured out. The groups that are not finished, you need to get together and finish."

When all the groups were finished, Mrs. Anderson held the following conversation with the class:

Anderson: "Okay, I have reports from each group. The total for Group One is 8,687 wealth units. The total for Group Two is 11,636 wealth units. The total for Group Three is 18,895 wealth units. The total for Group Four is 7,016 and the total for Group Five is 2,723 wealth units. How many of you thought it was going to end up the way it did when we started out? Group Four, where did you think you would end up?"

Student: "Probably last."

Anderson: "Group Two ended up with 11,636 wealth units. What did you think at the beginning of the simulation?"

Student: "To tell you the truth, I never expected to end up this way with all the droughts and plagues."

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, math was integrated with Student Council activities. After the class went outside to recess, Mrs. Anderson said to a student, "Mary, let's go count the money from the student store." The student

replied, "How much money did we make today?" Mrs. Anderson responded, "I don't know yet. We haven't counted it. You are going to come with me to count it."

Transitions.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson provided smooth transitions between class activities. While the students were working on a math assignment, Mrs. Oliver rang a bell to get their attention and said, "Will everyone sit down at their desk. I would like to see how you are doing."

Mrs. Anderson also used a bell for smooth transitions. While the students were working on a math assignment, she rang a bell and said, "Put them back there please. Okay, in your book, we will have a little practice on writing those [problems.] Turn to page 216."

In addition to using a bell for smooth transitions, Mrs. Anderson employed a clapping pattern with the class to get its attention and to signal that it was time for a new activity. When Mrs. Anderson clapped a pattern, the children were expected to clap back the same pattern.

Recognition.

The fourth grade teachers provided positive feedback for student responses and work. Before Mrs. Oliver's class went to the library, she made the following announcement to her class:

"Now, things that are good that are happening in the library. You're using the card catalogue which is good. You're also looking up in the encyclopedia to get specific information, like wild life. You found out

what the names of the wildlife were and then you looked in different books in the library to get more things about your state."

During an individual conference with a student, Mrs. Oliver explained:

"You have a real plot there now. Before, it was kinda sketchy. It was too simple. Now, you have added all these things . . . your revisions and your research. Finding out what the Barrier Reef was makes your story seem more real."

After a student had shared his story with Mrs. Anderson, she also provided positive feedback:

Anderson: "That's very clever except I can't believe you let your brother get the squirt gun and you got the black eye."

Student: "Oh, I am not mad. I think it makes sense."

Anderson: "Well, I like the way you wrote this, 'As you figured out, he got the squirt gun.' I like that part."

Teacher's Role

Instructor.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson provided directions and/or clarified directions for class and homework assignments. Before the students started a social studies project, Mrs. Oliver stated:

"Okay, the first thing you have to do is tell where your destination is. The second thing is to tell what you need to take. The third thing is what will you do when you get there and the fourth thing is to give map directions so that everyone in the class is following directions."

Before Mrs. Oliver's class went to the library, she gave the following directions to the students:

"Remember when you're taking notes, we do it exactly the way we worked on it a few months ago. You read first and then you write what you remember is most likely going to be the most important part. Remember, the whole purpose for this is for you to learn about the state."

When a student in Mrs. Anderson's class asked if he could go to the library to get a book on butterflies, she gave him specific directions:

"You have time right now to do this. You need to get this part done. There are pictures in the room that you can look at. They are right there at your table. What you want to do today is to get the outline shape completed and cut out with your name on it. That's what you want to do today."

Before Mrs. Anderson's students started a math assignment, she explained the following directions:

"Please get out a piece of paper and a pencil and put your name and date on it. On your piece of paper you need to make your circles really big. As soon as you have done that and if I have your eyes up here, I know you are ready for me to go on with the directions."

Process Teacher/Facilitator.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson facilitated thinking skills and a process approach to learning through modeling, student input, problem solving and making sense, student accountability and ownership for learning and behavior, interaction and cooperation.

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she stated:

"I believe that everything we do is a learning process and that students need to learn that there are responsibilities."

Mrs. Anderson encouraged a process approach to

solve problems. When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson what she would do if a student deliberately destroyed another person's property, she explained her role in the problem solving process:

"... the students would need to work that out between them. They would arrive at some kind of workable solution. They would have options that we have talked about as a class such as restitution, replacing, repaying or repairing whatever it is they damaged. My part in it would be talking to the student to find out the reasons behind them doing what they did. As far as making it right for the student that had something damaged, the two of them would need to work that out together. I have had situations like this. I had a student take someone's hat and ruin it. They [sic] earned the money and went to the shopping center and bought a new hat to bring back to class to give the student whose hat was damaged. In the process, there is discussion and problem solving what you were feeling when you did this."

Mrs. Anderson explained the point at which she gets involved in the problem solving process:

"I get involved immediately to let them know to work out a time, place, and manner where they can do that. It may be right then or it may not be right then. So, I need to be involved in the process of them determining when they can talk about and solve the problem."

During an interview with Mrs. Anderson, she explained what she would do if a student hit someone else in the classroom:

"... The what ifs are real individual. If someone is physically hurting someone else in the classroom, then that person who is hurting someone else needs to be removed and the process would go on. Someone who is hurting someone else would be removed, someone who is damaging someone's property, they may both be removed from the classroom to talk to each other and arrive at a solution. If the timing is right, they may do it right there. If it's not, they

could do it at recess, lunch or before or after school when it is convenient and the best time. But, the whole point is whatever is happening, whatever the what ifs, my approach is what does the student need to learn from the situation. If a student who hurt somebody else needs to learn that he can't do that, then the process that will work for them is to teach them that they can't do that and that they need to somehow make it right as they can to the student that they hit. Also, the student who is hitting someone else has some sort of problem and so that needs to be dealt with as well."

After the students in Mrs. Anderson's class had finished comparing and contrasting characters from two different novels, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"That is real important in the thinking process to make those comparisons. It is important for you and the thinking process. It helps you problem solve to think about similar things and different things. There are lots of things you can [gain] from the books other than just sitting down and reading it."

Mrs. Anderson encouraged the students to think, express their opinions, and be respectful of each other to solve problems. When problems arose from students teasing one another regarding stages of physical development, the following conversation ensued:

Anderson: "Class, we will talk about the teasing issue. There were people from our class on the bus that were teasing about pictures and the growth process. I want to hear from two boys and two girls . . . [your] opinions about how you would like to be treated. If you are a girl, how you would like to be treated by boys as you go through these stages of development and boys saying how you would like to be treated as you go through your stages of development. It can be anyone who volunteers to share. Mary?"

- Mary: "Well,"
- Anderson: "Just a minute Mary. The way I like everyone in this room to be treated whenever they are talking is with respect. If you are whispering or talking when someone is trying to have your total attention, then you are not being respectful. Turn your attention to Mary."
- Mary: "I would want to be treated with respect because it wouldn't be a very big deal because everybody is going to have to go through it and the boys are going to have to go through it but they will go through it later than we will."
- Sandy: "Most girls feel that it is an uncomfortable issue to be teased about. Even for me sometimes when I sit through a film, I feel uncomfortable to talk about it. It wouldn't be very kind to be teased whether it was a boy or a girl because it is an uncomfortable issue to talk about or be teased about."
- Anderson: "John, did I see your hand up?"
- John: "Yes. I don't like to be teased about it because growing up is a natural part of life."
- Anderson: "Exactly. Another boy? Jim?"
- Jim: "I wouldn't feel good about teasing and things like that because it is a part of life. Some boys don't go through what girls do and some girls don't go through what boys go through. It is just what is going to happen."
- Anderson: "All four of you made some excellent points. And ones that I think everyone should hold close to your heart of concern and thought for other people."

Mrs. Anderson also encouraged a process approach to learning writing in her classroom. When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson if her students chose their topics for writing and when they would write, she explained the writing process in her classroom:

"They choose their topic. When they get finished with pre-writing and rough draft, they run the story by someone else in the classroom and ask them to read it. They might read it to the whole class. There is usually some time aloud where they can read stories

out loud to the class and get suggestions from their classmates about the story. Once they have written the rough draft, they go into the revision process. Reading and sharing it with someone else is part of the process. When they have finished revising the story, they go through the editing process. We use Daily Oral Language for them to practice editing their material. They use the same cues from Daily Oral Language. They need to go through their paper if it's going to go to a final published form. They go through their paper to edit it, they have someone else go through their paper to edit it, and they do a final draft and then they give it to me. I go through it to edit and give any suggestions for revisions. Then they do their published book or whatever. . ."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson what she does when a student misspells a word or fails to punctuate a story, she replied:

"It depends on what stage they are at. If they are at editing and I have the final draft, then I meet with that student and go through it to see what corrections need to be made. If it's at final draft, then I make those corrections with them as we go through the story together. They need to make those corrections if it's going to published form. The published form needs to be as correct as possible."

Mrs. Anderson facilitated cooperation and interaction in the classroom. The students worked in pairs or small groups to complete assignments. Before the students started a Math assignment, she explained:

"You only need one calculator for the two or three of you. The first thing you will need to do once you get together with your partner is that the two of you will need to make a cloud like this [Mrs. Anderson models how to draw a cloud]. Each one of you will need to make a cloud like this on a piece of paper and fill it in with these numbers that are up here."

While the students were writing stories, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"Today what I would like you to do is to have an opportunity to share your books with others. The finished books that are done, I would like you to either read through it with someone or exchange yours with theirs so that while they are reading yours you can read their book. I would like you to give some feedback to each person whose book you are reading. Give them some feedback about the story. And because I believe that everyone has done their best work, I think the feedback needs to be positive as possible. If there is something, a suggestion that comes to you while you are reading the story that you think that might help the story, then you can make that suggestion. If the person wants to, they can go ahead and do that."

Mrs. Anderson encouraged student input and for students to think and process information. Before the students started a social studies project, Mrs. Anderson made the following statement:

"Friday we found the years for some of the U.S. conflicts. What we need to do is find out more information about the important ones and then decide on a way to share that information with each other, with the class, with other classes. We want to make something of a presentation that could stay at our school so that in two years when the fourth graders are studying U.S. History that information could be used by them from this class. You will make or create something that would stay here and pass that information that you learned onto other students. So, we need to decide first of all what our method is going to be to share that information with other students. Then we need to decide who is going to find out the information and what information we need to know. It will be like a mini-report by each student."

After Mrs. Anderson made the above statement to her class, she asked, "Are there some unanswered questions?" A student explained the following:

"You go and find out about the war or the conflict and then you write for publication for the whole class and then you put that

information into what the class decides or will there be a bunch of different ones or just one, like a book?"

Mrs. Anderson responded:

"There will be one that will include everything that the class has found out. Marty, [you] hit it straight on the process. First, we need to gather the information and once we gather the information on whatever topic each one of you chooses, then you need to figure out some way to present it to the class because everyone in the class needs that information."

Mrs. Anderson facilitated the learning process by modeling and providing examples. When the students started a reading assignment to compare and contrast a novel with a film on that same novel by using a Venn Diagram, Mrs. Anderson held the following conversation with her class:

Anderson: "I am going to give you about three minutes for you to think about what you think goes here only [Mrs. Anderson pointed to the left side of the Venn Diagram] and what goes here only [Mrs. Anderson pointed to the center of the Venn Diagram] and what goes here [Mrs. Anderson pointed to the right side of the Venn Diagram.] Before we get started, please give me one example of what goes here."

Student: "That Sophie was not wrapped up in her pen."

Anderson: "Now, give me an example of what goes here?"

Student: "Sophie saw the jeep. [Mrs. Anderson modeled where to write the information in the Venn Diagram as the students gave their responses.]

Anderson: "What is something that would only go here?"

Student: "When the giant didn't get tied up."

Anderson: "Do you get the idea? I said three minutes. Do you think that three minutes is a reasonable amount of time or do you need five?"

Students: "Five." [The class responded with five.]

Anderson: "Let's make it five."

Mrs. Anderson encouraged students to be accountable

for their learning and behavior as shown by the following statement to her class:

Anderson: "Over a month ago, I gave you an assignment to bring an animal to school in a safe environment. You have three assignments in this one assignment. Can somebody identify what the three parts are to the whole assignment?"

Student: "You have to do research about your animal."

Anderson: "Okay, research and report on the animal. That's one piece. [Mrs. Anderson wrote "research" on the chalkboard.] What is a second assignment?"

Student: "Think about hypotheses about your animal."

Anderson: "Okay, a tested hypotheses. The results of that test need to be a part of your report. What is the third part? Monty?"

Student: "Think of how you are going to get your animal to school."

Anderson: "Okay, you have a problem to solve and the problem that you need to solve is 'How might I share my animal as a living animal with my class?' That's the problem and that's the problem you need to solve. I have had conversations with parents. I have given them the same message that I am going to give you right now. They don't have a problem to solve, you do."

When the students finished a social studies project, Mrs. Anderson said to her class, "Whose responsibility is it to get me your paper?"

During a science project, a student said to Mrs. Anderson "Mrs. Anderson, the wings are looking like moth wings." Mrs. Anderson replied, "And how can you fix that John?" Another student asked Mrs. Anderson, "Do you think this is close enough to a butterfly?" Mrs. Anderson

responded, "What do you think? Do you think this looks like a butterfly? What do you think?"

After the students in Mrs. Anderson finished a social studies project, Mrs. Anderson asked the class, "What would be the best thing to do with your time if you are finished?"

When a student had not turned in a class assignment, Mrs. Anderson held an individual conference with him to discuss his plan for completing the project:

Anderson: "Terry, how are you doing?"

Terry: "Well, my head is okay."

Anderson: "What about your book?"

Terry: "Well, not that good."

Anderson: "Okay, this is the date that it is due. So, what is your plan?"

Terry: "I don't know."

Anderson: "Okay, earlier today you said to me that you were sick for a week. Have you worked on your book at home?"

Terry: "A little."

Anderson: "Okay, then I am not getting any message that you are trying to make up for the time that you were sick. You want me to make up for it by extending your time. See, if I have a job to do at school and I am a student and I miss some school then when I get well again I need to work out what I need to make up and when I need to get those assignments done and I need to do some extra work because I missed a week of time. I am not hearing from you that you did any of that for that extra responsibility, picking up for lost time. So, I am not hearing a lot of need to extend your time because you have not talked to me about that. All you said was today when it was due that you were sick for a week but you didn't talk to me about it before that. So, you want me to make the arrangements but you haven't made any. Do you hear what I am saying?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, I want you to think about it and I need a plan from you as soon as possible."

When the students started a social studies

project on U.S. conflicts, Mrs. Anderson held the following conversation with her students:

Anderson: ". . . there [are] lots of ways that you can get that information.
 Student: "Yes."
 Anderson: "Is it the best way for me to just tell you the answer right now to that question?"
 Student: "Probably not."
 Anderson: "I don't think so. I could sit up here on this stool and I could just spew information to you for hours on end about United States History. Would that be the way you want to learn?"
 Student: "No."
 Anderson: "Me either. So, we have information that we need to learn about the conflicts of the United States. Gain information yourselves and leave something for the future citizens. [Mrs. Anderson wrote the goals on the chalkboard.]

Mrs. Oliver also facilitated thinking skills and a process approach to learning in her classroom through modeling, student input, problem solving, student accountability and ownership of learning and behavior, and interaction and cooperation.

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained her job as a teacher:

". . . all you are trying to do is to help a child so that he can solve his own problems. 'What do you think?' in terms of education as well as discipline. So, in reading and writing, those two subjects in particular, that is my job. I see my job as just sitting down and saying, 'Well, let's take a look at this. What do you think?' All my questions and things, I try to say, 'How do you feel about that?' and 'What do you think if?' So, they have to think and they have to decide where they are headed on their next piece or in their next book instead of me making those decisions for them. You are dealing with student behavior. 'Well, what do you think? What do you think if this happened? What do you think would

be a good consequence? To me, it is the same kind of wording and questioning going on in both."

Mrs. Oliver explained what she would do if a student made a disturbance while she was doing a lesson:

"Now, if I was leading a class discussion and someone did that, I would make a general comment like, 'When I am talking I would really appreciate it if no one else was talking. I think this is really important and I want all of you to know this. So, let's all pay attention.' Then, I would go over to that child later and say, 'You know, that really bothered me when you spoke out when I was talking. Then, I would go through the whole process. 'What would help you remember not do that? I would go through the whole process that I always go through.'"

Mrs. Oliver encouraged her students to be accountable for their own learning and behavior. During a math lesson, a student complained about another student out loud in the class. Mrs. Oliver held an individual conference with the student after the Math lesson was finished. The following conversation demonstrates how Mrs. Oliver encouraged her students to be responsible and to practice a process approach to problems of interpersonal relations:

Anderson: "Okay, remember when you raised your hand and you were complaining?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, why did I say I would talk to you later?"

Student: "Because you were working."

Anderson: "Yes. When are you suppose to tell me about something like that?"

Student: "When you are not working."

Anderson: "Yes. Who are you supposed to talk to first when you have a problem with that?"

Student: "Her."

Anderson: "If it doesn't work out, what do you do then?"

Student: "You."

Anderson: "Would you do it in front of the whole group like this?"

Student: "No."
Anderson: "Okay, do you see why I said wait until later?"
Student: "Yes."
Anderson: "Okay."

After a student requested to have an individual conference with Mrs. Oliver, the following conversation ensued:

Anderson: "Mary, you wanted to see me?"
Student: "I'm stuck."
Anderson: "Get me your plan and then I'll help you."

During a class discussion, Mrs. Oliver asked her students how they solve a problem. A child explained the following:

"You give us time to think it over and the next day you call us back up and we tell you what we thought of and then if we haven't thought of anything then you do it."

She explained the process she would follow if a student hit another student:

"What I would do is the victim would come to me and would say so and so hit me and I would ask them if they have talked to the person themselves first. If they didn't, then I would send them back to the person and have them talk to the person and try to work it out. If they can't work it out together then they can come up and make an appointment to see me and then the three of us would sit down together. Basically, this is the way I handle all the discipline things. I would ask, 'Well, how do you feel about that? What do you think you need to do?' We would work out together what the consequence would be and how the person would go about doing that."

During an interview, Mrs. Oliver explained the process she would follow if a child deliberately destroyed another child's work:

"I would set up an appointment with both of them. I would say, 'Well, have you talked to him or

her about it." If they haven't done that, they need to go talk to that person about it. If they can't settle it between the two of them, then we would make an appointment to settle it. I would treat it just like anything else. I would say, 'She has a problem with what you have done. Why don't you talk and say what you feel? Tell us what you are feeling. Why would you do this?' And then what I have used and seems to work real well is 'What would make you happy about this? What could she do that you would feel good about? Now, how do you feel about that? Do you think you could do this? Is that going to take care of this? What do you think you need to do? You just destroyed this person's property. What do you think you should do about this?' Usually, I bring in which one of the rules they have not followed. I bring the rules back into it, the compelling state interests. They decide among themselves what the consequence will be. It works great."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver what she would do if a student became upset in her classroom and threw a book and started screaming and swore at her, she explained the following:

"I would probably say something like, 'You know, you were swearing at me? How do you think that made me feel?' Then, whatever happened, I would just go through the process of 'What do you think you need to do to make that right?'"

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students also practiced a process writing approach. Mrs. Oliver explained the process:

"The process is rough draft, reading their story to see if it makes sense, and going to a group share. After group share, they do a revision. Then they have a partner share where they are looking for meaning and for clarification with a student. After partner share, they do a partner edit where they both edit it. Then, they turn it to me. I look at it and I have a conference with them. Then, we go over the story and determine what the goals are going to be for the next story that they do. I tell them what . . . they have done well in it. If there are things

that they have done in the past that they did not do in this one, then I send them back to their editor."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson, "Who is the editor?", she answered:

"There is a sign up sheet. Anytime they are at group share or partner share or an edit, they go and sign up. Each morning when it is writing time, we just go down the list and say, 'Are you ready to edit? Are you ready?' So, those two will go edit. They go to the hall or find a place to edit their work."

Mrs. Oliver encouraged her students to think and process information. During an individual conference, Mrs. Oliver said to a student:

". . . what I am asking you to do is to think. You can take a second to think about it. Something in the story, that if it was changed, how would it change the story. How would it make the story different?"

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom interacted with one another and worked in cooperative learning groups. While getting ready for the morning writing session, Mrs. Oliver teamed students for partner share:

"Now, let's look at partner share. John, are you ready for partner share? Dustin, how about you? Kathyryn, are you ready? So, you and John will work together today."

When the students were working on a social studies project, Mrs. Oliver explained to the class what to do if one of their peers was having a problem with map directions:

". . . look to see if anyone needs help. You can say something like, 'Would a neighbor please help Mary? She is having trouble finding it.' Okay, so that's what you want to do."

In the afternoon, when the students were working in cooperative learning groups, Mrs. Oliver made the following statement to the class:

"Now, I want you to come up with ideas of how to use a flowchart. I'll give you one minute in your groups to talk about how you would make and use flowcharts."

Coach.

Both fourth grade teachers encouraged and instructed students on an individual basis, listened to what a student was saying, guided and fostered ideas, asked and answered questions.

During an individual conference, Mrs. Oliver coached a student to understand the meaning of voice in the writing process:

Oliver: "How would a mom feel if her daughter is crying? What could you write to show how she feels?"
 Student: "Sorrowfully."
 Oliver: "Okay, what could you write?"
 Student: "My mom felt really sorry for me as she put her arms around me."
 Oliver: "Anytime you can add notes to let me understand how the writer feels, that is voice. Does that help you with voice, to let you know how to add voice?"
 Student: "Yes."

During an individual conference, Mrs. Oliver guided the student on how to publish a book for a story that he had finished:

Oliver: "Do you want to make a book?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Oliver: "Okay, what is the next step?"
 Student: "I'll go over to Mrs . . ."
 Oliver: "What you need to do is to go down to the office and have this copied

off and then you do your dummy copy of the book. Do you know how to do that?"

Student: "Yes, I go down and ask someone to copy it off and then I bring it back for my dummy copy."

Oliver: "That's right. Do you know how to do your dummy copy?"

Student: "Yes."

Oliver: "Okay, tell me what you do."

Student: "You cut out like sentences and then you put them onto a piece of paper."

Oliver: "Do you know where the paper is?"

Student: "Right there. When you get them glued on, you have to make sure they are all in order. You decide how much you want on each piece of paper, on each page."

Oliver: "Do you want an illustration on the page? What do you want on the page? You would cut out from the copy just exactly what you want on each page."

Student: "So, do you want me to go down right now?"

Oliver: "Yes."

When a student shared a story during a reading conference, Mrs. Oliver guided her on how to punctuate dialogue:

Student: "Do I change this?"

Oliver: "Is there someone talking there?"

Student: "No, it's me, the author."

Oliver: "Right. So, you don't need to. This is where you had your dialogue, here."

After a student shared his records with Mrs. Oliver at an individual conference, she explained the following:

". . . be sure you keep up everyday. That is important. See, it's hard for me to tell what you have been reading and that is important."

When a student needed help with word meaning, he asked Mrs. Oliver the following question:

"Mrs. Oliver, what's that called? You know

when you look at a tree and you draw it and try to figure out what kind of tree it is? What's that called?"

Mrs. Oliver replied, "You are keying out something. You are keying it out if you are trying to find out what the name of it is."

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained how she helps her students with schoolwork:

"We would look at it together, and go over it together. Let's take reading. For instance, Ron came to me and said, 'I'm really having trouble reading enough in this book.' I said, 'Why do you think that might be?' It came down to that the book was too hard for him. John decided that he did not want to continue with the book. He wanted to choose something different."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson how she helped her students with their schoolwork, she replied:

"I answer questions that they have. My students, at this point of the year, are fairly independent learners or they are cooperative learners. So, instead of relying on me, they rely on each other or themselves. They first draw on themselves to see how they can get the answer to their question. If they can't come with something on their own, they'll ask a friend or someone in their cooperative group. If that person doesn't have an answer, then they will come to me. So, I'll answer questions but usually by not giving them the information. I'll give them a direction before I give them information. I consider myself a coach in the classroom not a direct instruction classroom teacher. There isn't very much time that is spent in direct instruction."

Mrs. Anderson explained her philosophy of the role of the teacher in the classroom:

"I believe that the students are here to learn and that needs to be encouraged in every thing that I do. I am a coach. I am on the sidelines in the classroom and not the focal point. They are the focal point."

Mrs. Anderson coached students during the writing process. After a student read her story to Mrs. Anderson, she asked, "On my face? [Mrs. Anderson then suggested the following revision for the story.] You washed your face with water. The child replied, "Yes. [The child revised his story.] I washed my face with water." Mrs. Anderson responded, "Some of the words, the way you put them need to be revised. Like 'Me and her were getting a haircut.' Could you say 'we?'" The student answered, "Yes."

When a student was working on a social studies project, Mrs. Anderson held the following conversation with a student:

Anderson: "How many lists were you supposed to make?"
 Student: "Two."
 Anderson: "What do you do with them?"
 Student: "Take one home and [put] one in your spiral."
 Anderson: "What do you do with the one at home?"
 Student: "Study."
 Anderson: "Okay, just a reminder."

When a student was having difficulty with a math problem, Mrs. Anderson met with him on an individual basis:

Student: "Do we write the problem?"
 Anderson: "Yes, you do. You need to write the problem and show your work. [Mrs. Anderson walked around the room and whispered with students on an individual basis.]

Mrs. Anderson coached a student on how to bind a book that he had completed:

"John, there is a stapler in the office that

will do the binding for you. And that's really what I think you want. Are all your pages folded?"

While a student was working on a reading assignment, Mrs. Anderson helped the student individually:

Anderson: "What's up Erin?"

Student: "I don't understand this part.

"I don't get why it says . . ."

Anderson: "What happened in the story that made you feel fear?"

Monitor.

Both fourth grade teachers checked on the progress, understanding, readiness and learning rates of students through observation, keeping and studying anecdotal notes and moving spontaneously about the room.

While the students were working on a morning reading assignment, Mrs. Anderson checked on the learning rates of the students:

Anderson: "I wouldn't expect that everyone would be finished with those pages by Math time. But what do you think I would expect by Monday at 9?"

Student: "Chapter One."

Anderson: "Yes, that everyone would be up to the second chapter by Monday. How realistic is that? Raise your hand if you think that would be no problem for you? [Students raise their hands.] Okay, great. You may continue reading right now. Thank you."

After Mrs. Anderson circulated in the room to check on the students' progress in reading, she made the following announcement to the class:

"I walked around and noticed that many of you are up to page nine. You have to read to page eighteen. You have nineteen minutes before Math time."

When Mrs. Anderson's students were working

independently on a reading assignment, Mrs. Anderson circulated in the room to answer questions and check on student understanding. A student asked Mrs. Anderson, "What should I put on the report?" Mrs. Anderson leaned over and whispered directions to the student.

When a student was having difficulty making a book cover, Mrs. Anderson held the following conversation with him:

Anderson: "David, do you want the paper laminated for the cover of your book?"

Student: "Yes."

Anderson: "Okay, then you need to mark in [the name of the book] on the cover and then we will have it laminated. Then, you can put it on your book."

Mrs. Oliver also circulated in the room to check on student progress and understanding. While the students were working in cooperative learning groups, Mrs. Oliver circulated among the groups to check what and how they were doing. She asked one group, "Are you guys all doing the same problem?" The group responded, "Yes." Mrs. Anderson replied, "Okay," and continued circulating in the room. When one of the groups was having difficulty with the assignment, Mrs. Oliver explained the following:

"This is what I want you to do. I want you to help each other out. I want you to make a problem for the other people. If there is someone that doesn't know the facts, then don't worry, it is the process. Everyone has a chance to make up a problem."

Mrs. Oliver also monitored the students' spelling progress. During an interview, a student from Mrs. Oliver's class explained how the following spelling

practices were implemented in his classroom and how

Mrs. Oliver helped him with spelling:

"When we are writing, she will help us. When you are doing it, you want to get it done as fast as you can. When we get it all the way done, she [Mrs. Oliver] circles the words. If you have a lot of the same words spelled wrong, she will spell one of them right and circle it and then circle the rest of them. She will circle every word that I spell wrong."

Manager.

Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson acted as managers in the classroom by managing schedules, time and dates for materials and assignments or projects. They kept the students on task, checked and marked off assignments and assigned grades.

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained how she evaluates a child's reading:

"What I do is I look at their reading journal and then we look at the records to see if they have kept records. Not how many pages they have read but whether they have kept records. Then, I mark it on a scale. A sufficient amount depends on the student, what level they are on. Self selected appropriate reading level is determined by whether the book was a good book for them or not. This is where the vocabulary comes in. What I do is I look at that [vocabulary] card to see what words they have there and if it's appropriate."

While Mrs. Oliver was working with a student during an individual conference, she explained:

"Here [are] your daily records. You did a sufficient amount. Zero would be if you didn't do it all and five is if you did it very well. You have done it very well. Now, you don't have a vocabulary card, so I would have to give you a zero here."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Oliver's classroom how his teacher helps him, he explained:

"She looks at how many vocabulary words you have and she looks at how many times you write in your journal. She looks at your daily records and sometimes she has something that we do with her. Like, we think of what will happen next."

One method Mrs. Oliver used to evaluate writing and reading skills was explained during an individual conference:

". . . the skill that I usually have up on the board, this week it was paraphrasing, the students know that when they come up here [individual conference] I'm going to be asking them to paraphrase for me. I grade them and evaluate them on how well they did that skill that we have learned."

During the morning work session, Mrs. Oliver met with a student individually to discuss his grades. She explained the following:

"This is your oral presentation. That was when you were presenting it to the third graders. You didn't write it yourself. You had the high school girl and other people helping you. So, I didn't give you any grades at all on the things that had to do with mechanics and the sentences. What I gave you credit for were your ideas and organization. I graded you on that. I thought you did an excellent job on your report."

During a reading conference with a student, Mrs. Oliver explained what needed to be done before she would grade his work:

Anderson: "Before I grade you on this, I think you should do that first. It was a part that you hadn't done. You had gone through the whole process

but you need to do your part three revisions. What do you think you are going to do when you go back?

Student: "Put in the directions. Like, how you want them to look and how you want them to feel and how you want their voice to sound and things like that."

Anderson: ""Why don't you go back and start working on that. When you are finished doing that, put your name up here and then I'll get back with you."

During an interview, Mrs. Oliver explained what she would do if a student did not complete his assignments:

"We would have a conference and I'll say, 'You know, I am concerned because this is what shows me that you know what I am teaching you or not. So, if I don't have this, then I don't know that you have learned what I have taught"

When the researcher asked one of Mrs. Oliver's students during an interview what her teacher would do if she didn't do her schoolwork, she replied, "Well, she needs that. She needs to know what you know to put a grade on your report card."

Mrs. Oliver assigned dates for projects and/or reports. While the students were working on a social studies project, Mrs. Oliver made the following announcement to the class:

"Now, if you would be able to put this together real soon, raise your hand. [Students raise their hands.] Great. Would there be anybody that would be ready by Thursday? [Children raise their hands.] Oh, good. You can go ahead and keep working and I'll do this [assign dates for reports] while you are working."

When Mrs. Oliver was finished making the list of dates for reports, she rang a bell and explained the following to the class:

"Okay, I figured out what dates you will be presenting. So, on the paper you are writing your plans on, I am going to tell you the date and you write it down. On Thursday, the ninth, Ann and David will be presenting. Write it down so you will remember."

Mrs. Oliver acted as a manager for students to complete assignments by a certain time. While the students were working on a writing assignment, Mrs. Oliver made the following announcement:

"What I'm going to do is I'm going to hand out the letters that have been completed in pen and those of you that are working on your letters still, I want you to finish them up. We really need to get those in the mail today."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver during an interview how she checked off assignments, she explained:

"A work chart is what we call that. I go through the grade book on Fridays. Any work that has not been turned in, I write that down. I circle anything they have out that hasn't been turned in. And then on Monday, anyone that has assignments that are not finished, see me before they go out [to recess]. They make a plan of how they are going to get their work caught up and then we write it on the chart."

Before the students were dismissed for recess, Mrs. Oliver circulated in the classroom to check off assignments. She said to a student, "If you are done, you can go to recess." She went over to another student and asked, "John, what do you have left to do? The child explained that he had paraphrasing left to do and that he would do it after math.

When the students were working on a social studies assignment, Mrs. Oliver explained:

"I am going to come around with a clipboard. I'm going to ask you where you want to take us. That way, I will have a list of where everybody wants to go. We will negotiate with people that want to go to the same place."

While the students were working on an assignment in the library, Mrs. Oliver made the following announcement to the class to keep the students on task:

"I need your attention. I'm starting to get concerned. What I am seeing is some laughing and some things that I don't find appropriate. What I want is the noise level to go down and I want you to be working. Remember, we only have the rest of today and tomorrow in the library. You need to be working as hard as you can to get as much information as possible. So, use your time really well."

Mrs. Anderson also acted as a manager in the classroom. After the students were done working on a reading assignment, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement:

"We have some finished books and we have some unfinished books. I would like to find out where we are. If you have a finished book, it needs to go up here in the basket. I am going to call everybody's name and all I want you to tell me is if your book is finished or not. I know that there's many of you who are not finished but you have forty-five minutes to work on it right now. So, you can start working while I call the list."

After Mrs. Anderson was done calling off names, she held an individual conference with one of the students:

Anderson: "How close are you to being finished with your writing and your typing?"

Student: "I have three pages left."

Anderson: "You might want to get some help to get it finished because it is due today."

Mrs. Anderson met with another student and said, "How close are you to being finished with your book?" The student replied, "I'm done. It's right here."

After the students were done working on a social studies assignment, Mrs. Anderson explained the following:

"There is a paper due today. Please don't move yet. You need to be in your seats and listening. I think that you have had plenty of time to get this sheet done. But the note cards, since I didn't give you time to work on note cards this afternoon, I don't think that would be fair to collect those from you today."

At the end of the school day, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"Some people did not turn in Science homework. You will be asked Monday morning for Science homework. Please clean out your cubbies and take home anything that needs to go home."

When a student was ready to explain a math game to a group of students, Mrs. Anderson kept the students on task by stating the following:

"Just a minute Mary. I hear noise that makes it difficult to hear [your] voice. You need to be sitting quietly and listening to the person giving directions."

Student's Role

Instructor.

The students in Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson's classroom provided directions and/or clarification for an assignment. They acted as teachers and provided examples for concept development.

The students in Mrs. Anderson's classroom were given the opportunity to perform as teachers by conducting and

being in charge of a weekly news report. A student made the following announcement to the class:

"I would like to welcome you to the weekly news report. [The student gives a report on the Trailblazers.] Well, that's our news update."

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the students brought Math games to school to share with the rest of the class. The person who brought the game was given the opportunity to perform as a teacher by explaining the directions of the game to his peers:

"This is the discount game. You have dimes and quarters. You cover all the squares with coins. You need a one to move the die. If you get a zero, you can't move. Whoever has the most coins, wins the game."

In the morning, the students in Mrs. Anderson's class gave directions for Daily Oral Language. A student went to the front of the classroom and explained:

". . . capitalize the 'h', cross out 'had', cross out 'them' and write 'those.'"

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom also performed as instructors. In the morning, the students took turns going to the front of the classroom to share stories they had written. After they shared their stories, they asked the class for comments. The following are examples of student comments:

Student: "I liked the way you changed it."
 Student: "I liked the dialogue."
 Student: "I liked the title of the story."
 Student: "I liked how you described what they were going to get."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class provided examples

for concept development. When the students were working on a Social Studies assignment to plan and map a vacation, a student provided examples with the class by sharing the destination of her trip and what she needed to take on the trip with the class:

"We will be going to Grants Pass. We need to take a sleeping bag, binoculars, warm clothes, extra clothes, bathing suits and skis. We will be swimming, skiing, and activities."

Process Learner.

The students in both fourth grade classrooms performed as process learners by thinking, processing, analyzing, comparing/contrasting, and researching information. They asked questions, made observations, choices and decisions to solve problems and make sense. The students performed as independent learners.

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class processed information and made choices during the writing process. During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained the writing process as it occurs in her classroom:

"The process is rough draft, reading their story to see if it makes sense and then going to a group share. After group share, they do a revision and then they have a partner edit where they are looking for meaning and for clarification with another student. After partner share, they do a partner edit where another student edits it. Then, they turn it into me. I look at it and I have a conference with them. We go over the story and determine what the goals are going to be for the next story that they do. I tell them things they have done well. If there are things that they have done in the past that they did not do in this one, then I send them back to their editor."

When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver what the students

do with their stories after they have gone through the process, she explained the following:

"After that, they decide how they are going to go public. We have a mother that is a writer. She comes on Wednesdays. She takes them out and conferences with them in the hall individually. The students tell her what they want done with their work. If they just want it posted in the classroom, then it is typed. If they want it to be a book, then there is a form that we use for the book. If they are going to publish a book, they do a dummy copy of the book. The way they do that is they take their draft to the office and it is copied off. And then after that, they take the paper that is the same size of the book that they are going to publish and they cut out what they want on each page. They glue it to the page. That is what they take out to the mother. She takes a look at it and takes it home and types it up and brings it back. The student puts a cover on it and it's done."

When the researcher asked a student during an interview if they chose what they wrote stories about, she explained:

"Well, if it is a subject you are really interested in, you make a story plan. A story plan is that you have your piece of paper and you write down the character, setting, action, problems, and solutions."

A student in Mrs. Oliver's classroom explained how he is a process learner during the writing process:

"First you get your writing log and write down what you are writing and when you started it. You write the story and when you are all done with it, you put down the date you finished it on the writing log. Then you go to group share and read the story to some kids. At group share they give you some suggestions about what they like about your story and questions. Then you go back and do your revisions. Then you go to partner share. They help you and give you more suggestions to make it better. After you are done doing all of that, you go to editing. You get a dictionary and look over the words to see if they are spelled right and if you have the right punctuation. Then you let Mrs. Oliver check over it. Then you go to Mrs. Little and

she looks over it and types the story for you and you've got a finished product."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom applied thinking skills as process learners to solve problems. When the researcher asked Mrs. Oliver who is in charge of classroom meetings, she explained:

"Whoever has their name on the agenda, they run the meeting. Basically, they state the problem, ask if other people in the room have the same concern. If they don't have the same concern, they need to take care of it personally between them and the other person. If it's a lot of people, there is discussion on it and they come up with suggestions to solve the problem. So, those are the steps."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class also solved problems during Student Council Meetings. Mrs. Oliver explained the following during an interview:

"They work in committees and they do projects. They come up with what they are going to do for this month and for that month. If there are any problems in the school, a class can send it back with a representative and then the Student Council works on solving problems for the school."

Before a Student Council meeting began in Mrs. Oliver's classroom, she made the following announcement to the class:

"We are working on the social skill of the school to be neat and clean. You are trying to decide how to change the goal this week. We had lots of problems of how to record it."

Two students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom went to the front of the room and led a discussion on how to solve the problem of recording. After a lengthy discussion, the

students made a decision to lower the goal and that Student Council would keep records. A student summarized the decision:

"We could have the Student Council keep track of our tally marks. Then, we wouldn't have to worry about putting them down. They could tell us if we made our goal or not."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom also applied thinking skills as process learners to solve behavior problems. During a class discussion, a student made the following comment:

"I think this year is a better adjustment at school because instead of something on the board or having to miss a recess, you think of something else that is going to help you better than that. You are thinking of it. When you get your name on the board all the time, it doesn't help you make your own decisions. Rather, everyone else makes your decisions."

Another student made the following comment during the class discussion on problem solving:

"If I went over and started kicking someone as hard as I could, you [Mrs. Oliver] would talk to me and see if I could come up with a consequence. You would ask, 'Would this help you not to do this anymore?'"

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Oliver's classroom what his teacher would do if he called someone a bad name, he replied:

"You have to think of your own consequences. What will happen if that happens again."

During a class discussion, a student explained the process used to solve behavior problems in the classroom:

"I have something about when you are solving a problem. When you solve a problem, say you

are not getting along with somebody, you keep arguing with them and you get in fights, then you try to talk to them first. We work it out amongst ourselves. We have to try and work it out first. When we come up with a solution, we go to you [Mrs. Oliver] and tell you what it is. If it isn't as good as you think they can do by themselves, then you let them go back and try again. If they started doing it again the next day, you would come up with a consequence."

During a morning work session, the students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom processed, compared and contrasted information to arrive at generalizations as demonstrated by the following conversation:

Oliver: "What are the different kinds of leads that are possible at the beginning of a book?"
 Student: "Typical."
 Oliver: "A typical lead. What's another kind of lead?"
 Student: "A dialogue."
 Oliver: "A dialogue lead where people are talking. What's another one?"
 Student: "Action."
 Oliver: "An action lead where the character is doing something."
 Student: "Thinking."
 Oliver: "And a thinking lead where characters are thinking. Okay, look in the book you've got right now. Go to any chapter and read the first couple of sentences. Figure out what the lead is. John?"
 John: "On Saturday morning, I could hardly eat my cereal."
 Oliver: "All right, what kind of lead is that?"
 Student: "A talking lead."
 Oliver: "Was anyone talking?"
 Student: "He was."
 Student: "Or thinking?"
 Oliver: "Well, let's look at it. Was the character talking?"
 Student: "No."
 Student: "He was just thinking."
 Student: "Action."
 Oliver: "Is there anyone doing anything?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Student: "No."

At the end of the conversation, the students decided that John's lead could be either thinking or a typical lead.

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the students also performed as process learners. Before they started a social studies project on U.S. conflicts, Mrs. Anderson stated the following:

"You are going to be going through the known and unknown and you are going to be choosing what you want to find information about. You are going to be looking for something that you want to research, that you really want to know about. So, you will dig into books, you will dig into the library. Then, you need to decide what the best way is to give that information to the class."

For a science assignment, the students in Mrs. Anderson's class practiced research skills and making hypotheses. Mrs. Anderson clarified the assignment with the students:

Anderson: "Can somebody identify what the three parts are to the whole assignment that I have given you?"

Student: "You have to do research about your animal."

Anderson: "That's one piece. What is a second piece?"

Student: "Think about hypotheses about your animal."

Anderson: "Okay, hypotheses, a tested hypotheses. The results of that test need to be a part of your report. What is the third part?"

Student: "Think of how you are going to get your animal to school."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's classroom also performed as process learners during the writing process. During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained the writing process:

"They choose their topic for writing and when they get finished with pre-writing and rough draft, then they run the story by someone else in the classroom and ask them to read it or they might read it to the whole class. There is usually some time where they can read stories out loud to the class and get suggestions from their classmates about the story. Once they have written the rough draft, then they go into the revision process; reading and sharing it with someone else is part of the process. When they have finished revising the story, then they go through the editing process. We use Daily Oral Language for them to practice editing their material. They need to go through their paper if it's going to go to a final published form. They go through their paper to edit it, they have someone else go through their paper to edit it and then they do a final draft and they give it to me. I go through it to edit and give any suggestions for revisions. Then they do their published book or whatever they are writing."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's classroom about the kinds of choices he makes in the classroom, he explained the following:

"What you want to write about or how you want to explain your answer. If you read something and a whole bunch of people have it one way and you want to explain another way for the same thing, then you can choose how you want to explain it."

Interestingly, another student answered the same question in this way:

". . . you can choose the book that you want and then when you are done with that, you can choose how to explain it on the papers that the teacher gives you."

The students in Mrs. Anderson's classroom performed as process learners to solve behavior problems. During an interview, a student explained what would happen if someone took something from someone in the classroom:

"You say, 'Could you please put that back' or 'That's my property and you have to put that back.' There would be no consequences if you solved it with the other person and they gave it back."

When the researcher asked a student if he made the rules in the classroom, he explained:

". . . she [Mrs. Anderson] says to us to just think it through in your head before you do something and what happened if you did."

Peer Teacher.

In both Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the students collaborated, interacted and coached each other in the learning process.

When a student was conferencing with Mrs. Oliver, she suggested he find a peer to help him edit his story:

"What you should do is to talk to the person and say, 'You know, I really want to edit this. Could you help me?'"

After a student from the class volunteered to help edit the story, Mrs. Oliver said, ". . . she's got something that she has really worked hard on. She needs to think about paragraphs and spelling. So, would the two of you work on that?"

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained group and partner share where students coach, interact, and collaborate with each other during the writing process:

"The group share is where three not more than four students come up and share their stories. Basically, someone reads and then they say something positive about the story. They ask questions, to get more information, and they make suggestions. The person writes down the suggestions and they decide if they want to use those suggestions or not. On the writing

log, they write down the revisions they will do. For partner share, they work with another student who is also doing a partner share."

After a student read his story to the students at group share, the students took turns, asking questions and giving suggestions to the writer. The following conversation demonstrates the process during group share:

Student: "I like the part where the teacher made nine mistakes."
 Writer: "Do you like the first part, the way I started it?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Writer: "Questions?"
 Student: "My question is, is this a conversation?"
 Writer: "Yes."
 Student: "My suggestion is to describe where."
 Writer: "It was at their house."
 Student: "You can't tell a story. It is a conversation. Describe where and when."
 Student: "My suggestion is you could put a narrator in there. You could put the narrator describing the house and what is going on."
 Student: "She gave you a suggestion. You don't have to write it down."
 Student: "I'll write it down."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's class worked in groups of four to solve problems. Before the students started with an assignment on how to make flowcharts, Mrs. Oliver made the following announcement:

"In your group of four, I'd like you to decide on one flowchart. You need to divide up the work. Someone will draw the pictures. Someone will write the instructions underneath with the arrows and someone will be the spokesperson. They will stand up and share what you've come up with. The other person, the fourth person, will be the person to make sure that you stay on task and will be watching and will ask questions like, 'Will everyone understand this? Is this really clear?' So, everyone will work together. Decide who will do what jobs. Everyone will help. What my job will be is watching and I want to hear positive comments

to each other. I want to hear you talking and and giving good suggestions that are positive to each other."

During math time, the students were divided into groups to solve problems. Mrs. Oliver explained the following directions for the groups:

"What you are going to do in your groups is each one is going to make up a problem for the other people. You can only have two digits on top and two digits on the bottom because that's what we are working on right now. If there is someone in your group that you know doesn't know the their facts very well, you want to make the numbers lower so that they will be able to do it because the purpose in doing this is to learn how to go through the process. You want to see how many points your group can get. What you are trying to do is trying to learn how to do this. You're trying to help everyone in your group. So, go for as many points as you can get. You help each other. If someone is having trouble, you want to help them."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students interacted with one another during the Student of the Week activity. When the activity started, the student was at the front of the class. His peers asked him the following questions:

"What is your favorite brand of shoes?"
 "What is your favorite drink?"
 "Where do you wish you could live?"
 "What is your favorite basketball team?"
 "What is your favorite season?"
 "Do you wish you had glasses?"
 "If you had to eat a crayon out of a sixty four crayon box, which one would you eat?"

The students in Mrs. Anderson's class also collaborated, interacted and coached each other in the learning process.

When the researcher asked Mrs. Anderson if the students

read and wrote stories together, she replied, ". . . they read and write together in pairs."

Mrs. Oliver explained in an interview that during the writing process the students:

". . . [the students] read stories out loud to the class and get suggestions from their classmates about the story. Reading and sharing it with someone is part of the process."

When the researcher asked a student in Mrs. Anderson's class if they helped each other write stories, she explained:

"Yes, when you are revising you do. When you are revising it and they might help you when you are writing it out on the computer."

In the afternoon, when Mrs. Anderson's class returned from music, the students worked in pairs or small groups to map the United States. The following conversation demonstrates two students interacting with each other:

Student: "Are you done yet?"
 Student: "No."
 Student: "Want me to tell you the next word?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Student: "Utah."
 Student: "What is 47?"
 Student: "New Mexico."
 Student: "I sure don't know the location."
 Student: [Pointed to New Mexico.]
 Student: "Oh, that is good. There I am done. Did I get them all right?"
 Student: "I don't know."

Before a math activity, Mrs. Anderson made the following announcement to the class:

"It is math time. Mary and Andy will be partners. David and Ron will be partners. Jason and Don will be partners. The two of you will be partners. [All the students are with a partner.] Okay, everybody has a partner. You will get a calculator

and play this game with your partner.
 What you have to try to do with your partner
 is strategize the best numbers to get the
 most amount of points. Talk about what
 your choices will be [with your partner.]"

Evaluator.

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom evaluated and corrected their own schoolwork and their peers' schoolwork. During an interview, Mrs. Oliver, explained that students "are evaluating their own work. They guide their own learning in a way." This evaluation process was practiced by Mrs. Oliver's students during group and partner share. A student from Mrs. Oliver's classroom explained how they evaluated each other's work during group share:

"Each person has to do each one of these. First, you say something nice and then you ask questions like when, where, why, what, how and make suggestions. You say just what you think you should do in the story. The clipboard is for keeping grades. If, let's say, Chris said, 'Well, I like the part when Brian threw up in the trash can or something, he didn't say something, or he gave one but it wasn't very good, you'd give him a check. And if he doesn't say one at all, you give him a minus. Then it goes on your report card."

The students in Mrs. Oliver's classroom also checked each other's work in cooperative learning groups during Math. Before the students started their assignment, Mrs. Oliver gave them the following directions:

". . . do the problems yourself and then check with someone to see if they agree. If they don't agree, then they do the problem to see if they get the same answer. Work together to get the answers."

During a science activity, the students in Mrs.

Anderson's class evaluated each other's work. After Mrs. Anderson shared a plan with the class on how a student was going to bring a live animal to school, she held the following conversation with the class:

Anderson: "What do you hear in the plan that you think will work and what do you hear in the plan that you think won't work?"
 Student: "You would need a video and recorder. It sounds like they have that."
 Student: "It sounds like the person forgot about the research and report."
 Anderson: "To do the research and the report?"
 Student: "Did they cover everything?"
 Student: "No."
 Anderson: "What didn't they cover?"
 Student: "The hypothesis."
 Anderson: "The hypothesis. So, this person needs to think through making sure they are covering the hypothesis. You are giving feedback and that is real good."

In Mrs. Anderson's classroom, the students also evaluated each other's work during the writing process. During a student interview, a student explained who does the editing for a person's story:

"Another person in the class edits for somebody else's story. Like, I go pick somebody to edit my story."

Manager.

The students in both fourth grade classrooms kept records, managed materials and were responsible for various classroom management jobs.

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students kept records of their schoolwork. During an interview, Mrs. Oliver explained that procedure:

". . . they keep track of the book they have read, what date they started it, what date they finished it and what date they abandoned it. They also

have records. Everyday they write down the page they started on and the day and page they finished."

The following conversation between Mrs. Oliver and a student during an individual conference demonstrates how the students kept records:

Oliver: "Let me see your records. Okay, which book did you abandon?"
 Student: "Emily. It wasn't good."
 Oliver: "It just wasn't a book that you were interested in?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Oliver: "Okay, you read twenty four to thirty. Was this Christmas Memories?"
 Student: "Yes."
 Oliver: "Okay, and I saw you on the fourteenth. Thirty to forty one . . . and let me see here. Christmas Memories. That was the date you abandoned it. Okay." Your record keeping is good and you have been reading a good amount. What do you think of this book?"

During an interview with Mrs. Oliver, she explained that Student Council members were responsible for various jobs in the school:

"One of the officers for Student Council is the Health and Safety Officer. [He] gives out certificates to the different classes for pride of our school like if a class goes out and cleans the playground. The Health and Safety Officer gives out certificates and posts the certificates."

In Mrs. Oliver's classroom, the students managed materials. After the students were done playing a math game, Mrs. Oliver made the following announcement:

"Time to go back to your desk." [One student from each math group, who had performed as the teacher, took the cards and placed them away in a packet].

The students in Mrs. Anderson's class also managed

materials and were responsible for various management jobs as demonstrated by the following conversation:

Anderson: "Let's make a list of the things that need to be done."
 Student: "Math books need to be put away."
 Student: "Fill out March calendar."
 Student: "Clean out desks."
 Student: "Clean off the front table."
 Student: "Clean paper off the floor."
 Anderson: "We need to hang octagons. Who wants to volunteer? [A student volunteers]. Who wants to straighten out the shelves? [A student volunteers]."

After the students in Mrs. Anderson's class had completed a hands on math activity, she made the following announcement to the class:

"Okay, would you connect your cubes? Have one person in your group collect the cubes, one person collect the cards and one person collect the sticks."

During a morning classroom observation, the students performed as managers by taking role and lunch count without Mrs. Anderson in the classroom. While the students took role and the lunch count, many students wrote down the Daily Oral Language assignment in their notebooks. When Mrs. Oliver arrived in the classroom, she made the following announcement to the class:

"Are you done with calling names and taking lunch count?"

The students replied, "Yes." Mrs. Oliver then began with morning work directions.

Similarities and Differences Between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline Classrooms.

The purpose of the qualitative comparison listed above is to determine similarities and differences with respect to

classroom variables, i.e., classroom climate, teacher instructional strategies, the teacher's role and the student's role between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms.

Classroom Climate

Respect.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers showed a courteous regard for students' feelings and encouraged students to show respect for other people's feelings. The teachers treated children fairly and recognized individual differences, i.e., developmental learning abilities.

All of the teachers showed a high regard for the constitutional rights of others. They encouraged their students to respect other people's property, privacy, and freedom of expression. However, one major difference between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is that students in Judicious Discipline classrooms clearly understood their constitutional rights and how they applied in the classroom. In contrast, students in Whole Language classrooms did not know the language of the Bill of Rights, its meaning and application in the school setting.

Democracy.

The students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms engaged in a democratic learning process demonstrated by voting, class meetings, and the opportunities to make choices and decisions. All of the

students were given opportunities to solve problems, make decisions and vote on some matters of curriculum and classroom management. Interestingly, the students in all four classrooms made similar kinds of choices, (e.g., topics for writing, books to read, when to complete projects, how to complete projects, and how to go "public" with their stories.)

In contrast to Whole Language classrooms, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms were in charge of formal class meetings. The students decided the agenda, solved problems and made some limited classroom/school building management decisions. In Whole Language classrooms, the class meetings were less formal. The teacher called for the meetings and was in charge of them. However, the students did give input, solve problems, and make decisions.

Trust.

A sense of trust existed between the teachers and students in both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms, demonstrated by open communication and by a significant student voice in the learning process resulting in joint agreements between the teachers and the students. Thus, the classroom environment in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was student-centered, interactive and democratic. The students worked together collaboratively and were given the opportunity to express their opinions on various subjects and issues. However, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms were also

encouraged to exercise "freedom of expression" publicly through announcement boards and "Speak Out Boards." This particular type of expression was not observed in Whole Language classrooms.

The students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms established trust by making joint agreements for classroom rules. These rules emerged from collaborative effort among students and teachers in all four classrooms. However, the rules in Whole Language classrooms were more clearly focused upon a traditional concern, "how to make the classroom run smoothly." In contrast, the rules in Judicious Discipline classrooms were more grounded upon a legal framework, namely the Compelling State Interests.

The students and teachers in both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms arrived at qualitatively similar agreements regarding curriculum and classroom management. However, the students and teachers in Judicious Discipline classrooms went on step further; they arrived at ethical agreements on how they wanted to be treated in the classroom. These ethical agreements were signed by all members of the class and posted in the classroom.

To establish trust and respect in Judicious Discipline classrooms, the students were also given receipts when their individual property was seized by their teachers. This strategy was not observed in Whole Language classrooms.

Self Sufficiency.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers

encouraged student accountability for their learning. All four teachers believed that students were at school to learn and were responsible for that learning. All gave their students an opportunity to make choices and to be responsible for those choices.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged their students to become more responsible, self-governing, more self disciplined, independent learners. This strategy was applied across the curriculum, and in matters relating to personal conduct. Whole Language teachers asked their students to explain, "What do you think?" when a problem had to be solved. Judicious Discipline teachers asked their students to explain, "What do you think you need to do to make that right?" and "What do you need to do?" to solve the problem. In short, both groups of teachers applied a "process approach" by asking questions, discussing classroom conduct problems with students, and most importantly, including them in establishing methods for dealing with "poor conduct."

But, Judicious Discipline teachers extended the "process approach" one step further. They taught their students the language and meaning of the Bill of Rights and how they could lose those rights based on the Compelling State Interests. In addition, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms clearly understood that they were responsible to choose consequences that would help them learn.

Reinforcement.

A major difference between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms existed in the area of reinforcement. Although all Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers made positive comments to students, Judicious Discipline teachers did not reward students for appropriate behavior. Stars and other extrinsic awards for appropriate behavior were not observed in their classrooms.

Teacher Instructional Strategies

Directives.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers provided materials, examples, structure and directions for an assignment and stated problems with a directive to correct problems.

Processing Information/Thinking Skills.

The teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms encouraged their students to think, ask questions, process and research information. Their instructional strategies included encouragement of student input, active participation, hands on activities, open-questioning, elaboration, reviewing, summarizing, comparing/contrasting, guessing, making predictions, making sense, and generalizations. All of the teachers encouraged their students to think and "make sense" in the learning process.

Individual Conferences.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers held

individual conferences with students to instruct, give encouragement, discuss problems and correct mistakes.

Interestingly, neither Whole Language or Judicious Discipline teachers used basal readers in their classrooms. The children in all four classrooms chose the books they wanted to read according to their interests. But, the teachers encouraged the children to chose different books if their choices were either too easy or too difficult. As the children were engaged in the reading process, the teachers instructed students individually. They listened to the children read and asked them to explain what the material, usually a story, was about. They asked students to guess, make predictions, identify patterns, compare and contrast characters in books, figure out the meanings of words in a way that made sense to them.

During the writing process, all four teachers met with students individually to help them make sense of "their" print and to work on specific writing skills, i.e., punctuation and grammar. During individual writing conferences, the teachers helped students elaborate their stories by asking questions and making comments.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers used individual conferences to solve behavior problems. When students engaged in inappropriate behavior, none of the teachers punished them. Rather, they gave children a "chance" by discussing and confronting problems with

them. They also encouraged their students to confront problems and arrive at solutions with their peers.

Again, the major difference between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms during the "process approach" to discipline was that children in Judicious Discipline classrooms understood their constitutional rights and how one lost those rights; in addition, they had the opportunity to choose a consequence for their behavior. The students in Whole Language classrooms were not knowledgeable of the Bill of Rights and its meaning and application in the school setting. However, the Whole Language teachers did practice a "process approach" for discipline by discussing problems with students individually and encouraging students to be responsible for their behavior.

Integration of Curriculum.

A difference existed between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms in the area of classroom structure. Whole Language teachers arranged for their classrooms to have learning centers and literacy stations which integrated language arts with all subject areas. Judicious Discipline classrooms did not have learning centers. However, in Judicious Discipline classrooms, the teachers continually integrated reading, writing, math, social studies, science, art and health.

A commonality of classroom structure in all four classrooms was that desks and/or tables were so arranged as

to promote cooperative learning groups. This arrangement allowed the language processes of speaking and listening as well as socialization skills to be learned within content and content was learned through language abilities in meaningful situations.

Transitions.

Judicious Discipline and Whole Language teachers employed bells, timers, instruments, hand signals, clapping patterns, and direct statements to their students to provide smooth transitions between class activities. The major difference between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms in the area of transitions was that Whole Language teachers reinforced smooth transitions by giving students "stars" for being ready for the next activity. Judicious Discipline teachers did not.

Teacher Roles

Instructor.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers provided directions and/or clarified directions for class and homework assignments.

Process Teacher/Facilitator.

The teacher's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was clearly that of a process teacher, i.e., a facilitator of learning and was accomplished by: 1) establishing a classroom environment that was student-centered, interactive, integrated and democratic and by 2)

applying a "process approach" to learning. The process approach was applied in all areas of the curriculum.

Whole Language teachers performed the role as a guide during the reading and writing processes. Everyday they modeled how to write and how to read with their students. They asked students to "watch" them write and read. In contrast, Judicious Discipline teachers did not model the writing and reading process for their students to the same extent as Whole Language teachers. They, rather, acted as editors during the writing process and asked students questions about the books they read.

However, all Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers helped students during the writing process by asking questions and making comments. They helped students "make sense" in their writing. In the same way, they helped students "make sense" in their reading. All Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers taught writing skills to children as they wrote and reading skills as they read.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers exercised a "process approach" to solve problems, which included "discipline" problems. When a child had a problem, all four teachers gave the responsibility to solve the problem to the child. If the problem was with another student, they encouraged both students to "work it out between themselves to arrive at a workable solution." If the problem was personal or with another student, the

teachers asked them the following types of questions: 1) "How can you fix that?" 2) "What do you think?" 3) "What is your plan?" and 4) "How do you feel about that?" Judicious Discipline teachers, in addition, asked their students, "What do you think would be a good consequence?"

During teacher interviews, both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers stated a common goal, namely that students become independent, responsible learners. Therefore, all four teachers encouraged students not only to learn from whatever "situation" confronted them, but also to take responsibility for engaging in the task of learning.

Another important role of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers was to facilitate "thinking" by asking students to process information. Rather than giving students direct answers to their questions, Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged students to apply thinking skills. In addition, all four teachers encouraged students to gather appropriate information and to decide how to share that information with others.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged cooperation and interaction in the classroom by placing students in cooperative learning groups. The students in all four classrooms worked together to complete assignments and solve problems. The teachers in all four classrooms facilitated cooperative learning.

Coach.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers acted as coaches in the classroom. They met with students on an individual basis to answer "how to" questions. They guided students in the learning process.

During the editing process, all four teachers coached students by helping them to decipher the meaning of difficult words or sentences and to spell properly. They coached students on how to punctuate dialogue, how to revise, and even on how to publish a book.

The teacher's role as a coach was that of helping students who were having difficulty with assignments, i.e., difficulty in measuring quantities, multiplying numbers, mixing powders for a science project, drawing faces, among others. The teacher as coach helped students with the following kinds of questions: 1) "How do I do this?" and 2) "What do I do here?"

Monitor.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers checked on student understanding and progress by moving spontaneously about the room. If a child needed assistance, each would stop to help. All four teachers monitored cooperative learning groups by going to the groups and asking, "How are we doing here?" If students did not understand the assignment, the teachers would explain the directions.

All four teachers also checked on individual learning

rates as they moved about the room. If they concluded that more time was needed to complete an assignment, they discussed the problem with the students. Ultimately, teachers and students arrived at agreements on "due dates" and on the amount of time needed to complete the assignments.

Whole Language teachers monitored student progress through observation. They watched what students were doing and saying at learning centers and literacy stations. They kept anecdotal notes and portfolios on each child. They talked to children "to find out how they are doing." During individual reading conferences, Whole Language teachers wrote anecdotal notes on what the students read and on the progress the child was making in reading.

Judicious Discipline teachers also monitored student progress through observation. They circulated in the classroom and watched students as they worked in cooperative learning groups, with partners or on an individual project. They commented on student work and answered questions. But, the researcher did not observe Judicious Discipline teachers writing anecdotal notes on the children as they circulated in the classroom. However, notes were recorded by Judicious Discipline teachers during individual reading and writing conferences.

Manager.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers acted as classroom managers. They arranged "due dates" and set

the amount of time to be allotted for assignments and/or projects, and all four teachers asked students if they needed additional time to complete assignments. They revised the original "due dates" if necessary.

All four teachers explained to students what materials were needed for assignments and supplied those materials. They explained where the materials could be located in the classroom. The teachers reminded students to put "hands on" materials back in cupboards and on shelves at the completion of an assignment.

Whole Language teachers did daily "check ups" to evaluate student work. They asked students the following kinds of questions during "checkups": 1) "Did you put your name on the paper?" 2) "What have you chosen at literacy stations?" and 3) "Whom did you work with today?"

Whole Language teachers kept anecdotal notes and a student portfolio with examples of student work. They checked off and initialed assignments. However, the researcher did not observe Whole Language teachers assigning "grades" for student work. But, Whole Language teachers did write notes on and placed stars on completed assignments.

In contrast, Judicious Discipline teachers evaluated student work by assigning grades. They kept records during individual conferences and checked off assignments.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers acted as classroom managers by keeping students on task. When the noise level in the classroom was too high, the teachers

would ask them to lower it. They asked students to use work time efficiently to complete assignments. They reminded students to "listen and work."

Student Roles

Instructor.

All the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms acted as instructors. They taught their peers how to play games. They gave directions to one another on how to complete projects. The students provided one another with examples of concept development such as patterning, constructing equations, and mapping. In all four classrooms, the students acted as teachers when they shared stories and when they asked one another for comments and suggestions.

The students in Whole Language classrooms brought objects from home to share with classmates and acted as teachers by asking for comments and by explaining the rules to follow for handling the objects. The researcher did not observe Judicious Discipline students sharing objects from home.

The students in Judicious Discipline classrooms led class meetings, directed daily oral language, took lunch count, took role, and gave weekly news reports. In Whole Language classrooms, the students led the morning opening by changing the dates on the calendar, by reading charts, and by leading songs.

Process Learner/Independent Learner.

The students in Whole Language and Judicious classrooms clearly performed as process learners by researching and gathering, analyzing, processing, and comparing/contrasting information. They asked questions, discovered answers to questions, made observations, made choices and decisions in the solving of problems and in general, "made sense" in the learning process.

During the writing process, students in all four classrooms processed information. They made choices on what to write and on what they wanted to do with their stories. They made story plans and revised them; and they edited their work. When students had a problem during the writing process, their teachers asked them "What do you think you can do about it?" The students, in short, had the ultimate responsibility to "fix it."

Students made choices and decisions during the reading process. They chose books to read and the students chose with whom they wanted to read. They extracted the meanings from words, compared/contrasted characters in books, and explained when, where, how, and what happened in those books. Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers asked their students the following types of questions: 1) "What do you think about that?" and 2) "Tell me what you decide to do about that." The students were responsible to "figure it out" in such a way that stories would make sense to them.

In Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms the students compared/contrasted information and made observations during reading, writing, science, social studies, health, and art. Rather than receiving direct answers to their questions, the teachers encouraged the students to analyze information and form generalizations.

Whole Language and Judicious Discipline students processed information to solve behavior problems. They worked out problems and arrived at solutions with teachers and peers. Additionally, in Judicious Discipline classrooms, the students chose consequences that would help them learn.

Peer Teacher.

Students in all four classrooms collaborated, interacted, and coached each other during the learning process. When students were writing, they helped each other revise and edit stories. They made comments, asked questions, and gave suggestions to help each other extend their stories. During reading, the students read to each other in pairs and asked each other questions about their stories.

The students in Whole Language and Judicious classrooms collaborated with one another to solve problems during class meetings. They also solved problems in cooperative learning groups and coached each other to complete assignments in math, social studies, science, reading, writing, art, and health. The students interacted with one

another during several class activities, (e.g., at literacy stations, in learning centers, in group sharing, in partner sharing, and in student council meetings.) In short, the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms acted as peer teachers throughout the school day.

Evaluator.

In Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms, the students evaluated their own and their peers' schoolwork. As one teacher explained during an interview, "students guide their own learning in a way."

In Whole Language classrooms, the students evaluated their work that was completed at literacy stations and in learning centers. They filled out forms which explained what they did at each station and whom they worked with. Whole Language students also corrected their peers' work. If it were done correctly, the students' "graders" placed stars on that work. Whole Language students also provided feedback to each other as they worked on assignments.

The students in Judicious Discipline classrooms also evaluated their schoolwork and kept records of what they read and wrote and provided feedback to each other while they worked on assignments. But, in the area of evaluation, Judicious Discipline students did not evaluate each other's work with stars.

In all four classrooms, the students were responsible for evaluating and "fixing" their assignments to make them complete. When students finished their assignments, their

teachers asked them the following types of questions:

1) "You're sure this is your best?" 2) "How could you check to find out if it's true?" and 3) "Check with someone to whether they [sic] agree." The students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms were given the opportunity to correct their own work.

Manager.

Students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms acted as managers. They were responsible for various classroom management jobs.

Jobs in Whole Language classrooms:

1. Changing the calendar
2. Feeding the animals
3. Cleaning desks and tables
4. Taking lunch count
5. Passing out "hands on" materials
6. Collecting "hands on" materials
7. Cleaning the chalkboard
8. Picking up materials at literacy stations and learning centers

Jobs in Judicious Discipline classrooms:

1. Preparing bulletin boards
2. Changing the calendar
3. Picking up paper off the floor
4. Cleaning desks and tables
5. Taking lunch count
6. Taking role
7. Displaying art work in the halls
8. Passing out materials for projects and assignments
9. Picking up "hands on" materials and returning them to their proper location

As one teacher explained during an interview, "Whatever can be done by a student is done by a student." This statement holds true for students in both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms with only the limited number of exceptions noted herein.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

In the United States, extensive efforts have been made to develop classroom instruction as a model of democratic process. The dominating figure in this effort has been John Dewey. Dewey stressed that an important role of education is to improve the capacity of the individual to reflect imaginatively and effectively upon information and concepts--including his own and others' beliefs and values --in the process of solving problems. He believed that a society of "reflective thinkers" employing, as it were, the scientific method of "inquiry" would be capable of improving itself as well as capable of preserving the uniqueness of individuals in a democratic society.

In Democracy and Education (1944), Dewey accordingly, recommended that the entire school be organized, as much as possible, as a miniature democracy in which students would acquire early experience participating in a "democratic setting."

In spite of Dewey's scholarly work and contributions to promoting the democratic process within the school setting, the implementation of democratic methods of teaching has been exceedingly difficult. Parents, teachers, and school officials have feared that democratic processes will not be efficient as teaching methods. Probably the most important hindrance is that few schools have been organized to teach the social and intellectual processes of democracy, much

less been organized so as to provide democratic learning environments in the classroom.

In the past decade, two democratic processes for classroom instruction have arisen which emphasize respect for and development of the individual and of the group. These educational models are Whole Language (Goodman, 1989) and Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1990).

Whole Language is a process of teaching and learning language within a democratic classroom environment, an environment in which students acquire language skills in an active process involving reading, writing, listening, and speaking through an integrated, not a fragmented curriculum. Such a curriculum invites them to solve problems and make choices about the kinds of experiences in which they participate (Goodman, 1989). Children are encouraged to shape their own lives, actions, interests, and interact with others (Rich, 1985a).

Judicious Discipline is a philosophy of education which provides a framework within which students participate actively in a democratic process leading toward the achievement of self discipline. The framework balances the rights of the individual and the welfare of the group. It is based on a synthesis of law, education and ethics which not only allows students to learn their constitutional rights but also teaches them how they may lose those rights. This synthesis also promotes an understanding of responsible citizenship in a democratic society (Gathercoal, 1990).

Effective problem-solving, effective making of choices, and nurturance of the child's self-esteem are also central to the educational practice of Judicious Discipline.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the classroom environments of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline with respect to their commonalities and differences. More specifically, this research addressed the following questions:

1. What are the commonalities and differences among the instructional approaches, classroom climates, and social interactions in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms?
2. What are the commonalities and differences between the teacher's role and student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms?

Findings

The findings of this study indicated the existence of more commonalities than differences between the classroom environment, the teacher's role and the student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms. The major commonalities are: 1) Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers practice an "inquiry process approach" for learning in all areas of the curriculum, including the discipline of a child's inappropriate behavior; 2) The classroom environment in both Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is student-centered, interactive,

integrated, and democratic, thereby fostering a student voice in the learning process; 3) The teacher's major role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is that of a "process teacher", i.e., a facilitator of learning; and 4) The student's major role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is that of a "process learner."

The major differences between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms are the following:

1) Although Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers facilitated a democratic learning environment in each of their classrooms, Judicious Discipline teachers went one step further by teaching students their citizenship rights and how those rights applied in the classroom as well as in the larger democratic society. The students in Judicious Discipline classrooms understood their constitutional rights based on the Bill of Rights and they understood how they could lose their rights under the doctrine of Compelling State Interests.

2. Whole Language teachers provided extrinsic awards for appropriate behavior i.e., stars and awards. Judicious Discipline teachers did not.

The management characteristics of the Judicious Discipline classrooms are not consistent with research on classroom organization and management. This point is demonstrated by the research studies conducted by Kounin (1970) and Gump (1967). Their research

suggests that the greater amount of student choice and the greater the complexity of the social scene, the greater the need for overt managing and controlling actions by teachers. In addition, student engagement was found to be higher in teacher-led, externally paced activities than in self-paced activities. However, it is important to note that the primary purpose of this investigation was to assess the similarities and differences in Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classroom environments. Consequently, no effort was made to document whether the Judicious Discipline model was an effective management approach. Clearly, research is needed to assess the effectiveness of Judicious Discipline as a classroom management scheme. However, it is clear from this investigation that whatever management scheme is used in Whole Language classrooms, the scheme should be consistent with the atmosphere which characterizes Whole Language classrooms.

Conclusions

Process Approach

The "process approach" for learning practiced by teachers and students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is similar to Richard Suchman's "inquiry process" for classroom instruction. Suchman (1966) described inquiry as "the pursuit of meaning" (p. 175). According to Suchman, individuals are motivated to continually make their encounters with the

environment more meaningful, that is "to obtain a new level of relatedness between and among separate aspects of one's consciousness" (p. 178).

The findings in this study clearly indicated that Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged their students to construct meaning through reading, writing, speaking, and listening. During the reading and writing processes, Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers did not stop students at the point at which they were producing meaning, nor did they draw attention away from the composing process. Instead, they encouraged students to construct meaning by using language cues (i.e., graphophonemic, syntactic, semantic) and reading strategies, (i.e., predicting, confirming, and comprehension.)

As the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms wrote stories, they employed "inventional" spelling techniques, that is, they guessed and used language cues based on their prior experience and expectations of language to spell words. As a result, the natural flow of thought was undisturbed as the children constructed meaning.

Students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms did, however, correct spelling, punctuation and grammar during the editing process with their peers, i.e., during partner share, during group share or with their teachers during an individual conference. This writing process in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline

classrooms is supported by Halliday's (1973) research on language learning.

The kind of writing that students accomplished in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is defined by Carole Edelsky (1984) as "authentic writing." Edelsky explains that "authentic writing" occurs when students

". . . write stores for publication, receive spelling and punctuation instruction as it is appropriate to the piece of writing they are working on." (p.47)

In addition, Edelsky explains that "authentic writing" is meaningful and functional for the writer. The children in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms chose what they wanted to write about and for their own purposes. This finding is supported by Halliday's (1973) research on language learning which suggests that schools approach language learning from the child's own linguistic experience since language learning takes place at the deeper levels of a child's prior knowledge and cognitive processes. Halliday contends that language is not learned independent of meaning or function.

In the same way that students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms wrote for meaning, they also read for meaning during the reading process. Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged children to "process information" as they read. However, none of the data in this study showed a Whole Language or Judicious Discipline teacher instructing children to read by drilling them on isolated linguistic units. Instead, the children

were encouraged to use language cues based on their prior experience and expectations of language. As the information was processed by the students, they confirmed, rejected, or corrected the passage as the reading progressed. This approach to reading is supported by Kenneth Goodman's (1967) research on the reading process. The teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms gave their students the opportunity to construct meaning during the reading process.

In summary, Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers engaged their students in an "inquiry" process approach during reading and writing to arrive at meaning.

The teachers and students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms also encouraged their students to practice an "inquiry" process approach to solve problems involving math, social studies, science, health, and art and when a problem arose with a student's inappropriate behavior in the classroom. This process is similar to Suchman's (1966) inquiry instructional model which consists of the following three phases:

1. Phase One: Encounter with the problem.
2. Phase Two: Inquiry through questioning, the collection and analysis of data, and the generation of hypotheses.
3. Phase Three: Analysis of the inquiry strategy with an emphasis on the development of more effective strategies. (p. 47-48)

In Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms, the students acted on the environment to solve problems. That is, they conducted experiments and analyzed problems by

gathering data and putting it together in new ways. They generated ideas and solved problems in meaningful ways. During the inquiry process the students asked questions and the teachers asked and answered questions. The students gathered information, determined what was relevant, and built concepts to solve a problem. The teachers and students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms also worked together to analyze strategies and solutions to problems. This "inquiry process" was demonstrated during reading, writing, math, social studies, science, health, and art, and when a problem arose with inappropriate classroom behavior. Across the curriculum, the teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms asked their students, "What can you do to solve this problem?" The students then proceeded through an "inquiry" process to arrive at a meaningful solution.

Classroom Environment

In Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms, the classroom environment was student-centered, which means all four teachers showed interest in their students as individuals. They let students know that they valued their experiences, their knowledge and that they liked them as individuals. They found out about students' interests, abilities and needs and used that information in curriculum planning. Teachers talked with students regularly, asked them questions, had conversations with them in which both parties were equal contributors. They also helped students

develop attitudes of responsibility. Thus, in effect, the teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms were democratic in their interactions with students rather than authoritarian. This is in line with Piaget's (1965) position which rejects an authoritarian role for teachers in the classroom. He argues, instead, that a major portion of student-teacher interaction should result in students and teachers acting as collaborators and as "equals."

The teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms used much of their time to prepare the environment in which children could learn through socialization and active involvement with each other and with adults. The data in this study showed that in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms the children worked together cooperatively in learning centers and/or on projects. Peer tutoring as well as learning from others through conversation while at work occurred daily. The children were encouraged in all four classrooms to evaluate their own work in small groups where in children took turns giving feedback to one another.

The researcher's observations of the social interactions which occurred in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms clearly revealed that the learning opportunities became more powerful and effective than might be found in a traditional classroom. While it was not primarily the researcher's task to determine the quality of

the amount of the learning actually achieved in the two types of classrooms that the researcher observed, the processes going on in these classrooms did conform in many important aspects with those [in the various studies cited] in which there apparently was much good learning and much opportunity to learn.

The classroom environment in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was organized to focus on the child as learner. Thus, language learning, i.e., speaking, listening, reading and writing were integrated. These language processes were learned within content, and content was learned through language abilities in meaningful situations so learners could make sense of both language learning and content. For example, during math, the children in all four classrooms explored, discovered, and solved meaningful problems through speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Math activities were integrated with relevant projects in science and social studies. Social studies [like math] was integrated with science and music. Social studies concepts were learned through a variety of projects and activities which involved research in library books, interviewing various people, discussions, and by using language, spelling, and reading.

The teachers in all four classrooms provided a generous amount of time and a variety of interesting activities for children to develop language, writing, spelling, and reading competencies such as: having high quality children's

literature readily available for pleasure reading and the gathering of information; discussing what was read; drawing, dictating and/or writing about their activities; planning and implementing projects that involved research; preparing and/or leading weekly news reports; making books of various kinds; listening to recordings or viewing high quality films of children's books; using the school library regularly, and reading to the teacher, to another child or to a small group of children on a daily basis.

Yetta Goodman (1989) explains that the notion of an integrated curriculum can be traced back to the 1940's and 1950's. At that time, integrated programs were being developed through the integration of language arts and social studies, social studies and humanities and science and math programs. Educators discussed ways of making education relevant to all students. Interestingly, the concern for better integration of the curriculum arose not only from the desire to emphasize the unity of knowledge through better integration of subject matter but also from the concern with fostering the integration, among students, of attitudes, values and the knowledge believed necessary for living in and for maintaining a democratic society.

The findings in this study indicated that the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms integrated social skills within content by planning, sharing, taking turns and working together cooperatively. The children explored values and learned

rules of social living and respect for individual differences through experience.

Thus, the classroom environment in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was democratic. That is, each child was viewed by teachers as a unique person with an individual pattern and timing for growth. Children were allowed to move at their own pace in acquiring important skills including those of writing, reading, spelling, math, social studies, science and art. In all four classrooms, the students participated, within limits, to decide what will be learned and how it will be learned. They discussed their views, beliefs, interests and concerns with others through classroom meetings and/or individual conferences with peers or teachers. Students were given the opportunity to make choices such as choosing their own reading texts and writing their own stories and telling their stories in individual ways. They made choices on how to manage their own behavior and solve problems with peers as well as how to solve problems within the content areas. In short, the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms had a "voice" in the learning process in an environment organized to show respect toward all members of the learning community with the expectation that learning will occur. In contrast to traditional classrooms, the students were empowered, to more than the usual degree, to govern and think for themselves and to be responsible for

their own actions which are basic principles of the democratic process.

Teacher Roles

The teacher's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was that of a "process teacher", i.e., a facilitator of learning. The teachers played a crucial role in organizing a democratic learning environment in which the teachers and students collaboratively set agreed upon goals. In addition, all four teachers facilitated learning experiences which focused on comprehension and making sense through communication processes. The teachers planned, organized and implemented social, interactive learning experiences for large groups, and small groups, as well as learning experiences for individuals. The learning activities were arranged so the teachers could observe the children in meaningful communication and content settings. The teachers interacted with children to facilitate learning by asking questions and encouraging children to think and solve problems. The teacher listened attentively to children, talked with children and provided feedback when necessary. Most importantly, Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged student independence in learning, self-evaluation and self-correction.

Student Roles

The student's role in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was that of a "process learner" which

means each one learned "how to learn" within meaningful contexts through an "inquiry process approach" to learning. Since the students were given a voice in the learning process and expressed that voice freely, albeit with respect for others, they also learned how to govern themselves in a democratic classroom environment. As "process learners", they processed information to solve problems across the curriculum, including behavior problems. They applied thinking skills; they made choices; they made decisions; they studied problems and arrived at solutions; they examined alternatives and made improvements to make sense of their work. They selected from a variety of learning experiences, had opportunities for independent learning and were expected to be responsible for their own learning by planning, doing and evaluating their learning.

Thus, students as "process learners" in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms were given a voice in the learning process. They were given the opportunity to express that voice freely, with respect for others. They were given the opportunity to make choices and learn responsibility. Therefore, the students as "process learners" began to learn how to govern themselves in a democratic classroom environment. The teachers in all four classrooms did not do things for students that students could do for themselves. They allowed their students the opportunity to think and learn through experience.

Differences

All Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers established a democratic learning environment in their classrooms by encouraging students to practice democratic processes, (e.g., stating opinions, discussing differences of opinion, voting, making choices, being responsible for their choices, respecting each other as individuals and working together cooperatively.) However, the significant difference between Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classrooms is that students in Judicious Discipline classrooms clearly understood the meanings and implications of the Bill of Rights in the classroom. Unlike the students in Whole Language classrooms, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms understood their constitutional rights, (i.e., freedoms) and how one may have those freedoms abridged, limited, or modified when the needs and interests of the majority weigh greater than those of an individual--any individual.

Judicious Discipline teachers, unlike Whole Language teachers, taught their students the meanings of the First Amendment, Fourth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment and how their rights, which are protected by these amendments, could be applied in the classroom. Their teaching seemed "to take" since the data in this study clearly demonstrated that students in Judicious Discipline classrooms understood the meanings and implications of freedom of speech, religion, and the press, search and seizure, and due process. The

students understood they could express their opinions, not only because their teachers encouraged them to, but because they had a constitutional right guaranteed under the First Amendment. The students clearly understood that their school property would not be taken away from them unless the teacher gave them a "reasonable cause" to do so. The students also understood their rights of due process, i.e., notice, a hearing, and the right to appeal a decision when a right may have been violated. In addition, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms understood that their rights could be limited when the exercise of those rights adversely affected the welfare of the group; they understood the meanings and implications of the Compelling State Interests.

As a result of the students' understanding of their constitutional freedoms and the needs of the majority, they established rules in the classroom based on the Compelling State Interests, rules relating to property loss or damage, legitimate educational purpose, threat to health and safety, and serious disruption of the educational process. Unlike the rules in Whole Language classrooms, the rules in Judicious Discipline classrooms were formulated upon a legal framework, i.e., 200 years of constitutional law. This framework, within which students participated actively, balanced the rights of the individual and the welfare of the group; the rules were not arbitrary; and the students began to understand that they were based on a synthesis of law, education and experience.

In summary, the students in Judicious Discipline classrooms having learned their constitutional rights, having an opportunity to experience individual freedoms, and having developed some understanding of the limits of those freedoms vis-a-vis the general welfare, were regarded and treated as citizens. The data in this study clearly indicated that students in Judicious Discipline classrooms developed some considerable understanding of the language, meanings and implications of the Bill of Rights and of responsible citizenship by working and learning as citizens in their classrooms. In short, their citizenship rights were effectively integrated into the curriculum. They were not in Whole Language classrooms.

The second difference between Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms is that Whole Language teachers extrinsically motivated students to conform to the established boundaries of behavior by providing stars and awards for appropriate behavior. Judicious Discipline teachers did not. Rather, Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged their students to choose consequences that would help them learn appropriate behavior. When students deviated from the established boundaries of behavior, Judicious Discipline teachers encouraged them to get back on track by asking, "What needs to be learned here?" Each situation became a teaching opportunity, an opportunity for students to experience accountability for their own actions, and an opportunity for students to learn acceptable

behavior and to develop positive attitudes toward learning which, in turn, helps students succeed in school.

Implications

The findings and conclusions of this study indicate that the underlying philosophies and current practices of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline teachers are similar, that is, they clearly respect the individual child within a holistic learning environment, i.e., student-centered, interactive, integrated and democratic. Within this environment, they encourage children to make choices and to accept a considerable degree of responsibility for their own learning. Within this environment, the children learn language within content and content via language in meaningful situations through socialization, i.e., sharing, talking and listening within a social context. All teachers encourage their students to practice an "inquiry process" of learning to think, to process information, to make generalizations, to solve problems in all areas of the curriculum, plus problems of personal behavior. In short, the students in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms "make sense" of their work, their surroundings, and thus their lives in meaningful ways and in meaningful contexts.

The teachers in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms interacted democratically with their students; they actively participated as co-learners, coaching, demonstrating and explaining, always adhering to the goal

that students should become independent learners. The foci in Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms was on meaning (not on facts for their own sake). It was also on a democratic process that developed each student's sense of ownership and voice in the learning process--accepting considerable responsibility for one's own learning.

Whole Language instruction and Judicious Discipline instruction not only complement each another but are notably similar in philosophy and in democratic instructional methodology. Consequently, if an educator is going to implement Whole Language in his/her classroom, it would seem sensible for that educator to also implement Judicious Discipline or a management scheme with a similar philosophy. To cite one important example, Judicious Discipline fosters a student voice in the development of self-discipline in the same way that Whole Language fosters a student voice in the development of language. The two educational models appear to go "arm in arm."

Workshops should be provided for Whole Language teachers to learn the concepts and educational practices of Judicious Discipline.

The data in this study has clearly shown that Judicious Discipline is more than a method for "discipline." It is also a democratic, instructional method for children to learn how to process information and to solve problems. So is Whole Language. Therefore, in the same way that Whole Language is integrated with the curriculum in order that

teachers may teach children language in meaningful contexts, Judicious Discipline should be integrated with the curriculum in order that teachers may teach children self-discipline in meaningful contexts. In summary, the main reason for integrating Whole Language with Judicious Discipline is that both educational models implement learning strategies which foster thoughtful student independence and responsible self-government attitudes through an "inquiry process approach" to learning, an approach which can be applied to all areas of the curriculum and ultimately, to life beyond the formal school years.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are proposed for further study.

A study should be conducted to compare Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classrooms with classrooms that are not implementing either instructional methodology. This study would help determine if the inquiry process approach is a result of the instructional practices of Judicious Discipline and Whole Language.

Judicious Discipline and Whole Language should be compared across a wider spectrum of grade levels. This type of study would help determine whether the similarities and differences between Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classroom environments are due to an age factor.

More than two Judicious Discipline classrooms and more than two Whole Language classrooms should be compared at

each grade level. This type of study would allow more meaningful comparisons of the similarities and differences between Judicious Discipline and Whole Language classroom environments.

Although the environments of Whole Language and Judicious Discipline classrooms appear to have more similarities than differences, the effectiveness of Judicious Discipline as a management approach is yet to be established. Consequently, a final but critical recommendation for future research is that the relative effectiveness of the Judicious Discipline approach be investigated.

References

- Allen, P.D., & Watson, D.J. (1976). Findings of research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications. IU: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Council of Teachers of English.
- Altwerger, B., Edelsby, C. & Flores, B.M. (1989). Whole Language: What's new? In G. Manning & M. Manning (Eds.). Whole Language: Beliefs and practices, K-8 (p. 9-23).
- Anderson, G.S., (1984). A whole language approach to reading. MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Aspelund, C.L., (1970). Free speech rights of school children. Loyola Law Review 6 (166).
- Bar-Adon, A., & Leopold, W. (1971). Child language: A book of readings. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B. (1979). A functionalist approach to the acquisition of grammar. In E. Kennan (Ed.), Developmental pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- Bethel School District v. Fraser, U.S. 106 (1986).
- Bigge, M., (1982). Learning theories for teachers. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Bock, J., (1989). Literacy learning for developing readers in a whole language classroom. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, AAC9003188.
- Bogden & Taylor (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bolden, R., (1987). A study of judicious discipline: A constitutional perspective for school rules and decisions and its effect on the school related attitudes of students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.
- Bruner, J., (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. Journal of Child Language 2 (1-19).
- Chomsky, N., (1957). Syntactic structures. The Hague: Mouton.

- Chomsky, N., (1959). A review of verbal behavior by B.F. Skinner. Language 35.
- Chomsky, N., (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N., (1968). Language and mind. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Christensen, K., (1990). Whole Language in perspective: A teacher's continuum. (Educational Resource Information Center. No.ED315725).
- Clarke, M., (1987). Don't blame the system: Constraints on "whole language" reform. Language Arts 64 (384-396).
- Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cutlip, J., (1969). Symbolic speech, high school protest and the First Amendment. Journal of Family Law. 9 (119-125).
- Dale, P., (1976). Language development. New York: Holt.
- Darwin, C., (1977). Mind. (Reprinted in A. Bar-Adon & Leopold, W.F. (Eds.), Child Language: A book of readings. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971).
- Dewey, J., (1944). Democracy and education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Dewey, J., & Bentley, A.F. (1949). Knowing and the known. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Edelsky, C., & Smith, K., (1984). Authentic and inauthentic writing. Language Arts. LXI January (25)
- Edelsky, C., (1990). Whose agenda is this anyway? A response to McKenna, Robinson, and Miller. Educational Researcher. 19 (7-13).
- Edmonds, M., (1976). New directions in theories of language acquisition. Harvard Educational Review. 46 (175-198).
- Fennacy, J., (1988). Teaching and learning literacy in two kindergarten classrooms. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49. AAC0564794.
- Furth, H., (1970). Piaget for teachers. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Gathercoal, F., (1990). Judicious discipline. Michigan: Caddo Gap Press.
- Gleason, J., (1985). The development of language. Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Glover, J., & Bruning, R. (1987). Educational psychology: Principles and applications. Canada: Little, Brown & Company.
- Goodman, K., (1965). A linguistic study of cues and miscues in reading. Elementary English 42 (641-645).
- Goodman, K., (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. Journal of the Reading Specialist. May.
- Goodman, K., (1969). Analysis of oral reading miscues. Applied psycholinguistics. Reading Research Quarterly, 5 (9-30).
- Goodman, K., (1975). The reading process. In S. Smiley & J. Townes (Eds.), Language and Reading. Sixth Western Symposium on Learning Language and Reading, Western Washington State College.
- Goodman, K., (1986). What's whole in whole language? New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Goodman, K., (1989). The whole language evaluation book. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Goodman, K.S. & Goodman, Y.M. (1977). Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. Harvard Educational Review. 43 (217-333).
- Goodman, K.S., Shannon, P., Freeman, Y.S. & Murphy, S. (1988). Report card on basal readers. New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers.
- Goodman, Y., (1970). Using children's reading miscues for new teaching strategies. The Reading Teacher, 23 (455-459).
- Goodman, Y., (1989). Learning theories for teachers. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975).
- Gordon, H., (1988). Learning to think: Arendt on education for democracy. The Educational Forum, 53 (49-61).
- Graves, D., (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. New Jersey: Heinemann.

- Graves, D.H., (1979a). Andrea learns to make writing hard. Language Arts, 56 (569-576).
- Graves, D.H., (1979b). Let children show us how to help them write. Visible Language, 13 (16-28).
- Graves, D.H., (1979c). What children show us about revision. Language Arts, 56 (312-319).
- Graves, D.H., & Calkins, L.M., (1980). Research update: Children learn the writer's craft. Language Arts, 57 (207-13).
- Graves, D.H., (1981a). A case study observing the development of primary children's composing, spelling, and motor behavior during the writing process. NIE Grant Mo. G-78-0174 Project No. 8-34/9-0963.
- Graves, D.H., (1982). How do writers develop? Language Arts, 59 (173-179).
- Gump, P.V., (1967). The classroom behavior setting: Its nature and relation to student behavior. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 015515)
- Guilfoyle, K., (1988). Teaching Indian children: An Ethnography of a first grade classroom (Native Americans). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, AAC8907957.
- Halliday, M.A.K., (1973). Explorations in the functions of language. New York: Elseview.
- Halliday, M.A.K., (1975). Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language. New York: Elseview.
- Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 108 S. Ct. 562 (1988).
- Hogan, J.C., (1974). The schools, the courts, and the public interest. Mass: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Holdaway, D., (1979). The foundations of literacy. Australia: Ashton Scholastic.
- Hymes, D., (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographics of communication. In J. Gumperz & Hymes (Eds.), The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist, 55 (1-34).
- Kasten, W., & Clarke, B. (1986, July). A study of 3rd and

5th grade students' oral language during the writing process in elementary classrooms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association World Congress on Reading, London, England.

Kelly, E., Rogers, C., Maslow, A., & Combs, A. (1962). Perceiving, behaving, becoming. New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kounin, J.S., (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lee, D.M. & Allen, R.V. (1963). Learning to read through experiences. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lemon v Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971).

Levine, A., (1973). The rights of students. New York: Sunrise Books, Inc.

Lutz, F.W., & Ramsey, M.A. (1974). The use of Anthropological field methods in Education. Educational Researcher. 11 (5-9).

Malinowski, B., (1922). Argonauts of the western pacific. London: Ourtledge and Kegan Paul.

McEwan, B., (1987). A study of the application of judicious discipline: A constitutional perspective for school rules and decisions in selected Oregon school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

McNeil, D., (1970). The acquisition of language: The study of developmental psycho-linguistics. New York: Harper & Row.

Miel, A., (1986). Teaching for democracy. The Educational Forum, 50 (319-323).

Miel, A., & Brogan, P. (1957). More than social studies. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Mitzel, H., (Ed.), (1982). Language development. Encyclopedia of Educational Research (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Moshman, D., (1985). Children's intellectual rights. (Educational Resource Information Center. No. ED 1312501).

Moss, K., (1982). The developmental aspects of the writing

- process of young children: A review of related research. Texas A and M University, Microfilm No. ED236674.
- Murray, F.B., (1982). Teaching through social conflict. Contemporary Educational Psychology. 7 (257-271).
- New Jersey v. T.L.O., 105 S. Ct. 733 (1985).
- Newman, J., (1985). Whole language: Theory in use. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- O'Keefe, V., (1983, November). Using oral communication in the regular curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
- Owens, R., (1988). Language development. Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Pflaum-Conner, S., (1978). The development of language and reading in young children. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Piaget, J., (1964). Piaget rediscovered. Elementary Science Study Newsletter. June (15).
- Piaget, J., (1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press.
- Piaget, J., (1967). Six psychological studies. New York: Vintage Books.
- Piaget, J., (1970). Genetic epistemology. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Pinnell, G., & Haussler, M. (1988). Impact of language research on curriculum. DE: International Reading Association.
- Pugsley v. Sellmeyer, 158 Arkansas, 247, 250 S.W. 538 (1923).
- Read, C., (1975). Children's categorization of speech sounds in English. (Research report No. 17). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Reutzel, D., & Cooper, R. (1990). Whole language: Comparative effects on first-grade reading achievement. Journal of Educational Research. May/June (252-257).
- Ribowsky, H., (1985). The effects of a code emphasis approach and a whole language approach upon emergent

- literacy of kindergarten children. (Educational Resources Information Center. No. ED 269720).
- Rich, S., (1985a). Whole language: The inner dimension. English Quarterly. Summer (15-22).
- Rich, S., (1985b). Restoring power to teachers: The impact of "whole language". Language Arts. 62 (717-724).
- Riley, L., (1987). Psychology of language development. Ontario: C.J. Hogrefe, Inc.
- Rist, R.C., (1973). The urban school: A factory for failure. Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T. Press.
- Rose, L., (1989). The Democratic beliefs of whole language teachers. Democracy and Education. Spring (35-38).
- Rosenblatt, L.M., (1969). Towards a transactional theory of reading. Journal of Reading Behavior. 1 (31-49).
- Rosenblatt, L.M., (1978). The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Routman, R., (1988). Transitions: From literature to literacy. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Saville-Troike, M., (1982). The ethnography of communication: An introduction. England: Basil Blackwell & Mott.
- Schimmel, D., & Fischer, L. (1977). The Rights of parents: In the education of their children. Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.
- Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479 (1960).
- Skinner, B., (1957). Verbal behavior. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Slaughter, H., Haussler, M., Franks, A., Jilbert, K., & Silentman, I. (1985, April). Contextual differences in oral and written discourse during early literacy instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Smith, L.M., & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

- Smith, E., Goodman, K., & Meredith, T. (1970). Language and thinking in the elementary school. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, F., (1971). Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, F., (1975). The relation between spoken and written language. In E.J. Lennebert & E. Lennebert (Eds.). Foundations of language development: A multidisciplinary approach (347-460).
- Smith, F., (1979). Phonology and orthography: Reading and writing. Elementary English. 49 (107-108).
- Smith, F., (1982). Writing and the writer. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, W.E., (1989). What's so democratic about whole language? Democracy and Education. Spring (1-4).
- Southgate, V., (1973). The language arts in informal British infant schools. The Reading Teacher. January
- Suchman, J.R., (1966). A model for the analysis of inquiry. In C. Harris, (Ed.), Analysis of concept learning (pp.47-48) (175-178). New York: Academic Press.
- Taba, H., (1962). Curriculum development. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Tinker v Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).
- Tikunoff, W.J., Berliner, D.C., & Rist, R.C. (1975). A Special study: An ethnographic study of the forty classrooms of the beginning teacher evaluation study known sample. Submitted to California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.
- Tyler, B.J., (1988). The effects of a whole language classroom on the development and use of text strategies by retained first-grade students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, AA C8913460.
- Urzua, C., (1989). Empowering learners through whole language. Democracy and Education. Spring (39-46).
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, (1977). The Rights and Responsibilities of Students. Speech and Expression. Washington, D.C. (23-28).

- Venesky, R.L., (1967). English orthography: It's graphical structure and its relation to sound. Reading Research Quarterly 2 (75-106).
- Vygotsky, L.S., (1962). Thought and language. Mass: M.I.T. Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S., (1978). Mind in society. Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wadsworth, B., (1984). Piaget's theory of cognitive development. New York: Free Press.
- Watson, D., (1989). Defining and describing whole language. The Elementary School Journal. 90 (129-141).
- Weaver, C., (1988). Reading process and practice. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. (1943).
- Zimmerman, B., & Whuitehurst, G. (1979). Structure and function: A comparison of two views of the development of language and cognition. In G. Whitehurst & B. Zimmerman (Eds.) The functions of language and cognition. New York: Academic Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Mrs. Caster's Daily Schedule

Daily Schedule

- 8:40 - 9:00 Graph-lunch count, attendance, write in journals;
- 9:00 - 9:30 Calendar, newspaper-sharing, discussions, singing, stories, reading (partners, whole group), Big Books, dramatizations, announcements, planning;
- 9:30 - 10:00 Whole group: writing (stories, personal letters, non-fiction), word charts (lists, webs, brainstorming ideas), word searches (around the room and in dictionaries), sound-sorting (within words/poems/chants), special projects;
- 10:00 -10:15 Recess: undirected, supervised outdoor play;
- 10:15 -11:00 Literacy stations: child chosen activities in reading, writing, listening, speaking, illustrating, collaborating. (Currently, fourteen open-ended choices.) Teacher meets with one to six children for project work, skill development. Includes time for clean up and child-done inspection;
- 11:00 -11:30 Special classes: library, music, p.e.;
- 11:30 -12:00 Lunch;
- 12:00 -12:30 Quiet reading: library books, teacher's collection, children's magazines, district series, health and social studies texts, dictionaries, encyclopedias, old textbooks, old primers, class written books;
- 12:30 -1:00 Math Their Way (individual, small or whole group);
- 1:00 - 1:50 Learning centers: child chosen activities in sand, water, blocks, woodworking, cooking, listening center, chalkboard/feltboard easel, painting, inventions, playdough, home center, "explore" table, computer, painting, dollhouse, games and puzzles, manipulatives, reading, writing, pets, and math games;
- 1:50 -2:05 Recess;

- 2:05 -2:25 Gathering on the rug for stories, songs,
 evaluating our day;
- 2:25 - 2:30 Leaving until tomorrow.

Appendix B

Mrs. Rue's Daily Schedule

Room "U" Substitute Schedule for Barbara Perkins (home 563-2855)

REGULAR SCHEDULE

*detailed schedule below

8:15 Children start to come to the room. They have "use of the room time" until we start class.
 8:50 Class starts
 Opening/ lunch count/ calendar
 9:20 DEAR (drop everything and read)
 --WEDNESDAY ONLY--Computers
 9:50 Spelling Lesson
 10:00 Recess
 10:20 Language Arts
 11:20 Lunch
 11:50 Recess
 12:30 Relaxation
 12:50 P.E./Music (Mon.-Thurs.)
 1:20 Sharing/Story (Tues.-Fri.)
 1:50 Recess
 2:05 Math/Art/Science/etc.
 3:00 First dismissal
 3:15 Second dismissal

DETAILED SCHEDULE

8:15 Use the room time
 --The children choose the activity that they want to work on. They can use blocks, computer, art supplies, math materials, etc.
 --About 8:40 you should help the recorder take lunch count and attendance. They take the green slip to the office.
 8:50 Children meet on the rug (I play a song on the piano to signal the time to come)
 --Add the next number to our "how many days have we been first graders" chart. Ask for the number and how many days until we get to the next "zero the hero" number (10, 20, 30)
 --Ask if anyone lost a tooth. Have them sign the tooth.
 --Calendar keeper changes the date sentences. They can read them or "be teacher" and let the class read them
 --Calendar keeper adds the pattern to the calendar.
 --Calendar keeper changes the activity sentences and chooses children to read them to the class.
 9:20 DEAR (drop everything and read)
 --The first 5-7 minutes is silent reading. Everyone at their desk. Then 15-20 minutes of self-selected partner reading.

--WEDNESDAY ONLY (9:20-9:50). Take children to the computer lab. Joanie Dempster is the computer aide and will have the lesson loaded on the computers. She will run the lesson, but you will need to stay with the children. Go straight to recess from computers.

9:50 Spelling Lesson

--Pass out yellow spelling papers

--Tell the kids there will just be one spelling group

--Children write first and last letters. They may say the word outloud.

10:00 Recess

--There is an aide on duty. You may have a break.

10:20 Language Arts (see attached plans)

11:20 Lunch

--The children eat in the gym

--This is your lunch break!!!

11:50 Recess and your planning time

12:30 Meet the children at the gym door.

Relaxation/Positive thoughts

--The children are used to coming into a darkened room for a formal relaxation. A few minutes of quiet time is nice even if you don't do a formal relaxation. If you don't do relaxation, it is great to have them think of something nice that they did or that someone did for them and share it with the class. It can also be their favorite place to go, favorite friend, etc.

12:50 Music/P.E. (Mon.-Thurs.)

--Music is on Monday and Wednesday. Walk the children to the music room (portable). Mr. Bradshaw is the music teacher. You do not need to remain with the children.

--P.E. is on Tuesday and Thursday. The children go to the gym and sit on the steps. Miss Bedlington is the PE teacher. You do not need to remain with the children.

--FRIDAY ONLY (see attached plans)

1:20 --There are 5 children who have the right to share each day. They have a "Mystery Share". It has to be in a bag and they must have 3 clues written down. The other children ask questions and try to guess the sharing. Judge when they've tried long enough.

--After sharing, read stories until recess. Choose ones you like to read.

--MONDAY ONLY (1:20-1:50) Children have library. Marge Williamson is the librarian. You do not need to stay with the children.

1:50 Recess

- There is an aide on duty.
- 2:05 See attached plans
- MONDAY ONLY (2:05-2:30) There are 5 children who have the right to share. They have a "Mystery Shaare". It has to be in a bag and they must have 3 clues written down. The other children ask questions and try to guess the sharing. Judge when they've tried long enough. The room needs to be in order before the children go to computers. They need to take their belongings because they are dismissed from the lab.
- MONDAY ONLY (2:30-3:00) Take the children to the computer lab. Joanie Dempster is the computer aide and will have the lesson loaded on the computers. She will run the lesson, but you will need to stay with the children.
- 2:05 See attached plans for the remainder of the day.
- 2:50 (or sooner) Clean up/Messages
- The children are responsible for cleaning up the floor and table tops. They need to stack their chairs in piles of 5 or 6.
- Read any transportation messages that were delivered by the office helper. These usually arrive about 2:45.
- 3:00 1ST RUN BUS KIDS AND CHILDREN BEING PICKED UP leave for the buses. They know who they are. DON'T BE LATE!!!
- You stay in the room with the 2nd run and extended day kids.
- 3:15 All other children dismissed.

*****Ask Mary Bertun in Room U or Julie Craig in Room I if you need help.

*****We have helpers for certain jobs. The job wheel is by the calendar.

ATTENTION GETTERS:

Bells are on the top of the piano. They should cause statues when you ring them.

Stop, look and listen are words we have practiced.

Monday Journal Writing - Language Arts 9:20-10:30

Gather children on the rug. Write 2 or 3 sentences about what you did that weekend on chart paper. Have the children identify words they can read and you underline them. After they have most of them, read the entry to them and then have them read it together. Have them share a few things they did that weekend to give ideas to others.

--Children go to their desks and take their journals from their baskets. They find the reply I wrote to their last journal entry. It is in colored felt pen. They underline every word they can read. Then they raise their hands and read the entry to an adult. --They write a sentence answer to my question and then write what they did that weekend. --Their entry is complete when they have written more than the last entry and had it OKed by an adult.

--These adults are usually in room and understand the procedure.

--**Mitzi Shoemake, mother helper, Preah's mom,

--**Betty, teacher assistant (9:45-10:15)

WRITER'S WORKSHOP

This is self-selected writing. The children have on going projects that they are working on. They need to be writing. They are to draw the picture for one page and then do they writing for the story. You circulate and encourage their writing. Have them read their story to you. Ask what's going to happen next, how is it going to end, etc. Not all the children are self-directed and some need lots of help to stay on task.

--Gather children on the rug and focus them on writer's workshop. You can ask children to share what they are currently working on. Pick a couple to share their writing with the class.

--To dismiss them from the rug, call on each child and have them tell you what they are going to start working on.

--They get current projects from their unfinished work folder in their baskets. Blank books are on the cubby bookcase.

--Each child is working on something different and if you can't answer their question, ask them to try something different until I get back. They can always copy a book or poem they like.