DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 074 SP 037 865

AUTHOR Knudson, Ruth E.
TITLE The Relationship between Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices During Literacy Instruction for Non-Native Speakers of English.
PUB DATE 1998-03-13
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Bilingual Education; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Language Teachers; *Literacy Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Special Education Teachers; Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed 106 student teachers/interns to determine (1) whether they possessed theoretical beliefs about second language learning and teaching that reflected the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward teaching English as a Second Language (ESL); (2) the extent to which their instructional practices were consistent with their theoretical beliefs; and (3) whether their beliefs and practices changed from the beginning to the end of the year. Participants were preservice educators studying multiple subjects, single subjects, special education, and bilingual education. They completed the Beliefs Inventory, which examined their orientation to teaching ESL, and the Lesson Plan Analysis Task, which had them choose which lesson plans they preferred. Students who demonstrated clear theoretical orientations completed the Ideal Instructional Protocol, which had them describe preferred procedures, techniques, and materials; preferred groupings of students; preferred assessment measures; and good second language learners within ESL classrooms. Next, researchers used observational instruments to examine students' procedures and techniques, materials, grouping methods, assessment methodology, and interactions with students. All students were observed three times from January-June. Results indicated significant differences between programs in proportions of students having clear theoretical orientations and in theoretical orientations toward teaching ESL. Participants' practices were very consistent with their theoretical beliefs. Their theoretical beliefs did not change over the year. The survey instruments are appended. (Contains 17 references.) (SM)

The Relationship Between Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices During Literacy Instruction for Non-Native Speakers of English

Ruth E. Knudson, Ph.D.

College of Education

California State University, Long Beach

1250 Bellflower Boulevard

Long Beach, CA 90840-2201

(310) 985-5642

The Relationship Between Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices During Literacy Instruction for Non-Native Speakers of English

ABSTRACT

There are three questions to be answered with this study: First, to what extent do Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects with Bilingual/Crosscultural Emphasis, Single Subject, and Special Education Specialist pre-service teachers and interns possess theoretical beliefs about second-language learning and teaching which reflect the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward second-language teaching? Second, to what extent are pre-service teachers' instructional practices consistent with their theoretical beliefs? Third, is there a change in their beliefs and practices from the beginning to the end of the year?

One hundred eight student teachers/interns who agreed to participate in this study were administered a Beliefs Inventory (Leu & Kinzer, 1991; Johnson, 1992) and a Lesson Plan Analysis Task (Kinzer, 1988; Johnson, 1992). Those who demonstrated a clear theoretical orientation on these two instruments were then given the Ideal Instructional Protocol (Johnson, 1992). Since two of the student teachers/interns did not turn in complete responses, they were omitted from data analysis. Therefore, all data is reported for the 106 complete protocols.

Data were analyzed with an analysis of variance (BMDP). Since cell sizes were not equal among program groups, Sum of Squares III was used. Results indicated that there are significant differences between programs in the proportion of students having clear theoretical orientations.

Significantly more students in the Bilingual Intern Teaching Program than in the Special Education Student Teaching Program, English Single Subject Student Teaching Program, or in the Multiple Subjects Student Teaching Program have clear theoretical orientations. There were no statistically significant differences in the number of students with clear theoretical orientations in the Bilingual Intern Program and students in other Intern Programs or between students in the Bilingual Intern and Bilingual Student Teaching Programs.

There are three significant findings of this study related to the question: To what extent do these pre-service teachers and interns possess theoretical beliefs about second-language learning and teaching which reflect the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward second-language teaching? First, there is a decided difference between the percentage of participants (student teachers and interns) with clear theoretical orientations in this study and those reported in Johnson's study (1992). Johnson reported that approximately 60% of the experienced teachers in her study demonstrated dominant theoretical orientations; in contrast, only 30% of the inexperienced teachers in this study demonstrated dominant theoretical orientations toward language teaching, even when a less stringent criteria was employed to define "dominant orientation."

Second, there were 34 candidates who identified three or more statements on the Beliefs Inventory which did not correspond with the lesson plan they selected on the Lesson Plan Analysis Task. Of these 34 candidates, 22 (65%) selected the Function-oriented lesson plan and chose Rule-oriented or Skill-oriented Beliefs Inventory statements. Thus, many students selected beliefs statements which were different from the classroom perspective presented in the Lesson Plan.

Third, there are definite program differences with respect to theoretical orientations toward teaching ESL. Bilingual Interns as a group possessed not only significantly more clear theoretical

orientations than Multiple Subjects, Single Subject English, or Special Education Specialist student teachers, but the Bilingual Interns all possess the same theoretical orientation: Functional. This is not the case with students from other programs with clear theoretical orientations.

There is one clear picture that emerges with respect to the question, "To what extent are pre-service teachers' and interns' practices consistent with their theoretical beliefs?" In short, their practices are very consistent with their theoretical beliefs, and a detailed description is provided in the text.

There is also a clear picture that emerges with respect to the third question, "Is there a change in their beliefs and practices from the beginning to the end of the year?" These student teachers' and interns' theoretical beliefs basically did not change with respect to their dominant theoretical orientation.

The Relationship Between Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices During Literacy Instruction for Non-Native Speakers of English

There are three purposes in conducting this study: (1) to determine the extent to which Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects with Bilingual/Crosscultural Emphasis, Single Subject, and Special Education Specialist pre-service teachers and interns possess theoretical beliefs about second-language learning and teaching which reflect the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward second-language teaching; (2) to determine the extent to which pre-service teachers' instructional practices are consistent with their theoretical beliefs; and (3) to determine if there is a change in the relationship of their beliefs and practice from the beginning to the end of the year.

Teachers' Theoretical Beliefs

Teachers' theoretical beliefs are thought to make up an important part of the prior knowledge through which teachers perceive, process and act upon information in the classroom (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Munby, 1982). Pajares (1992) points out that teachers' beliefs effect their judgments, perceptions, and actual classroom practices. Vacca, Vacca, and Gove (1987) propose that teachers' implicit theories of reading are evident in their instructional practices. Unfortunately, beliefs are seldom clearly defined in most research studies, nor are they used as explicit conceptual tools (Pajares, 1992). Several methods are used in the research literature to assess teacher beliefs, including naturalistic approaches which incorporate observation, interviews and documentation, as

well as less direct methods of data collection such as surveys, questionnaires, and lesson selection (Kinzer & Carrick, 1986).

Tillery (1995) reviews literature (21 studies) on the acquisition of teachers' beliefs and how they influence practice in literacy; she also reports the results of her original research on vocabulary acquisition. Her review elucidates the disparate nature of this research. Most of the research is on beliefs on teaching reading; much emphasis is given to the difference between expert and novice teachers' beliefs and practices; and a variety of methods are used. She argues the importance of learning about teachers' beliefs, how they are formed, and what influences them from the standpoint of teacher education and the design of teacher education programs.

Duffy and Anderson (1982) suggest that reading teachers' theoretical beliefs have reflected the methodological approaches of phonics, skills, and holistic approaches to reading instruction, as well as a combination of theoretically-based notions of how the reading process take place (text-based, reader-based) and how reading ability develops (specific skills, holistic language development). Other studies in the field of reading/language arts support the idea that teachers do have theoretical beliefs toward reading and that such beliefs tend to shape their instructional practices (Blanton & Moorman, 1987; Brophy & Good, 1974; Kamil & Pearson, 1979; Leu & Misulis, 1987). This work, however, has been supported by limited research in literacy instruction. Since learning to read is of central importance to all students, much of this limited research focuses on beliefs about reading. However, other foci are gaining a level of promise. One of these areas is ESL instruction, partly because of the large number of students now needing such instruction.

Allen (1985) discusses instructional decisions for ESL children and points out that children in classrooms are expected to do more than learn English. They are expected to move ahead cognitively

as well as linguistically. Curriculum guides and courses of study outline the skills and knowledge they are expected to acquire. It may be argued that ESL teachers typically work with students for only a small portion of the day; those students still spend most of the day in the regular classroom. Mainstream teachers are expected to instruct culturally and linguistically diverse learners, so we are interested in learning what beliefs both ESL and mainstream teachers hold and what their practices are.

Johnson (1992) investigated the relationship between ESL teachers' literacy beliefs and practices. Her study examined the beliefs and practices of thirty experienced ESL teachers. During the first phase of the study, teachers were asked to complete an Ideal Instructional Protocol, a Lesson Plan Analysis Task (see Appendix A), and a Beliefs Inventory (see Appendix B). Their responses were analyzed with respect to three identified theoretical orientations toward literacy instruction: skill-based, rule-based, and function-based. Skill-based instruction, linked with empiricist explanations of language learning, is characterized by drill and practice; separate language study of listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and memorization of language patterns. Rule-based approaches, linked with rationalist explanations of language learning, are characterized by treating listening, speaking, reading, and writing as a connected whole; view language learning as governed by rule-based creativity; and adhere to the viewpoint that production of language is preceded by comprehension of the language. Function-based approaches are based on communicative explanations of language learning, which emphasize real-life contexts, the use of authentic language within situational contexts, and place more emphasis on meaningful communication than on correct structural form.

Johnson (1992) found that the majority of the ESL teachers (60%) in her study possess clearly defined theoretical beliefs toward one particular methodological approach of second language teaching. Johnson linked the theoretical orientation of the teachers to the training they received to be ESL teachers. Of those teachers with dominant theoretical orientations, most clearly favored the function-based approaches. These teachers had taught ESL for an average of 4.5 years and began teaching ESL when the function-based approach was prominent. Similarly, teachers who were identified as having dominant skill-based theoretical orientations had taught ESL for 14 years when skill-based approaches were prominent while teachers who were identified as having dominant rule-based theoretical orientations had taught ESL for an average of 8.5 years and began teaching ESL when the rule-based approach was prominent. Johnson also linked teachers' theoretical beliefs with their classroom practices and her findings support previous research which recognizes the importance of teachers' theoretical beliefs on instructional practices within literacy contexts.

The study reported here builds on the above-cited work, but extends the work to pre-service teachers in different teacher education programs within one University.

Program Descriptions*

Student Teaching vs. Intern Teaching

There are student and intern teaching strands for all programs. Interns are selected because they demonstrate their ability to succeed as classroom teachers through recommendations, experiences working with children, and background knowledge.

*This research was conducted at the Univeristy of California, Riverside

Multiple Subjects and Single Subject

Students in the Multiple Subjects and Single Subject programs complete the following coursework in addition to Supervised Student Teaching: Learning and Instruction, Curriculum and Instruction, and Reading and Language Development (Multiple Subjects) or Reading and Writing in the Content Areas (Single Subject). These courses are also required for the Special Education Specialist and Bilingual/Crosscultural Emphasis Programs. All Interns in these programs must have completed these courses before the beginning of their Internship, in addition to their completing other prerequisites (CPR, U.S. History, and so on). Students in the student teaching program may have completed these courses or may be taking them concurrently with Supervised Student Teaching.

Special Education Specialist: Students in this program take the following sequence of courses in addition to the ones taken by students in the Multiple and Single Subject Programs:

Learning Handicapped: The Exceptional Child, Mental Retardation, Guidance in Special Education, Language and Speech Development and Disorders, Educational Assessment of the Handicapped, Field Experience in Tutorial Teaching, and The Learning Handicapped Child.

Severely Handicapped: The Exceptional Child, Mental Retardation, Guidance in Special Education, Language and Speech Development and Disorders, Educational Assessment of the Handicapped, Field Experience in Tutorial Teaching, Education of the Severely Handicapped.

Bilingual Emphasis Program

In addition to the courses required in the Multiple Subjects Program, students in this program take the following: Multicultural Education in the American School, Literacy and Language Development or Language Development in a Content Area, Multicultural Literature Curriculum, Chicano Tutorial, one course in the general area of Education and Bilingualism, one course on

Societal Perspectives on the Chicano/Latino Experience, and one course in Chicano/Latino Art or Literature. They may be taking these courses concurrently with Supervised Student Teaching.

Theoretical Orientations

The theoretical framework for the study is provided in Johnson's (1992) descriptions of three orientations toward second-language instruction. The first is a skills-based orientation using memorization and repetition of native language patterns, drill and practice of oral language, and separate study of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The second is a rule-based orientation which emphasizes the intellectual understanding of language, its grammatical structures, and the need to communicate in meaningful contexts. The third orientation emphasizes the communicative function of language and places language learning in the social context of interaction in real-life contexts. The study is reported in two phases. Phase I was designed to answer Question 1. (See page 4). Phase II was designed to answer Question 2 and 3. (See page 4).

PHASE I

To what extent do Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects with Bilingual/Crosscultural Emphasis, Single Subject, and Special Education Specialist pre-service teachers and interns possess theoretical beliefs about second-language learning and teaching which reflect the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward second-language teaching?

METHOD

Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study: a Lesson Plan Analysis Task (Appendix A) (Kinzer, 1988; Johnson, 1992), a Beliefs Inventory (Appendix B) (Leu & Kinzer, 1991; Johnson, 1992), and an Ideal Instructional Protocol (Johnson, 1992). The Beliefs Inventory and the Lesson Plan Analysis Task were collected at the same time from all students who agreed to participate in the study. They were administered during the Supervised Student Teaching Seminar at the beginning of the Fall quarter and took approximately 30 minutes.

They were scored and students with dominant theoretical orientations were identified. Students who selected three or more items on the Beliefs Inventory from the same theoretical orientation and the corresponding lesson plan on the Lesson Plan Analysis Task were defined as having clear theoretical orientations. These students were invited to complete the Ideal Instructional Protocol, which was then evaluated by two independent readers and assigned a theoretical orientation based on the presence or absence of specific elements.

Beliefs Inventory: Students were presented with fifteen statements about language teaching and asked to select the five which best represented their orientation to teaching ESL (Johnson, 1992). There are five statements representing each of the three orientations.

Lesson Plan Analysis Task: Students were asked to read three lesson plans and to select the one they would use (Johnson, 1992). Each lesson plan represented the activities and teaching strategies associated with one of the orientations.

Ideal Instructional Protocol: Students were asked to describe the procedures and techniques they would use, the materials they would select, the groupings of students they preferred to teach,

the measures they would use to assess language achievement, and their own descriptions of a good second-language learner within what they considered to be an ideal ESL classroom (Johnson, 1992).

Skill-based protocols included references to dialogues, pattern drills, pronunciation drills; treatment of speaking, listening, reading, and writing as discrete skills; emphasis on proper pronunciation and oral communication; and measuring growth as the ability to produce accurate oral and written native-language patterns.

Rule-based protocols gave illustrations of grammatical rules and focused on the creative use of language constructions. A goal was the ability consciously to use language to communicate in a variety of contexts; and language growth was measured by examining the ability to apply the conscious understanding of language in meaningful contexts.

Function-based protocols included the use of realistic materials and emphasized interactive communication and cooperative learning. The goal was the ability to communicate with others, and language growth was the ability to function in real social situations.

Subjects

One hundred eight student teachers/interns participated in the study. Since two of the student teachers/interns did not turn in complete responses, they were omitted from data analysis. Therefore, all data is reported for the 106 complete protocols.

Multiple Subjects

Forty-six multiple subjects candidates agreed to participate in the study; they completed the Beliefs Inventory and selected the Lesson Plan they felt most closely resembled one they would implement. Of these 46 candidates, 11 (24%) demonstrated clear theoretical orientations by selecting three of the items on the Beliefs Inventory which were representative of the same orientation as the

Lesson Plan Task they selected. Of those 11 candidates, eight were function-oriented, two were skill-oriented, and one was rule-oriented. Of the remaining 35 candidates, 20 selected three or more items from the Behavioral Analysis Task of one orientation but these items did not correspond in orientation to the Lesson Plan they selected. The distribution of mixed Behavioral Analysis Task and Lesson Plan Task student teachers'/interns' responses is given in Table 1.

Of the 11 Multiple Subjects student teachers/interns identified with clear orientations, one dropped from the program, four agreed to participate in the remainder of the study, and six did not elect to continue in the study. Two of the students who continued were student teachers and two were interns. All four of these students wrote Ideal Instructional Protocols that were classified as function-oriented. In every case, the candidates' response to the Beliefs Inventory and the Lesson Plan Task was also function-oriented.

Special Education

Eighteen Special Education Specialist candidates completed the Beliefs Inventory and the Lesson Plan Task. Of these 18 candidates, three demonstrated clear theoretical orientations by selecting three of the items on the Beliefs Inventory which were representative of the same orientation as the Lesson Plan Task. All three were function-oriented. Only one of the Special Education Specialists participated in the study. Her Ideal Instructional Protocol was coded as function-oriented, also.

Bilingual/Crosscultural

Twenty-one bilingual candidates completed the Beliefs Inventory and the Lesson Plan Task. Twelve were identified as having clear theoretical orientations. Of those 12, seven agreed to participate in the remainder of the study; one declined; and four (all interns) were concerned about

the time commitment and could not commit to begin when the Ideal Instructional Protocol was to be collected. All seven who participated were rated as function-oriented based on their responses to the Ideal Instructional Protocol.

Single Subject

Seventeen Single Subject English credential candidates completed the Behavioral Objectives Inventory and the Lesson Plan Task. Six of the 17 were identified as having clear theoretical orientations based on their responses to the Beliefs Inventory and the Lesson Plan Task. Of these six, one dropped out of the teacher education program, two declined to participate, and one was unable to begin the study when it commenced. Of the six who demonstrated clear theoretical orientations, four were identified as function-oriented, one as rule-oriented, and one as skill-oriented. One function-oriented intern and one skill-oriented student teacher participated in the study. The function-oriented intern's Ideal Instructional Protocol was rated as skill-oriented and the skill-oriented student teacher's Ideal Instructional Protocol was rated as skill-oriented.

RESULTS

Data were analyzed with an analysis of variance (BMDP). Since cell sizes were not equal among program groups, Sum of Squares III was used. Descriptive statistics for each program are depicted in Table 2.

Results indicated that there are significant differences between programs in the proportion of students having clear theoretical orientations [$F(7,96)=3.26$, $p<.001$]. Significantly more students in the Bilingual Intern Teaching Program than in the Special Education Student Teaching Program, English Single Subject Student Teaching Program, or in the Multiple Subjects Student Teaching

Program have clear theoretical orientations. There were no statistically significant differences in the number of students with clear theoretical orientations in the Bilingual Intern Program and students in other Intern Programs or between students in the Bilingual Intern and Bilingual Student Teaching Programs.

DISCUSSION

There are three significant findings of this study related to the first question: To what extent do Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects with Bilingual/Crosscultural Emphasis, Single Subject, and Special Education Specialist pre-service teachers and interns possess theoretical beliefs about second-language learning and teaching which reflects the methodological divisions of skill-based, rule-based, and function-based approaches toward second-language teaching? First, there is a decided difference between the percentage of participants (student teachers and interns) with clear theoretical orientations in this study and those reported in Johnson's study (1992). Johnson reported that approximately 60% of the experienced ESL (mean teaching experience = 5.6 years) teachers in her study demonstrated dominant theoretical orientations by selecting a lesson plan from the Lesson Plan Analysis Task which corresponded with four or five statements on the Beliefs Inventory representing a specific theoretical orientation, and wrote an ideal instructional protocol which represented one orientation. In contrast, only 30% of the inexperienced teachers in this study demonstrated dominant theoretical orientations toward language teaching, where clear orientations are defined as selecting three or more items on the Beliefs Inventory and the corresponding lesson plan on the Lesson Plan Analysis Task.

Second, there were 34 candidates who identified three or more statements on the Beliefs Inventory which did not correspond with the lesson plan they selected on the Lesson Plan Analysis Task. Of these 34 candidates, 22 (65%) selected the Function-oriented lesson plan and chose Rule-oriented or Skill-oriented Beliefs Inventory statements. Thus, many students selected beliefs statements which were different from the classroom perspective presented in the Lesson Plan. Since student teachers in this study could be concurrently enrolled in Supervised Student Teaching and either Reading and Language Development or Reading and Writing in the Content Areas, it was of interest to determine how many of those with dichotomous orientations had completed the required language/reading course. Of the five Single Subject English candidates with dichotomous orientations, four had not completed the secondary reading course. Seven out of fourteen of the Multiple Subjects candidates had completed the required elementary reading course. All of the Special Education Specialists and Bilingual/Crosscultural candidates had completed the required reading course.

Third, there are definite program differences with respect to theoretical orientations toward teaching ESL. It is especially interesting that significantly more Bilingual Interns than any other group possess clear theoretical orientations, statistically significantly more than Multiple Subjects, Single Subject English, or Special Education Specialist student teachers. These Bilingual Interns have more coherent and cohesive orientations and they are articulate about them. What is especially interesting is that the Bilingual Interns all possess the same theoretical orientation: Functional. The functional approach to ESL is mirrored in the course work undertaken by these students in their student teaching program and reflects the philosophy of Krashen, Cummins, and others who have been instrumental in ESL and bilingual education.

Finally, it is entirely possible that faculty in the other program areas do not consider language and ESL instruction to be a dominant strand while the faculty in the Bilingual program do consider language, bilingual, and ESL instruction to be a primary focus of the program. Because of the large number of students selecting function-based lesson plans, it seems that students select classroom application (through the lesson plan) which reflects an emphasis on communicative competence, not rules or skills. They may be influenced through the two common language courses they all take, Reading and Language Development or Reading and Writing in the Content Areas. It is also possible that students who are selected to be Bilingual Interns have a primary interest in language development as opposed to a cultural focus and that their interest and training lead them to a clear orientation.

PHASE II

Phase II of the study was designed to answer two additional questions. First, to what extent are pre-service teachers' instructional practices consistent with their theoretical beliefs? Second, is there a change in their beliefs and practices from the beginning to the end of the year?

These questions were answered through qualitative research methods, specifically through those described by Kirk and Miller (1986). Kirk and Miller (1986) describe four phases of qualitative research: (1) invention or preparation; (2) discovery; (3) interpretation; and (4) explanation. The Invention phase involved reviewing the literature; gaining access to and becoming accepted by the school communities in which the student/intern teachers were working; challenging preconceptions; dealing with practical constraints; and identifying biases. It was also essential to develop questions and research instruments.

The research instruments used in the first phase of the study were used as a basis for the observational instruments used in this study. All of the instruments (BI, LP, and IIP) focused on the

classroom, including the procedures and techniques the student teacher/intern would use; the materials to be selected; preferred groupings of students; measures used to assess language achievement; and the description of a good second language learner.

Thus, the classroom observation instrument focused on the same elements. Observations were conducted to answer the questions:

(1) What procedures and techniques does the student teacher/intern use?

(2) What materials are used, including textbooks, classroom library, videotapes, student written and oral work, and so on?

(3) How are students grouped? Whole class, small group, individually? What materials do they use for different groupings? How is the classroom organized for them to work in these groupings?

(4) What measures does the teacher use to assess achievement? Are these the same across all subject areas? What measures are used specifically to assess language achievement?

(5) What kind of interactions occur between teacher and students?

The second phase, discovery, involved the identification of specific places and times to make the observations and conduct the interview. I decided to observe each participant in his/her classroom three times during the second phase of the study, which took place from January to June. All teachers were observed in early to mid-January; approximately six weeks later; and approximately six weeks following observation 2, which was twelve weeks following the initial observation 1. Each observation was 1 to 1 1/2 hours in duration. This gave me opportunity to conduct multiple

observations over approximately six months. I also reviewed teachers' lesson plan books, student work, and met with the principal or the principal' s designee at each school.

The third phase, interpretation, focuses on the analysis of the field data and its overall meaning. According to Vockell and Asher (1995), "The field data are converted into categories and relationships through a process of multiple readings and sorting multiple sources of records into piles relating to such aspects as themes, concepts, individuals, groups, and scenes" (Vockell and Asher, 1995, p. 208). Patterns are determined by piecing together data. Interpretation and explanation lead to pattern analysis and, hopefully, to a meaningful whole.

The final phase is explanation, which results in a reporting of the data. The student teachers/interns' instructional practices were observed to be very consistent with their reported theoretical beliefs. The following description of each student teacher/intern support the findings that pre-service teachers and interns' instructional practices are consistent with their theoretical beliefs. They are graphically presented in Table 3. This reporting is detailed below.

English/Language Arts Secondary Student Teachers

Two secondary students participated in this study, a female student teacher in a senior high school setting and a male intern in a middle school setting. Their beliefs and practices were consistent and changed little during the school year. Each is described below; pseudonyms are used.

Marcia

Marcia gave three Skill, one Rule, and one Function-based response to the Beliefs Inventory administered at the beginning of the study. At the end of the study, she gave two Skill, two Rule, and one Function-based response to the same Inventory. A preliminary reading of these responses

indicates that Marcia was a Skill-oriented teacher at the beginning of the school year and somewhat less Skill-oriented by the end of the year.

In addition, Marcia described her "Ideal Instructional Experience" as one where there is a "benign partnership between lecture and activity." She felt that "some direct instruction/lecture is required" if for no other purpose than to provide "... a common starting point." Numerous observations supported her statements. She used lecture to provide a framework for the pacing of lessons and expressed concern that the pace of instruction was very important, and that the pace had a major role in her use of groupings within the classroom. She wanted students to read and write about literature and to engage in real-life scenarios.

She did, in fact, have students engage in play-acting and group work, both to write and to read each other's writing. She also had students engage in numerous "Quick Writes" as well as extended works. In contrast to this generally functionalist approach, however, she gave dictation as a way for students to practice writing, find errors, and learn spelling and punctuation. She did have students engage in realistic activities, but there was academic importance to the work they did. They were expected to write well, to read "classic" works of literature (e.g., Ethan Frome), and to write plays using dramatic conventions. They learned form as well as content in almost everything they did.

Stan

Stan originally gave three Function and two Skill-based responses to the Beliefs Inventory. At the end of the year, he gave four Function and one Skill-based response to the same Inventory. Not only were his responses different from Marcia's, but his classroom practices were also dramatically different. He emphasized having students work individually, in groups, and in large class settings. He used books and videos, and emphasized many kinds of writing throughout the course of the year.

Students read poetry, drama, and novels; but his classroom was characterized the most by the journal writing students did to music. They were often asked to revise one selection from their journal for a composition/extended work, but the core of the writing was the journal entry, written to music.

He was very concerned with creating an environment. Not only did he carefully select music, he also encouraged students to respond to mundane assignments in a variety of ways. In response to one book report assignment, students presented their reports in five different ways: posters, brochures, book jackets, traditional reports, and projects.

His conversation focused on the students. He was concerned about them, about their experiences away from school, about what the school could do to help them succeed. He constantly examined what he did with respect to their responses and their learning.

Both Marcia and Stan were genuinely reflective about their beliefs and practices and each created a different classroom based on those beliefs and practices. Marcia focused more on the academic part of school and what school can do. Stan viewed academics as very important, but as only one aspect of their life and what students would gain from school. He reflected, in terms of his practices, a functionalist approach to language instruction. He focused more on the student than on the subject matter, although he was very knowledgeable about subject matter. Rather, his interest was the learning in the classroom, the originality and creativity that could be sparked, and his own growth as a teacher. Marcia was equally as concerned about her students, but she focused more on school and what happened at school. Her assignments were more traditionally academic, there was more lecture than in Stan's classes, and students tended to turn in projects/work that was more similar in form if not in content than the students in Stan's room. Thus, although these students were different from each other, their practice and beliefs were consistent.

Special Education Specialist Student Teacher

One Special Education Specialist student teacher participated in this study. Her beliefs are described below.

Karen

Karen completed both the Multiple Subjects Program and the Special Education Specialist Program. She had a clear theoretical orientation, with three Function and two Skills based responses to the Beliefs Inventory. She did emphasize function-based activities and goals, both in special education and mainstream classrooms. Her focus was on real-life situations, specifically conversation and writing. Although she used flash cards and other skill-oriented materials, her primary orientation was functional and most of her assessments were functional in nature. She asked students to construct and write for their own newspapers, engage in conversational assessment, and write letters to the authors of the books they read. They frequently discussed their work and also gave dramatic presentations.

Interestingly, although Karen had a clear orientation toward language, she was very interested in the social growth of the students. She saw classroom groupings as a way to teach social skills, and as a forum for classroom assignments. Groupings were as much a part of her class as her academic lesson plan; in fact, her oral discussion of her practices included the social interaction the students would undergo. In many ways she was very similar to Stan: Both used real-life situations for classroom activities, both expressed much interest in the students, and each shaped a classroom in non-traditional terms.

Multiple Subjects Student Teachers and Interns

Three Multiple Subjects student teachers and one intern teacher participated in the study, but one of the student teachers did not complete the study and her responses are excluded from this part of the data analysis.

JoAnne

JoAnne was an excellent intern teacher. She taught a K-1 classroom and enjoyed the full support of her school principal. At the beginning of the year, JoAnne selected three Function, one Rule, and One Skill-oriented response to the Beliefs Inventory. At the end of the year, she again selected three Function-oriented responses but chose two skill-oriented responses and no rule-oriented ones. Her classroom practices were closely aligned with her reported orientation and beliefs.

JoAnne preferred to use a literature-based reading program, one with big books and shared books with little books. She chose to use retellings and re-enactments as comprehension measures and measures of sequencing. She believed strongly that several types of assessments should be given in each subject, including oral, written, and teacher-made criterion tests. She stated that achievement would be measured on the individual's improvement in his/her own performance, not through comparison with others in the class. She based her lessons on a theme of particular interest to her students. In short, her practices were functional in nature, just as her theoretical beliefs were.

Heidi

Heidi was a very creative student teacher who stated that she would base her lessons on a theme of particular interest to her students. She wanted to use different levels of books and different types of books. She also used manipulatives to organize and rearrange ideas and to help them understand structure. She did want to use the Dolch word list and other sight word cards to give students a

foundation for spelling and vocabulary. She did not want to group students by ability. Rather, she preferred to work with groupings based on interest.

She also wanted to use portfolio assessment to measure the amount of progress of individuals. She hoped to make use of cassette recordings and videotapes to record change and improvements at the beginning of the year and towards the end. These methods of assessment are consistent with her measuring the individual's improvement rather than the individual's performance relative to others in the class.

Heidi did respond with three Function and two Skill-oriented responses on the Beliefs Inventory. Heidi was always very well prepared and her classroom instruction was consistent with what she reported her theoretical orientation and beliefs to be.

Kim

Kim began the year as a very function-oriented, child-centered student teacher. She responded to the Beliefs Inventory with three function and two skill-oriented responses. She reported that she wanted to immerse the children in literature and in writing. She did not want children engaged in "busy work", and clearly defined writing as children's creating their own stories, from the simplest ones to ones where they wrote their own endings to stories. These latter stories she saw as ability appropriate. Surprisingly, she reported a lack of consistency and some hesitation about grouping practices. She stated that the grouping of students had always been difficult for her, but that she would most likely have three groups based on their ability. She wanted to use groups for reading and to do whole group instruction with other subjects. In addition, she constructed her classroom so that many activities would be done in the children's table groups.

Her assessment measures were multiple, and she articulated assessment more clearly and less theoretically than any other student in this study. She said that she would use common sense measures: Can the students follow my directions? Do they understand what I am telling them? She wanted to use Informal Reading Inventory material, but for comprehension only. She also intended to use Dolch words and grade-appropriate word lists for evaluation. She stated clearly that materials in her classroom would consist of Rigby Big Books with small versions and tapes; books from the school and public library at the students' level; the district-mandated reading series; listening centers with books and tapes; Reading Rainbow video tapes with the book in her classroom; the Children's Television Workshop/Ginn Video phonics series; and Word Bingo and spelling games.

She was more sophisticated in her practice than in her interview and discussion, however. She tended to emphasize oral comprehension and the student's ability to perform a task. She also evaluated student work on what were essentially worksheets.

Multiple Subject Teachers: Summary

Although each student was unique, there were characteristics common to the three. First, each was very child oriented. Second, each saw the teaching of reading and English language arts to be part of an integrated approach to language instruction. Third, each focused on multiple assessment measures, some that were very traditional and others that were not. Fourth, each used a wide variety of teaching and learning materials. Fifth, each one regularly had students work in centers or in groups. They were different from the secondary teachers because they did not articulate that group work or centers were part of their focus. In short, the secondary intern/teachers seemed to realize that they organized the classroom differently from many secondary teachers while the elementary intern/student teachers did not seem to realize that they were any different from other elementary

teachers. The work they did in groups and in centers was not consciously articulated in oral discussion or in their lesson plans as unusual.

Bilingual Emphasis Student Teachers and Interns

Only one of the bilingual student teachers reported any real dissatisfaction with her student teaching experience. Her first cooperating teacher was negative and gave feedback which the student found belittling and genuinely harmful to her personally and professionally. She was also deeply at odds with the district's policy on bilingual education. She moved from one district to another and appeared to succeed in this second placement. This move was probably as successful as it was because her philosophy was more in keeping with the philosophy of the second district as well as her better relationship with her cooperating teacher. I especially note the importance of this situation since the bilingual teachers appeared to be employed based partly on the congruence of their philosophy with that of the district. This appeared to be more true of bilingual student teachers and interns than of any other group. Again, though these generalizations can be made, the specifics of each student's experience gives a different kind of insight into that student's orientation, beliefs, and practices. Without question, the Bilingual Emphasis students had a functional orientation.

Maria

Maria wanted to group students for most activities. She felt that the size of the group was not of critical importance. Rather, depending on the activity, two to fifteen students could participate. She was very flexible, also, on her language achievement assessment measures. She wanted to use her own test, which would be given to students at the beginning of the year. She wanted students to write, and from their writing she would assess where they needed assistance. She intended to keep

their work from daily lessons in a portfolio-like file. She depended on the cooperating teacher for the material she used.

Maria was very knowledgeable about ESL and bilingual teaching approaches. She interacted well with individual students and developed self confidence as the year progressed. However, her early experiences were so negative that she measured her progress in terms of the early failures and difficulties. She was very definitely function-based on both administrations of the Beliefs Inventory.

Marta

Marta was successful in the very district that Maria left. Her philosophy was consistent with that district's, however, and she remained there the entire school year and was successful in finding employment at the end of the school year.

She was very articulate with respect to the procedures and techniques she would use. She wanted to use echo reading, cooperative learning with a combination of high and slow students, many manipulatives, adequate body language and gestures to facilitate the understanding of a certain concept, big books that can be read to the entire class, posters, and audiocassettes.

She was especially successful her third quarter and developed an ability to work well with small groups of students, to engage them in more reflective, problem-solving activities than she had at the beginning of the year, and to assess their progress on almost a daily basis. She was able to remember what each student had been doing the previous day and build on the successes the student had. In short, she relied much more on informal assessment, specifically her own judgement, than she did at the beginning of the year. She still used objective assessment, but it ceased being her only method of assessment.

Clara

Clara was an outstanding intern teacher. She planned to use sheltered English to teach ESL students and whole language approaches for all students. She gave specific examples of student work. For instance, she said she would start with a low ability-high interest big book and present it to the class (i.e., show it, read title and author). Then she would present manipulatives and drawings to teach some vocabulary, read the book to the class with interruptions and clarifications when necessary, and then read it again without interruptions to model proper pacing and intonation. After the readings, she intended to ask some questions of the students and also ask for a written response.

Her responses about her choice of materials was consistent with her techniques and procedures. She wanted to use paper, pencils, crayons, poster board and crayons to make vocabulary word signs, an overhead projector, Big Books with little books and tapes so they can go to the listening center, and photographs.

Jessie

Jessie was an intern teacher who was very knowledgeable about the theoretical aspects of language learning, but one who had relatively little experience before her internship. When asked to name her procedures and techniques toward language teaching, she listed sheltered English, Total Physical Response (TPR), whole language (focusing on pieces of literature), concept attainment, with all learning related to real-life situations. Again, her choice of materials was consistent with her procedures and techniques. She wanted to use literature, particularly trade books, picture cards as visual cues, manipulatives to help teach lessons, and an environment which surrounded students with words.

In addition, Jenny felt that students could be grouped heterogeneously by gender, ability, social orientation (on-task vs. off-task), and random groupings. She wanted to tape students reading at the beginning, middle, and end of the year on the same cassette and then use these recordings for assessment purposes. Jenny also wanted students to engage in writing that makes sense, even if their grammar and spelling were not perfect. She said she would assess story comprehension by having students synthesize a story they had read.

Susanna

Susanna was a very function-oriented intern teacher. She wanted to use sheltered English techniques, visual aids in conjunction with speaking, and relevant and natural language instruction which was not script-like or irrelevant. She wanted to group students into cooperative learning groups for some activities to help enforce the social aspect of language; in large groups (whole class) for dramatization activities; in small groups for listening center activities, individually for some types of assessment; and in pairs for other types of assessment.

Susanna articulately stated that the emphasis in her classroom would be on the communication of ideas and the assessment must be aligned with this goal. She said she would evaluate individual students by having them work in pairs or with the teacher. However, she also felt she would assess them as they worked within the whole class for the purpose of adjusting and monitoring her own teaching. She was one of the few students to explicitly state that she would use student response and comprehension to monitor her own understanding of what she did. As observed in the classroom, she definitely did monitor the effect of her teaching on the students.

Elena

Elena was also an intern teacher. Her classroom practices definitely reflected her theoretical orientation to the teaching and learning of language. Elena was an outstanding teacher who was definitely function-oriented. She without question created a whole language and function-oriented classroom. Her written description of materials, techniques, procedures, groupings of students, and language achievement assessment measures was not very different from that of several other bilingual teachers. For example, she said she would use sheltered English, whole group instruction with code switching (moving from one language to another in the bilingual classroom), and speaking with body language. She wanted to use "easy" readers, materials with picture cues, manipulatives and hands-on activities, and student-made materials. Elena wanted to group students by language ability, but not by any other kind of ability grouping. She intended to engage the students in whole class instruction with cooperative groups and buddy partners. She did want to use primarily heterogeneous groupings for other learning activities. For assessment purposes, Elena wanted to use primarily authentic assessment measures such as portfolios, student self evaluations, rubrics for certain activities such as a unit on a subject, no standardized tests, and student-led conferences.

Elena was very knowledgeable about language instruction, as well as instruction in other subject areas. She created an environment where learning appeared to occur spontaneously. She involved students in whole language and avoided all worksheets, workbooks, and all drill and practice activities. Her actual practices were very consistent with her Beliefs Inventory and Ideal Instructional Protocol. However, there was a continuity, a seamlessness, that existed in her classroom from the setting of goals and objectives to procedures and techniques to assessment. She was original in her

use of materials and created sub-areas in the classroom for students to work in. She was able to attend an inservice presentation and implement what she had learned.

The level of her expertise was so surprising that I asked her what other experiences she had had. She had, in fact, worked as a bilingual aide during summer vacations from college and said she had really felt that was "born to be a teacher." She saw being a teacher as the culmination of her schooling and said she doubted that she would ever elect to move out of the classroom into another educational position. She was interested in working with children and especially interested in teaching beginning reading. She used materials effectively and was able to motivate students to attempt all work. She conversed with children in large and small groups as well as individually; the students interacted with each other unless they were involved in a teacher-led activity.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

There is one final question raised in this research study, and that question relates clearly to the extent of change that occurred in student teachers and interns' theoretical beliefs from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. As reported in the descriptive part of this study, there was only one change (Marcia) in dominant orientations (where the teacher selected at least three out of five responses on the Beliefs Inventory and wrote an Ideal Instructional Protocol consistent with the Beliefs Inventory).

Thus, the primary purposes of this study were clearly addressed. The first question focused on program differences, which did exist and were described by program and between programs earlier in this paper. The second question focused on the consistency ot beliefs and practices, and there was much consistency for these teachers. In fact, the combination of the Beliefs Inventory and the Ideal

Instructional Protocol gave a clear picture of the teachers' classroom practices. What they did not predict was the teachers' actual relationship with children, the teachers' "degree of fit" with the district philosophy, or the teachers' access to materials or the level of support they received. The third and final question addressed the degree of change in the teachers' theoretical beliefs. Surprisingly, there was only one change (Marcia) with respect to their dominant theoretical orientation.

There are implications of this research. First, results of this study indicate that students who begin the student or intern teaching year with dominant theoretical orientations do not change that dominant orientation although more secondary orientations may change. If there is interest in raising theoretical orientation questions with these students, it will probably need to be done throughout the student teaching or intern year. At this institution, students in all of these programs take one language/reading related course, and this course is taken before they begin the classroom experience or concurrently with their first quarter of student teaching. Thus, there may not be any systematic or programmatic focus on the continued development and reflection on theoretical orientations throughout the student/intern teaching year.

Second, faculty should address the role and importance of orientation toward teaching language as a programmatic focus since the faculty interviewed before, during, and after this study indicated an interest in the research questions addressed here. All Multiple Subjects, including Special Education Specialists and Bilingual/CrossCultural Emphasis candidates, are expected to teach reading and language arts. In addition, secondary English teachers definitely give language instruction, and it is a clearly defined objective of the California State Department of Education. Although all faculty may not value language instruction equally, those charged with the responsibility for the program

need to address this issue since most of these teachers, and those who employ them, will value language instruction.

Third, the results of these instruments give faculty insight into the theoretical orientation of their students inasmuch as they reflect the orientation of the programs. A discussion of the results may help faculty strengthen or affirm the current program offerings.

Fourth, the continued interest in teacher education, both elementary and secondary, may focus attention on renewed interest in the theoretical orientations of teacher preparation programs.

Fifth, it is not known what occurred during the student teaching/intern year for those who did not begin with dominant theoretical orientations. A future study should address the development of these orientations and raise and seek to answer the question: To what extent is a dominant theoretical orientation valuable and/or necessary to the teaching of reading and language arts?

Sixth, the extent to which student teachers and interns reflected their dominant orientation indicated that these teachers were language-oriented in the classroom. It may be that those teachers who do not have a clear dominant orientation may have an interest, background, or experience with subject matter other than language, language development, or reading. In other words, the purpose of this study was to identify students with dominant orientations, not to define the difference in practice between those with or without this orientation. It would be valuable to know if students without a dominant orientation would benefit from other experiences than the ones they had since there was no statistically significant difference between the number of those with and without dominant theoretical orientations with respect to when they took their reading course: before or at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Seventh, it should be noted that if the criterion for being identified as "having a dominant theoretical orientation" was the same as Johnson's (requiring four, not three, out of five responses on the Beliefs Inventory belonging to one orientation and a congruent Ideal Instructional Plan), very few participants would have been identified. On the other hand, Johnson's study was directed at ESL teachers and it would be expected they would have more clearly defined theoretical orientations than student or intern teachers. Unlike the teachers in Johnson's study who were selecteed because they were teaching ESL, only the Bilingual teachers in this study were necessarily planning to give instruction to non-English proficient or limited-English proficient students. Thus, their theoretical orientations seem to represent orientations toward language instruction in general, not only toward ESL.

Finally, unlike the teachers in Johnson's study whose theoretical orientations could be linked to their own experiences with language education, the teachers in this study reported almost unanimously that their experiences in their schooling were with basal reading, grammar, and workbooks, although many reported some experience with process writing beyond the elementary school. Little about their experiences would have suggested they would be function-based. This finding is not the same as Johnson's and is, in fact, different from other reported research. Course work definitely influenced some of these students, but one cannot say with any certainty that course work is the sole or even the primary influence on these students' theoretical orientations. Future research should identify what does influence teachers' theoretical beliefs and practices since the commonly cited source (their own language instruction) does not seem to be linked to these teachers' orientations.

REFERENCES

Allen, V.G. (1991). Teaching bilingual and ESL children. In J. Flood, J.M. Jensen, D. Lopp & J.R. Squire (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts, (pp. 356-364), New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Blanton, W.E., & Moorman, G.B. (1987). The effects of knowledge on the instructionalbehavior of classroom reading teachers (Research Report No. &). Boone, NC: Appalachian State University, Center on Excellence in Teacher Education.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T.L. (1974). Teacher student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Clark, C.M., & Peterson, P.L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.

Duffy, G., & Anderson, L. (1982). Conceptions of reading: Final Report (Research Series No. 111) East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Johnson, K.E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. Journal of Reading Behavior, 24 (1), 83-108.

Kamil, M., & Pearson, P.D. (1979). Theory and practice in teaching reading. New York University Education Quarterly, 10, 83-108.

Kinzer, C.K. (1988). Instructional frameworks and instructional choices: Comparisons between pre-service and in-service teachers. Journal of Reading Behavior, 10, 357-377.

Kinzer, C. & Carrick, D. (1986). Teacher beliefs as instructional influences. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.), Solving problems in literacy: Learners, teachers, and researchers. Thirty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 127-134). Rochester, N.Y.: The National Reading Conference.

Kirk, J. & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Leu, D.J., Jr., & Kinzer, C.K. (1991). Effective reading instruction: K-8, (2nd Ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Leu, D.J., Jr., & Misulis, K. (1986). Prior knowledge and the comprehension of basal teacher's guides. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, Texas.

Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology. Instructional Science; 11, 201-225.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers'elieves and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, (3), 307-332.

Tillery, T.K. (1995). Vocabulary acquisition: Effects of four instructional strategies, teachers' beliefs and teaching practices. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Riverside, CA: University of California, Riverside.

Vacca, J.A.L., Vacca, R.J. & Gove, M.K. (1987). Reading and learning to read. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Vockell, E.L., & Asher, J.W. (1995). Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Table 1

Description of Students' Responses when Results of Behavioral Objectives Task and Lesson Plan Task are Different

PROGRAM

Multiple Subjects

Skill-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 7

Skill-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Rule-Based

Lesson Plan: 7

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Skill-Based

Lesson Plan: 1

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 3

Special Education Specialist

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 2

Skill-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 2

Single Subject

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 3

Skill-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 1

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Skill-Based

Lesson Plan: 1

Skill-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Rule-Based

Lesson Plan: 2

Bilingual/Crosscultural

Function-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Skill-Based

Lesson Plan: 1

Rule-Oriented Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 1

Skill-Based Behavioral Objectives and Function-Based

Lesson Plan: 3

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics by Program of Number of Student Teachers and Interns with Clear Theoretical Orientations

Program	Number	Means	Standard Deviations
Multiple Subjects	39	1.83	.39
Multiple Subjects Intern	5	1.60	.55
Special Education Specialist	15	1.85	.35
Special Education Specialist Intern	3	1.33	.58
Bilingual/Crosscultural	12	1.58	.52
Bilingual/Crosscultural Intern	12	1.25	.45
Single Subject	18	1.78	.43
Single Subject Intern	2	1.50	.71

Table 3. Instructional Practices of Student Teachers/Interns

	Procedures and Techniques	Materials	Student Groupings	Assessment	Student-Teacher Intervention
Single Subject English					
Marcia	Lecture Activity Dictation Writing Quick-Writes Play Writing	Ethan Frome	Large Group Small Group	Graded Dictation Graded Plays Response to Writing	Discussion Teacher-Student Interaction Student-Student Interaction
Stan	Writing Journals Writing to Music	Books Videos Music	Individuals Small Groups Large Groups	Book Reports Journal Writing	Conversation Some Teacher-led Discussion
Special Education Specialist					
Karen	Conversation Writing Newspapers Letters to Authors of Books they Read Dramatic Productions	Flash Cards Newspapers Fairy Tales (Books)	Small Groups	Running Record of Student Progress	Conversation Teache-led Discussion

	Procedures and Techniques	Materials	Student Groupings	Assessment	Student-Teacher Intervention
Multiple Subject					
JoAnne	Interactive Discussion Read-Aloud Seatwork (nt workbook or work page) coordinated with lesson	Literature-Based Big Books Shared Books	Individual Small Groups Whole Class Groupings in Different Parts of the Room	Retellings Sequencing Measures Re-enactments oral written Teacher-Made Criterion Tests Student Improvement (not compared with other students)	Conversation Discussion
Heidi	Blackboard - for explanations Individual Work	Books Manipulatives Dolch Word List Sight Word Cards Teacher-Made	Individual Whole Group	Portfolio Audio and Video Tapes	Discipline-oriented After Student Questions Some Student Questions
Kim	Read Literature Aloud Writing Games	Rigby Big Books with small versions and tapes School Library Books Reading Rainbow Video Tapes Children's Television Workshop Ginn Video Phonics Series Word Bingo Spelling Games	Table Groups Whole Group Individual	Can they follow directions? Informal Reading Inventory Dolch Words Grade-Appropriate word lists	Conversation Very active student participation

	Procedures and Techniques	Materials	Student Groupings	Assessment	Student-Teacher Intervention
Bilingual					
Maria	ESL Bilingual	(Dependent on Cooperating Teacher)	Groupings Desirable (Size 2-15)	Teacher-Constructed Tests Writing Portfolios	Primarily Instructive
Marta	Echo Reading Cooperative Lerning	Manipulatives Big Books Posters Audio-Cassettes	Small Groups Whole Class Individual (Based on whole group instruction)	Informal Measures Some Objective Measures	Instructional Positive
Clara	Sheltered English Whole Language Read Books Aloud	Big Books Manipulatives Drawings (to teach vocabulary) Paper Pencil Crayons Poster Board (Vocabulary Word Signs) Overhead Projector Big Books (with little books and tapes Pholographs	Centers	Oral Questions Writing	Warm Instructional Positive

	Procedures and Techniques	Materials	Student Groupings	Assessment	Student-Teacher Intervention
Susanna	Sheltered English Natural Language Instruction	Visual Aids	Large Groups (whole class) for dramatizations Small Groups (writing listening center) Cooperative Learning	Individual In Pairs Student Comprehension	Positive Instructional Reinforcing
Elena	Sheltered English Whole Group with Code Switching Body Language	Easy Readers Materials for Pictures Cues Manipulatives and Hands-on Activities Student-Made Materials	Groupings by Language Ability (other groups heterogeneous) Whole Class Cooperative Groups Buddy Partners	Portfolios Student Self-Evaluations Rubrics No Standardized Tests Student-Led Conferences	Enthusiastic Warm Positive Instructional

APPENDIX A

Lesson Plan Analysis Task

Lesson Plan 1 (Skill-based)

The teacher has decided on the following procedures to teach the meaning and use of the modals; Can, May, and Might.

Dialogue

Sue: Are you going to the beach tomorrow?

Lisa: I am not sure. It may rain. I might go to the movies.

Sue: Can I come along? I love movies!

Lisa: Sure!

Sue: Will you call me if you decide to go to the movies?

Lisa: Sure, Can I have your number?

Sue: 663-6354.

Lisa: O.K., I will call you in the morning.

Sue: Great! We can go to the theater by bus.

Lisa: O.K., I will talk to you tomorrow.

Sue: Bye!

a. Repeat the dialogue. Ask students to take turns repeating the dialogue.

b. Ask students to identify the sentences which contain modals.

c. Write the sentences from the dialogue which contain modals on the board.

Exercise 1

Ask and answer each question.

1. Is Lisa going to the beach tomorrow?

2. Is the weather going to be nice tomorrow?

3. Can they go to the theater by bus?

4. Will Lisa call Sue in the morning or the afternoon?

5. Will it be sunny or rainy tomorrow?

Exercise 2

Use the cue word to make a new sentence.

1. It may rain tomorrow. (be sunny)(snow)(be cold)(be windy)

2. We can go to the theater by bus. (by taxi)(the museum)(the stadium)(by car)

3. I might go to the movies. (beach)(game)(store)

4. She can swim. (might/tomorrow)(will/on Sunday)

5. We can get to the airport by train. (might/faster by taxi)(will/faster by helicopter)

6. I can finish my homework in two hours. (might/in one hour)(will/before I go to bed)

Exercise 3

Read each situation aloud. Ask students to think of actions which might solve each problem. Encourage them to use can, will, may, or might in their oral responses.

1. Some students are walking in the forest. It is almost dark, and they are lost.

2. You are visiting New York City for the first time. You are lost and you don't have a map.

3. You took a taxi from the airport to your hotel. When you tried to pay the driver you had no money.

4. You just finished a meal at a nice restaurant and you realized you forgot your wallet.

Lesson Plan 2 (Rule-based)

The teacher has decided on the following procedures to teach the meaning and use of the modals; Can, Will, May, and Might.

Modal Auxiliaries: Introduction

Auxiliary + The Simple Form of a Verb

Can	I can speak English.	Can, Will, May, Might are
Will	I will be in class tomorrow.	followed by the simple form of a verb.
Will	Will you call me tomorrow?	
May	It may rain tomorrow.	They are not followed by to:
Might	It might rain tommorrow.	CORRECT: I can speak English.
		INCORRECT: I can to speak English.

a. Explain and discuss

Can expresses ability or possibility in the present or future.

Will expresses ability in the future tense.

Will you is used as a polite way to ask a question. It can also mean asking for someone's help.

May and Might express possibility in the present or future and have the same meaning.

Exercise 1

Ask and answer. Use Can.

a. What abilities and talents do you have? Tell the class about some of the things you can do. Can you swim? Can you play the piano?

b. Ask a classmate if he or she has a certain ability or talent?

1. Tom wants to go to the zoo. Tell him what he can see at the zoo.

2. John wants a hammer. Tell him where he can get a hammer.

3. Sandra has to go to the airport tomorrow. How can she get there?

4. Jeff is bored on the weekends. Tell him some things he can do on the weekends.

5. Jenny wants to eat out tonight. Where can she get a good meal?

Exercise 2

Answer each of the following questions using may and might.

T: What are you going to do tomorrow?

S: I don't know. I may go downtown. Or I might go skiing.

1. What are you going to do tomorrow night?

2. What's the weather going to be like tomorrow?

3. What does Sue have in her purse?

4. What are you going to do after class?

5. What are you going to do during vacation?

Exercise 3

Have students read each situation. Ask students to write five sentences which contain the modals; can, will, may, or might to solve each problem. Ask students to read their sentences to the class.

1. Some students are walking in the forest. It is almost dark, and they are lost.

2. You are visiting New York City for the first time. When you tried to pay the driver you had no money.

3. You took a taxi from the airport to your hotel. When you tried to pay the driver you had no money.

4. You just finished a meal at a nice restaurant and you realized you forgot your wallet.

Lesson Plan 3 (Function-based)

The teacher has decided on the following procedures to teach the meaning and use of the modals; Can, Will, May, and Might.

Congratulations! You have just won a "Dream Vacation." Choose one of the following trips as your prize and check ( ) your choice.

( ) A four-month luxury cruise around the world.

( ) A one-month safari in the Australian Outback.

( ) A three-week mountain-climbing vacation in the Himalayas.

( ) A two-month drive from Norway to Spain.

Exercise 1

Get into a group of people who chose the same trip as you. Talk about your trip: Where will you go? What will you bring along? What can you do there? What problems might you have once you get there? What can you do to prepare for the trip?

Make a list of 10 things you will take with you.

Make a list of 5 things you can do to prepare for the trip.

Make a list of 8 things you will do when you get there.

Make a list of 5 possible problems you might have on this trip.

Exercise 2

Take turns. Tell the class where you're going, what you will bring with you, and one of the problems you might have.

Your classmates will suggest solutions.

Exercise 3

Write a letter to a friend telling him/her about your "Dream Vacation." Describe all the things you will take and what you will do when you get there. Also mention some of the problems you might have and ask for suggestions.

Read your letter to a classmate before sending it off in the mail!

Johnson, K.E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. JRB: A Journal of Literacy, 24, 104-108.

Appendix B

Beliefs Inventory

Name: Level/School: Years Teaching ESL:

Prior Education & Experience:

Instructions: Please read all 15 statements. Then select five statements that most closely reflect your beliefs about how English as a second language is learned and how English as a second language should be taught.

(Rule-based) 1. Language can be thought of as a set of grammatical structures which are learned consciously and controlled by the language learner.

(Function-based) 2. As long as ESL students understand what they are saying, they are actually learning the language.

(Rule-based) 3. When ESL students make oral errors, it helps to correct them and later teach a short lesson explaining why they made that mistake.

(Skill-based) 4. As long as ESL students listen to, practice, and remember the language which native speakers use, they are actually learning the language.

(Rule-based) 5. ESL students generally need to understand the grammatical rules of English in order to become fluent in the language.

(Skill-based) 6. When ESL students make oral errors, it usually helps to provide them with lots of oral practice with the language patterns which seem to cause them difficulty.

(Function-based) 7. Language can be thought of as meaningful communication and is learned subconsciously in non-academic, social situations.

(Rule-based) 8. If ESL students understand some of the basic grammatical rules of the language they can usually create lots of new sentences on their own.

(Function-based) 9. Usually it is more important for ESL students to focus on what they are trying to say and not how to say it.

(Skill-based) 10. If ESL students practice the language patterns of native speakers they can make up new sentences based on those language patterns which they have already practiced.

(Rule-based) 11. It's important to provide clear, frequent, precise presentations of grammatical structures during English language instruction.

(Skill-based) 12. Language can be described as a set of behaviors which are mastered through lots of drill and practice with the language patterns of native speakers.

(Function-based) 13. When ESL students make oral errors, it is best to ignore them, as long as you can understand what they are trying to say.

(Skill-based) 14. ESL students usually need to master some of the basic listening and speaking skills before they can begin to read and write.

(Function-based) 15. It's not necessary to actually teach ESL students how to speak English; they usually begin speaking English on their own.

Reprinted with the permission of Karen E. Johnson and the National Reading Conference. Johnson, K.E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. JRB: A Journal of Literacy, 24, 104-108.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Relationship Between Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices During Literacy Instruction for Non-Native Speakers of English

Author(s): Ruth E. Knudson

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: Submitted March 13, 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

☒ Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here → please

Signature: Ruth E. Knudson

Printed Name/Position/Title: Ruth E. Knudson, Associate Professor

Organization/Address: College of Education, CSULB, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840

Telephone: (562) 985-1690

FAX: (909) 788-5971

E-Mail Address: rknudson@csulb.edu

Date: 3/13/98

(over)