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(ABSTRACT)

Typically, students have had limited voice in their schooling (Erickson & Schultz, 1992). The purposes of this study were to explore the concept of student voice in the elementary school and to develop strategies that develop student voice in the curricula. An elementary school principal and four teachers participated in an action research study that examined and attempted to develop student voice in their classrooms. Acting as a coach, the principal supported the four teachers as they implemented their classroom research on student voice. Four case studies were developed based on artifacts such as journals (student and participant), lesson plans, meetings, surveys and observations. Data were analyzed for emerging themes and compared across cases.

Findings indicate that there was a difference in the teachers’ emerging understanding and promotion of student voice. These differences were explained on the evolving commonalities being discovered in each case study. First and foremost were the instructional strategies utilized by the participants that engaged the learners and promoted their voice? Next, the organizational structure of the building and classes played an important role. Time and size of classes either promoted or restrained student voice. Finally, the culture of the organization and the belief system of the individual teacher played an important role.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Postmodernism

Engaging young minds in the postmodern era is a challenging career. Learning and schooling occurring against a backdrop of societal changes that include enhanced social and sexual maturity, poverty, neglect and abuse, is a complex, monumental task and the topic of many people. Being a teacher is tough today, being a student is tougher (Ruddick, Day & Wallace, 1997). Including the voice of the teacher and the student in today’s classroom to create a supportive and productive learning environment is one of the most essential challenges educators struggle with today.

Studying the postmodern era intensely illuminates the differences between it and the modern era. The modern era, roughly from the Renaissance and Enlightenment to the Second World War, was ushered in by the philosophical ideas of John Locke (1692/1930), Rousseau (1911), and by innovative practitioners such as Heinrich Pestalozzi (Greene, 1914) and Friedrich Froebel (1893). The modern era had three definitive ideas: progress, universality and regularity (Elkind, 1997).

Universality generally proposed that students were homogeneous in nature both cognitively and socially and they would all progress at a regular pace utilizing the same curriculum and resources. Textbooks were the same for all students regardless of difficulty of text. Textbooks made no attempt to recognize minority children. All children were expected to identify with the universal Anglo-American child (Elkind, 1997).

Progress in the school setting came in the form of John Dewey. He brought American public education fully into the modern era. Dewey argued for a progressive pedagogy where the
student was an active participant. He believed education was for everyone and that education should follow a predictable sequence in the learning (Elkind, 1997).

Regularity in achievement in school was assumed to follow a normal or regular curve of probability with most students achieving near the mean and fewer and fewer scoring further from the norm. Students that didn’t keep up the pace were judged as having some disability or defect (Elkind, 1997).

Another setting in the modern era that changed and had an effect on the students was their home. In the home setting divorce was rarely an option and definitely not the norm. Maternal love was based on the notion that all mothers have an instinctive need to love and care for their children (Elkind, 1997). It was a basic tenet of the times that the woman’s role was to care for the children and the house. Students that entered kindergarten found a setting more like home than school. Teachers were expected to teach and parents were expected to take care of the discipline. Parents were responsible for teaching values while teachers were responsible for instruction in the three “R’s.” Elkind (1997) believed, “The shift from modern to postmodern education reflects changes in the family as well as in the guiding beliefs of the larger society” (p.28).

After World War II, educators such as Maria Montessori (1964) and Piaget (1965) helped introduce the postmodern educational tenets of difference, particularity and irregularity to schools. It is difficult to fully understand the complex organization called school without understanding the effects postmodernism has had on it. All educational practices came under scrutiny. Developmentally appropriate practices, cooperative learning, performance assessments and learning styles are all educational practices that sprang from the changing values of the postmodern era. Irregular non-tests methods of assessments such as portfolios, projects and
performances spoke to the idea that children learn in different ways. Special Education became the law in recognizing the differences in how students learn. Gifted, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed and multi-handicapped are just a few of the irregular labels created by our desire to recognize differences in the name of learning (Elkind, 1997).

Dramatic events of the 1960s, such as the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War, changed forever the perceptions and realities of public education. The basic premises of modern public education were turned upside down. All authority was questioned. Ethnicity and learning styles became relevant and the object of intense study. Reality depended on individual perspective. Different cultures clamored to rewrite the history books and many did (Elkind, 1997). Diversity in all areas not only was to be appreciated in education, but valuable for planning and motivating students to learn (Elkind, 1997).

As universality gave way to differences and regularity evolved into particularity and irregularity, what we knew about teaching and learning had the potential of being vastly altered (Elkind, 1997). No longer would the majority of students come from two parent homes with a stay at home mom. In some instances, maternal love was replaced by sharing parenting. Single parent, gay parent, relatives, friends, and foster parents became more commonplace for our students. Violence from the streets and homes poured over into the school in many different forms by students that believed they had the right to challenge everything (Elkind, 1997).

In the postmodern world there was no longer a solid wall between public and private lives. One could air his/her dirty laundry on television about family or even about the President of the United States. Many lamented about the loss of the good old days when there was a well maintained distance kept between adults and children, where the adults laid down the laws and children obeyed them. Students today are seen as competent small adults that can deal with
divorce, drug addictions, violence, advertising, neglect and sometimes abuse. What at one time would have been irreproachable to change, students and society forced to change (Elkind, 1997).

Postmodernism became an ideological and political marker for referencing a world without stability, where knowledge was constantly changing and change was the only constant (Lyotard, 1984). The effects of postmodernism have helped change the definition of these relationships: power and culture, representation and domination, and language and subjectivity (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). Alternate representations of knowledge evolved and intelligences became plural (Gardner, 1983) as the effects of the postmodern world continued to change all facets of schooling.

Many people think that postmodernism is destructive (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). Critics of postmodernism argue it recognizes diversity: women, gays, and people of color, but fails to engage people in activities that lead to self/social empowerment (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). These arguments invoke visions of public schools in chaos, teaching a minimum curriculum and barely maintaining control of their students. Parents whose children attended public schools either affirmed that negative opinion or gave testimony to the great work that is taking place in our public schools. Which public’s perceptions are right?

The point for educators is to understand and manage school culture in the postmodern era, while using it to promote learning. How can we use what we know about the postmodern world to address the needs of our students? This basic question leads to other associated questions such as: (1) What kind of school culture is needed in order to promote student learning and student voice in the classroom? (2) What instructional strategies are needed to promote student voice in the curricula? (3) How can the inclusion of more student voice help promote rich learning environments?
The educational system, with the school as the focus, has undergone major scrutiny and reforms in the name of improvement. Coming to understand more about the power and participatory status of students in the classroom can help educators shape their practice in more responsive ways.

**School Culture**

Schools, like other organizations, have been shown to have different climates or cultures. The essence of a group’s culture is its pattern of shared, taken-for-granted basic assumptions that will manifest itself at the levels of observable behaviors (Schein, 1992). Culture is multifaceted, multidimensional and not easily understood (Schein, 1992). Some even believe that the schools’ effect on productivity is so powerful that creating a particular kind of school culture is essential to the effectiveness of the organization (Deal, 1982). Schein (1992) believes that, “Culture can be analyzed as a phenomenon that surrounds us at all times, being constantly enacted and created by our interactions with others” (p.1).

With research showing the importance of school culture, trying to create the right kind becomes essential. School culture has recently emerged as a framework for the study and interpretation of the structure of schools, especially in facilitating school improvement (Deal, 1991; Greene, 1991).

Studies examine several models for building quality cultures in organizations. The Education Quality Benchmark System (EQBS) was designed by Snyder, Acker-Hocevar, and Wolf (Acker-Hocevar, 1996) into a statewide project in Florida. This action research project involved the University of South Florida, thirteen school districts and a regional network to create a support system for change within a framework. The EQBS was based on systems
thinking. Its models, the Quality Performance System Model and the Change Process Model, provided mental models for restructuring schools (Acker-Hocevar, 1996).

However, two factors are worth considering when utilizing prescriptive approaches to building or changing culture. First, relevant literature suggests empirically based knowledge about culture in organizations is somewhat scarce and spotty. Second, the study of culture has its deep roots in anthropology and it is difficult to generalize any findings to other cultures, such as education (Sackman, 1991). The meaning of culture itself is interwoven within context. Sackman believes that the best approach is a heuristic one, which is an inductive approach of discovering culture rather than explaining it; however, schools need to do more than discover culture, they may need to create it to maximize learning.

The role of the leader is important and unique because leaders can create, manage, and sometimes even destroy culture (Schein, 1992). The school based administrator plays a critical role in establishing a positive culture and managing the anxiety that goes with it. School leaders have a daunting task of explaining public education today. School leaders must also pay attention to the external and internal issues of their organizations in to promote a certain culture. A leader must put things in context and make sense out of them for the organization (Schein, 1992).

To meet an organization’s external goals, internal issues must be handled productively. Six major internal issues that must be handled effectively to meet external goals in building or maintaining culture are as follows: creating a common language and conceptual categories, defining group boundaries and criteria for inclusion and exclusion, distributing power and status, developing norms of intimacy, friendship and love, defining and allocating rewards and punishments and explaining the unexplainable-ideology/religion (Schein, 1992).
Student voice could be present or absent in all six internal issues with some effect; however, for the purposes of this inquiry student voice finds its path through the school’s culture, through the internal issue of distribution of power and status. What is the status of students today with respect to student voice? How are instructional decisions made? What opportunities exist for people, including students, to have a voice? In what facets of schooling and learning do students exercise control? How do instructional strategies involve the students and promote their voice?

The multifaceted complexity of the school organization and the innate individuality of every child provide many stories that need to be told from different perspectives. A postmodern voice has been given to all and that finally includes the students. Cultural understanding and cultural learning start with self-insight (Schein, 1992). Self-insight begins with each child’s voice.

**Student Voice: Exploring the Definition**

What is student voice? The first definitions studied by educators and researchers were of a rather practical nature. Student voice is any activity in which students exercise any degree of control or communicate their feelings (Johnson, 1991). Most educators associate voice with empowerment which meant students would be given input into any decision affecting them. Creation of school councils or appointment of students to a site-based management council addressed this condition. The student councils, like site-based management councils, could spend their time voting on school colors or trying to get the adults to play music in the lunchroom. Student councils and representation on management councils have benefits, but do they reach the maximum number of students on a daily basis and do they affect student learning? The topic of student voice is broad. In this inquiry it will be limited to instruction.
The curriculum is pervasive and an excellent vehicle to hear more student voices than a student council. Curriculum, in particular the constructivist views and the use of discourse, have certainly engaged students more in learning, which is the purpose of schooling (Moore, 1996). A questioning approach set in a student’s social context is consistent with Dewey’s recommendation that real-life problems should be at the heart of education (Dewey, 1938). We mustn’t glamorize student voice but always examine these experiences within larger frameworks of morality, equity, and the formation of knowledge and culture (Schor, 1986).

Students will resist any process that disempowers them (Schor, 1986). Voice exists regardless of opportunities and students can tune out at any time. Teachers can quickly silence students’ voices. A negative comment to a wrong answer can silence a student for years in the classroom; conversely, a risk-taking, thoughtful democratic classrooms can foster students’ self-esteem and motivate students to success.

According to O’Loughlin (1995), students “are storied human beings interpreting their lives through their ethnicity, gender, class and culture” (p. 110). They live their lives as narratives that reflect their upbringing. “Rather than possessing one voice, students construct multiple perspectives on their emerging identities as a result of the social and economic communities” (p.111). Bakhtin (1986) refers to voice as your “speaking personality or consciousness” (p. 434).

Voice is not just simply talking or participating in a prescriptive critical thinking exercise. Student voice is a much deeper part of an individual (Dahl, 1995). “Voice is as distinctive as a fingerprint” (p.125). Voice will help us to help students learn.

Writing is an excellent strategy to listen to students’ voices. Lensmire (1995) writes extensively about freeing student voices in writing through the workshop and critical pedagogy.
approach. In essence, students’ writing should connect them to a greater social cause, and educators miss their mark by not fostering this connection (Lensmire, 1995). The role of personal narrative in multicultural education and the equitable strategies of dialogue and listening need to be emphasized to validate students’ cultures and voices (Luna, 1993).

The vision of the teacher as facilitator involves masterfully asking probing and extending questions, finding the themes and maintaining order. The approach supports student voice (Schor, 1986); however, others find these teacher actions confining, not liberating to students (Rode, 1995). Rode feels that we are still operating under the belief that the teacher always knows best. Power still rests with the teacher as in what knowledge is selected and how it will be presented. Students’ collaboration does not necessarily give them decision-making power; conversely, all decisions do not lead to empowerment. No reform is going to be the cure for all that ails us. However, reforms may elucidate problems, facilitate reflection and promote growth while educators are finding their way.

Let’s also not dismiss the times when educators have risen to the occasion. Many teachers have been creating cooperative democratic classrooms for years. Maybe we are just now copying best practices. The change in the structure of the workplace is also making changes in our thoughts about empowerment. A radical shift evolved as technology provided an equal playing field for teachers and students, and students became the instructors.

Fostering student voice borders on the brink of left-wing chaos in the thinking of some educators, while others regard it as a logical consequence in a democratic society. A participatory student voice may assist them in being able to articulate their learning style and resources needed to learn. But some may see student voice as simply another rung on the school
reform ladder. If anything is needed to legitimize student voice, recent school improvement reforms provide it (Soo Hoo, 1993).

Many recent instructional initiatives could fall under the umbrella of student voice. The philosophy of whole language affirms and accepts each child’s learning by beginning and teaching skills from that point (Kamil, Manning, & Manning, 1991). Cooperative learning gives students a chance to dialogue in small groups to aid in learning and socialization (Slavin, 1990). TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) training has equity as a component in calling on all students and providing sufficient wait time so we can hear their voices (Harris, 1990).

Student voice surrounds us constantly at the school site, if we listen. Awareness and acceptance of voice will lead to the provision of opportunities to engage students in the curriculum. The natural curiosity that the postmodern child evokes and the importance of managing a school in an effective democratic manner provide an excellent reason to study the fascinating focus of school, the student.

**Student Voice: Empowerment at the Site**

Why empower students? The neoconservative educator sees empowerment as giving students skills to make them competitive. The libertarian educator speaks of giving choices to students on how to spend their time and energy and the connectionist believes students have a responsibility to the community of people with whom they live (Goodman, 1992). Politicians and educators seldom ask students how they perceive their school and education (Andersson, 1995).
In today’s postmodern public school, the distribution of power and status is instrumental. As one peels away the layers of this construct, the players emerge. Who are the most disenfranchised participants in this arena? How could we have spent years working with adults while having such minimal participation from those who have no choice in being there, the students?

The issue of power is always present in the classroom. Power is an aspect of most, if not all, social relationships (Bendix, 1966). How has society managed to change so drastically in the past twenty years while schools have not? Despite all the action and calls for reform, schools and the education system are notoriously resistant to change (Caine & Caine, 1997). The task of trying to change schools has been compared to changing the laws of gravity (Greene, 1988).

The political context reinforces the historical purpose of educating students to take their place in the democratic process. Students are stakeholders. The lab where they are supposed to learn skills is the largest public social institution remaining in the United States, the public schools. This lab will be enhanced if educators will create a context where voice is seen as another source of information rather than competition in the classroom.

Seymour Sarason (1990) urges us not to fall into a cynical trap of thinking about cutting our losses and praying it doesn’t get any worse. It is Sarason’s premise that most reforms only work cosmetically or in isolated cases due to the intractability of schools. Schools’ structure, dynamics, beliefs and power relationships have changed little over the years. Sarason (1990) recognizes that trying to change power relationships, especially in complicated, traditional institutions, is a difficult task. Sarason (1990) believes that while people can accept empowerment in principle, it is much more difficult to confront the implications of implementation and practice.
Students aren’t the only participants that have experienced a lack of voice. Teachers have their own history and a steady rise to empowerment. This history of teachers being disempowered occurred not only at their job but also at home. Turn-of-the-century teachers had as many rules about their private lives as they did about the curriculum they taught or the values they embraced at school. Early educators were held to the highest moral character. After World War two, coinciding with the onset of postmodernism, things changed. Teachers, along with minorities, became individuals with rights (Elkind, 1997).

Two events in the realm of education helped change whose voice was heard. The first is the rise of teachers’ unions, which gave teachers a voice, and the second is the rights of parents to participate in their child’s education plan through the special education process (Elkind, 1997). A natural progression may be in effect here as much as any reform. Is it a logical move from feminism, black power, disability law and site-based management to student voice. Where else is there to go?

The natural progression for empowerment has finally reached the most disenfranchised participant, the student. The effects of postmodernism have provided the impetus for equity for all participants. It makes sense academically to study how to promote more student participation in the curriculum to enhance learning.

It is not sensible to look at student participation in a democratic school without investigating the dynamics of power and participation among adults (Goodman, 1992). Without adults’ commitment to democratic ideals and a leader whose ego allows participation, it will be fruitless to continue their understanding of student voice. Goodman also highlights the differences between symmetrical and asymmetrical organizations. Symmetrical organizations have full, equal participation from every individual while asymmetrical organizations have some
form of hierarchical power structure (Eckstein, 1973). Particularly interesting is Eckstein’s
definition of a hierarchical power structure as someone being controlled more than they are
controlling. This definition is powerful due to its truthful description. It is not only teachers
going controlled but school systems that are pawns in the arena of politics.

In schools it isn’t always “power from the top” but “spheres of influence” or “realms of
power” from which teachers operate. In schools, power may be distributed from top-down,
bottom-ups or sideways (Goodman, 1992).

Empowerment is comprised of enabling experiences and the opportunity to display
competencies. These elements give students voice by making them believe they are competent
(Dunst, 1988). Empowerment is a core concept found in both paradigms of quality improvement
(Deming, 1982) and learning organizations (Senge, 1990). Business approached empowerment
first through Deming’s Total Quality Management. Schools eventually followed with some form
of shared governance, such as site-based councils and management teams.

Empowerment should acknowledge the social and contextual constructivism of learning
in conjunction with the cognitive constructivism of Piaget (Moore, 1996). “Schools are places of
culture in that they create a sense of community, spirit, and common performance undertakings”
(p.12). “Everything done in the classroom should contribute to creating an assuring ambiance
which encourages and motivates students to assure greater control over their learning styles
which can promote academic success” (p.13). Learning must be meaningful. The focus of all
empowerment in all schools should be improved learning for all students (Moore, 1996).

Will empowerment lead to student voice? Are the terms synonymous? Student voice
comes with each child, regardless of what we as educators do. Empowerment may be seen as
opportunities provided for students to express their voice. Recognizing voice is a key element in empowerment and promoting that voice in learning is the focus of this inquiry.

**Statement of the Problem**

The postmodern era (from World War II to modern day) serves as a backdrop for the social and instructional changes that have taken place in the school. The schoolhouse culture reflects the effects of these changes on all of its participants. Typically, students have had limited voice in their schooling (Erikson & Schultz, 1992). To further educate postmodern students and help them be successful, understanding their lives and how it affects learning becomes of paramount importance. Can students play a part in their education? How much will the school culture empower students? Recognizing and trying to change power relationships, especially in complicated, traditional institutions, is among the most difficult tasks human beings can undertake (Sarason, 1990). What instructional strategies can the school utilize to promote student voice and assist students with their learning? Beginning to answer such questions through the lens of the day to day work of teachers, students, and administrators, is one way to help build vital understandings regarding student voice in the curriculum.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study are to explore the concept of student voice in an elementary school and to develop strategies that promote student voice in the curricula.

**Guiding Questions**

- What are the conceptions of student voice held by the faculty at Southside? How do they define student voice?
What classroom conditions or features were created or implemented in the classroom and utilized by the participants to enhance student voice in their classrooms?

Significance of the Study

In this postmodern world diversity and individual rights have taken center stage in most aspects of peoples’ lives. From the fall of the Berlin Wall to the acceptance of women as bishops, many countries and institutions have experienced the democratic struggles of voices to be heard. Schools are certainly not immune to this phenomenon. Special education and related services are just one example of how schools have been affected by voice. Educators in the last decade have witnessed the rise of teacher voice. Parents have clamored for site-based councils and succeeded. A logical next step would be the student. Can the student help educators with their learning?

Times have changed (postmodernism). These changes have affected many facets of schooling (school culture), prompting educators to change the way they do business. There is a human being inside of every test score: Have we really listened (student voice) to the people with the least power in our school community?

Isn’t it time we as educators formally sought student input? Student voice will provide a data base for teaching strategies and engaging students in the curriculum. Johnson (1991) purports, “With ownership comes motivation and with motivation, the self-imposed responsibility to achieve” (p5).
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND MATERIALS FOR STUDY: THE PROMOTION OF STUDENT VOICE IN THE CLASSROOM IN THE POSTMODERN ERA

The Beginning

Giroux (1996) believes that, “the question of democracy and citizenship occupies the center of an emancipatory project designed to educate students to the expanding claims of needs, rights, and obligations that are increasingly being promoted by new social groups and movements” (p.12). Who does and who does not have membership in this community?

This study was conducted at Southside Magnet Elementary school in a public school district with the permission of the superintendent. Southside is the largest elementary school in this school system. It has been a magnet school for performing and visual arts since 1989. It plays host to six hundred sixty students with eighty percent of those students being African-American, two percent Asian, and eighteen percent Caucasian. Approximately sixty-five percent of the students receive free lunch and the school is eligible for school-wide improvement status under Title One guidelines. Southside continues to strive to meet State Standards of Learning goals.

Teachers were sought on a voluntary basis and each participant became a case study. Emily Calhoun’s school-wide action research model was utilized for this collective inquiry. Calhoun’s model contains five basic steps that include selecting an area, collecting data, organizing data, analyzing and interpreting data, and taking action. These steps or phases are not a linear process but rather involve overlap that takes constant revisiting and reanalyzing (Calhoun, 1994).
**Design**

Imagine a long-time educational practitioner turned researcher embarking upon a journey to study student voice. It seems ironic or perhaps poetic justice to be studying student voice using qualitative methods, traditionally a research method that has not been given voice. Alternate voices have helped make qualitative research an acceptable way of doing science (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). This project has an emergent and inductive design where data were analyzed at all phases of the inquiry. All data from the four case studies were coded, unitized and analyzed by each artifact. The data from each artifact were unitized by line, and main concepts were placed on an index card. At the end of each artifact is an analysis of all the unitized data based on common themes and patterns. Empirical bins were established according to common themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The on-going analysis collapsed any weak empirical bins due to overlapping concepts.

These results translated into opportunities that promoted student voice in that classroom based on the artifacts present in that particular person’s case study. While student voice in the curriculum acts as a broad umbrella, the particular aspects of promoting student voice in the curriculum were not predetermined (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). An understanding of student voice is one of the goals.

According to Patton (1990), the phenomenological approach focuses on understanding the meaning events have for persons being studied. Phenomenology is the umbrella under which grounded theory is inductively arrived. This study reported understandings of what student voice meant at Southside with each participant. Calhoun’s action research model and the coded, unitized data provided a systematic procedure for developing some understandings inductively derived about the phenomenon, student voice in the curriculum (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
Participants

Professional staff who were interested in student voice and action research and were willing to commit to a lengthy inquiry were the volunteer participants in this inquiry. Selection was strictly voluntary and in no way predetermined. Teachers participated according to their beliefs and their schedules. An initial workshop was presented by the researcher on the postmodern child to provide an introduction to and background on the concept of student voice. Four teachers volunteered to participate. All four teachers were from the magnet fine arts department, which is of itself noteworthy.

The first to volunteer was Sara. Sara was a third year teacher at Southside hired as the vocal music instructor. Sara’s interest centered around connecting student expression (voice) through music and music technology.

Wyann became the second participant. She was a fourth year dance teacher at Southside. She was hired as the dance instructor and is a professional. Her concerns centered on classroom management and how students express their voice.

Betty became the third participant. Betty has been teaching drama for seven years with three of those years at Southside. Recently receiving her master’s degree, her main area of interest centered around constructivism.

The next participant, Rosa, was a fourteen year experienced art teacher in our public school system. The year she volunteered to participate in this inquiry was her first year teaching at Southside Elementary Magnet School. Although interested in student voice, Rosa’s concern with the recently imposed state Standards of Learning and their implementation propelled her to combine both issues for this inquiry.
Southside is a magnet school for the performing and fine arts: dance, orchestra, drama, art and music are integral parts of our curricula. A fundamental belief of the school program is that the arts give opportunities for our children to express themselves and to excel in different intelligences (Gardner, 1983). All fine arts magnet teachers rotate kindergartners through third graders in nine week schedules, while offering fourth and fifth graders an entire year of two classes a week in one discipline.

**Researcher’s Role**

In addition to researcher and principal of Southside, I also acted as a coach with the volunteer participants throughout this process. Coaching served as a means of facilitating this action research project and supporting the teachers. The teachers that chose to participate in this action research project formed a partnership of collaboration with me at the school site. Removing myself as the administrative evaluator of these participants helped to facilitate my nonjudgmental role as coach and researcher. It became a necessary step to provide fairness for the teachers and was more of an issue than first realized.

**Coaching Practices**

The 1980’s saw many theorists and researchers in teacher education shift their study of effective teaching behaviors to teacher reflection and teacher cognition. Barth (1990) believed that school reform has taken place when the participants, “consider, reflect on and articulate their vision of what their classrooms and schools might become” (p.154). Principals have long evaluated teachers through a clinical prescriptive model that demanded lots of script-taping and no interaction or dialogue with the person being observed. Educational critics, test scores and educators have demanded an evaluation process that will facilitate instructional leadership.
Collaboration is imperative among principals and teachers to facilitate professional enthusiasm and to better assist our students with their learning.

However, it is time for a change, time to redesign the evaluation system. The skills that make a good manager do not necessarily make a good leader. Reflection has become a method of learning and a viable way of assisting educators to a greater sense of self-efficacy (Barth, 1990). This research inquiry with the use of dialogue journals became a method of learning and a tool of reflection during this inquiry.

Dana and Pitts (1993) tell the story of one principal’s experience through change using reflective coaching practices. It is a powerful story of an individual able to escape his own ego to facilitate empowerment and collaboration at the school site. Through reflective coaching practices, a researcher analyzed and debriefed the principal during the course of this study. This researcher appeared to be an outsider and of no threat to the administrator. Coaching, in this study, focused more on the individual person, the principal, and his interactions with everyone and everything. This is an overpowering idea considering social interactions may range in the hundreds for principals during the course of a day.

This particular researcher was trained and skilled in questioning and probing techniques and led the principal to self-evaluation (Schon, 1987). It eventually changed the administrator’s entire method of doing business. An important piece of qualitative data from Schon’s method is dialogue journal writing. This process of journaling took understanding to a higher level. The researcher must have training in his/her role to effectively facilitate the principal’s growth. The key concept of this method is the oral and written dialogues in which the researcher and principal participated. According to Barth (1990), this researcher would offer “helpful nonjudgmental
assistance in sharpening professional practice” (p.68). The utilization of the dialogue journal in my study facilitated reflection and growth of all participants.

Costa and Garmston (1994) recognized the teacher as the authority and purported that personal professional growth doesn’t necessarily come from external sources. Their Cognitive Coaching training focuses on three goals: (1) establishing and maintaining trust, (2) facilitating mutual learning through questioning and responding, and (3) advanced communication tools. A dialogue journal will support these goals in this inquiry (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Is all of this coaching collegiality contrived or collaborative? Contrived collegiality contains the characteristics of predictability of time and space, ease of implementation and initiation by the administrator, while collaborative collegiality is grounded in needs of the teacher and may occur any time (Hargreaves, 1991). This inquiry, through the use of the dialogue journal, allowed for both contrived and collaborative coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

The provision of technical feedback, the analysis of application and the adaptation to students became the topic of most dialogue journals and helped guide our dialogue toward the students in this inquiry (Joyce & Showers, 1987).

Of particular interest from this study are the qualities and skills of effective coaches: participants’ credibility, people skills, an orientation toward service vs. supervision, willingness to be an advocate under fire, strength and credibility in working with the central office staff, empathy, systems thinking and enjoying the job (Bennett, 1993). As a coach trying to gather participation and data, credibility became a big issue. How could I be sure my position didn’t influence the participants’ work?
As a coach, one was on a continuum of peer relationships each with primary functions (Kram, 1985). The informational peer had the primary function of information sharing, while the collegian peer had multiple functions of strategizing and providing career and job-related feedback. The special peer had the primary functions of providing confirmation, emotional and personal support and feedback and friendship (Kram, 1985). The Kram model illuminated the multifaceted role of the coach, the importance of the affective component of coaching and the importance of coaching in this inquiry.

Effects of Coaching

Does coaching help students learn? The relationships between coaching and student achievement and coaching and teacher efficacy have had varying results. In one study, student achievement was higher with teachers that had more contact with their coaches and in classrooms with teachers that had greater confidence in education (Ross, 1992). However, this confidence alone could have caused greater student achievement and was duly noted. Kram’s (1985) model helped me to understand the continuum of peer relationships and how mentoring relationships can simultaneously or alternately be peer coaching relationships. Peer coaching implies an equal relationship among professionals of equal status (Joyce & Showers, 1987).

The University of California-Irvine Professional Development Schools Program produced a study by Clinard (1995) that focused on the experiences of cooperating teachers and their work with mentoring student teachers. Findings point to increased teacher efficacy in the areas of instruction, classroom management, human relations, professional image and personal reflections.
Busher (1994) examined the effects of peer coaching on elementary school teachers’ professional attitudes and beliefs. An experimental and control group were utilized. Findings exhibited no significant change in professional attitudes or beliefs of the participating teachers.

What do teachers say about peer coaching? Teachers report benefits in the areas of enthusiasm, creativity, pride and sense of collaboration. It also eliminates the isolation teachers feel and promotes problem-solving (Cox, Gabry & Johnson, 1991). Teachers make the best coaches for new teachers because administrators create too much tension (Young, Crain & McCullough, 1993).

How about students? Are there any benefits to them from coaching? In a coaching training program with Dutch school counselors, no direct relationship was found between coaching and student achievement (Veenman, 1995). However, all the reports of increased teacher efficacy would indicate that there are some generalizable conclusions that need further testing. As this inquiry progressed different facets of coaching were utilized to different degrees with each individual participant.

Research on these models assisted in the understanding of coaching. The details of coaching models point out the relevance of good questioning and setting purposes in meetings. Research journals were used in this study as qualitative data to promote reflection, growth, and assist in helping teachers self-evaluate (Dyer & Fontaine, 1995).

Awareness of contrived and collaborative mentoring prevented the time line from being too rigid. There must be room for spontaneity and the teachable moment. Reflective questioning highlighted the importance of nonjudgmental questioning that led to teachers’ self-evaluation.
Scenario/Coaching

How will the research on coaching translate into this inquiry? Coaching made me a much more active and purposeful participant in this action research inquiry into student voice.

During the course of the study I acted in the role of information sharing coach (Kram, 1985). Topics researched to varying degrees included: attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder for Wyann, constructivism with Betty, differentiation and technology for Susan, and the Virginia Standards of Learning for Rosa. I collaborated with all participants to share information through the dialogue journals and meetings.

The meetings, observations, follow-ups and performances helped highlight me as a collegian peer (Kram, 1985). Observations of teacher’s classrooms were established according to the teacher’s wishes. Certainly some observations were scheduled (contrived) while others were at random or at the teacher’s request (collaborative). At all meetings purposes were established by the participant and me (Costa & Garmston, 1994). These purposes helped highlight the researcher as a collegian peer (Kram, 1985) and linked teacher objectives to the inquiry.

Dialogue was on-going throughout the process to analyze findings. My role as a special peer provided emotional and personal support throughout the process (Kram, 1985), and was evident in the interaction present in the dialogue between the researcher and each participant. Of key importance is the researcher’s ability to ask nonjudgmental questions that will help teachers self-evaluate (Dyer & Fontaine, 1995). Coaching made the researcher much more active and purposeful in interacting with the four participants in this action research inquiry into student voice.
Collaborative actions research was the method of investigating student voice in the curricula at Southside and acted as a lens to view student voice. Action research is a term usually attributed to Kurt Lewin in the 1940’s. This was an approach that applied the methodology of social science to practical problems with the hope that practitioners and researchers should no longer be separate (Lewin, 1946). Stephen Corey (1953) was one of the pioneers in promoting action research in the field of education. He believed that the action research model would help “practitioners to study their problems scientifically” (p. 6).

Today, Glickman (1993) is the major scholar advocating the use of action research for school renewal. A colleague of his, Emily Calhoun (1994) speaks nationally on action research and has written a book, How to Use Action Research in the Self-renewing School, that is frequently used as a practical guide to implementing action research at the school site.

While the models of John Elliot, Stephen Kemmis, and David Ebbutt are conceptually the same process as Calhoun’s (Oja & Smulyan, 1989), the abundance of text and graphic cues may be somewhat overwhelming for the beginning researcher. Calhoun’s model for action research is more user friendly and less threatening to teachers; therefore, it was selected for this inquiry.

Although Calhoun’s action research model was utilized in this study, Oja and Smulyan’s four basic elements of action research: collaboration, focus on practical problems, emphasis on professional development and the need for a project structure, were important guides (Oja & Smulyan, 1989).

However, Calhoun’s (1994) definition of action research has the ring of practicality so necessary for acceptance from harried educators. “Action research is a fancy way of saying, let’s study what’s happening at our school and decide how to make it a better place” (p. 1). That
statement served as a guide for this inquiry. Action research is a worthy project of an elementary school field-based program and supports the premise that our work be relevant.

Data collection occurred in the natural setting. Spending extended amounts of time in the setting where the action is happening is a concept referred to as human-as-instrument (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This strategy aids in the development of both explicit and tacit knowledge (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

Qualitative methods of data collection included surveys, participant observations, action research plans, lesson plans, dialogue journals and the collection of relevant documents, specifically videos and cassette recordings of student performances. In addition, each individual researcher’s plan may produce its own data.

Data were grouped and analyzed by finding patterns and concepts then synthesizing them into empirical bins (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Conceptualizing the data became the first step in analysis. To assist in the conceptualization, all data were analyzed word by word, line by line, and given a code number. Code numbers were based on the name of the researcher, the particular artifact taken from their portfolio, the page number of that artifact, and the line number, if appropriate. This open coding method was uniform throughout all four case studies (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Bins were constructed and collapsed according to the patterns that emerged from the data.

A matrix was constructed and used to look for emergent patterns (Patton, 1990). Filling in the matrix helped me discover similarities and differences in deeper more meaningful patterns. It is important to inquire into any deviant cases and not force explanations from the data during the analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Of key importance in this inquiry is understanding the meaning events have for participants (Patton, 1990).
Data Collection Description

Qualitative data were collected from various sources. The following is a description of each type of artifact.

Opinion surveys were administered to randomly selected students at Southside the spring of 1996. These surveys were part of the principals’ evaluations in our system every three years and were mandated by our school system. Every third year surveys were given to all staff members, randomly selected parents and second through fifth grade students at Southside. Random selection of teachers was done through the use of a numeric grid. The surveys are an opinion inventory and were created and scored by the National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE). Two hundred sixty-six students were surveyed that year at Southside. These surveys were returned with an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the school. These results are listed along with a Guide for the Interpretation of Survey Findings published by the NSSE. The NSSE gives an item analysis which included the average, the standard deviation, percentages and a subscale analysis of the findings. Basically it gave us the students’ opinions on their school.

These results were shared with the faculty at the initial meeting for the purposes of understanding student voice from the students’ perspective at Southside and to share formal information with the staff. An additional informal survey was administered to the entire faculty at the initial introductory meeting to gather their perceptions of student voice.

Dialogue journals were kept by each participant throughout the process. Each journal took on its own story and instructional direction. Sometimes my coaching role was one of strategizing and providing job related feedback while sometimes the role functioned as a special peer by providing confirmation and emotional and personal support (Kram, 1985). The volunteer
participants wrote down reflections and questions as the process unfolded. Some journals included excerpts from student journals.

**Samples of weekly lesson plans** were utilized as one data source from three of the four participants. The other participant chose to use her lesson plans along with the Virginia Standards of Learning as instructional strategies that promoted student voice in the curriculum. Lesson plans demonstrated the planning for strategies that promoted student voice in the curriculum.

**Observations** on each participant were collected to demonstrate implementation of instructional strategies that promoted student participation. Some participants had one to three formal observations while all had four to six recorded sessions of their individual magnet recitals and/or performances.

**Sample cassette recordings and videotapes** of student performances demonstrated the final product of student voice. These artifacts showed the progression of planning, implementing and evaluating student voice and were more easily documented through other artifacts that demonstrated the evolution of understanding student voice.

**Transcripts** from meetings with a line by line analysis with the four participants are provided. Also, an analysis of major points and patterns from the initial faculty workshop on student voice is available.

**Action research** plans were based on Calhoun’s (1994) Action Research model in conjunction with the school system’s Alternate Evaluation form. These two forms satisfied goals of this research and goals of the school division.
Research Task Timeline

The overall inquiry was organized into five phases, including an awareness phase, the buy-in, two action research cycles, and synthesis.

Phase 1: The Awareness Phase

It was important to establish context, definitions and general awareness of the construct student voice with all members of the faculty of Southside as a first step. A presentation of a condensed version of the literature review was provided. This overview provided information to the faculty on student voice and helped them decide upon participation in the year-long project. This information was presented in a formal faculty meeting in a direct teaching method. A faculty meeting was planned and held on September 24, 1997. Forty-six faculty members were present. Approximately ten faculty members were absent due to illness or other workshops. The workshop lasted from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. and each teacher received one-quarter day in-service credit for their participation. Each teacher was handed a six-page packet prepared to facilitate the session.

Postmodernism was reviewed as the framework that established the context for student voice. Initially teachers wrote down what they thought student voice was. This was done prior to any presentations so as to mark their initial thoughts. Research on student voice, its context, definition and its implications on current and new instructional strategies were shared with the participants. Recent instructional initiatives as well as teacher daily examples assisted the staff in bridging the gap from research to practice, demonstrated the familiarity that already existed with student voice and prompted feedback for the upcoming small group session with faculty.

Throughout the workshop small groups were formed by assigning numbers round robin. Each group appointed a facilitator, recorder, reporter and timer for the purposes of efficiency and
documentation. The groups reconvened several times during the course of the workshop with varying objectives. Those objectives included individual teachers’ definitions of student voice, personal examples of promoting student voice in the curriculum and teacher feedback from results of student surveys.

This faculty meeting helped highlight the goals of this inquiry and illuminated the pervasiveness of student voice in our daily lives at school. The acknowledgement of this awareness brought practicality to this project and demonstrated the need to pursue this line of inquiry for some.

Next, the concept of student voice was connected to our school by sharing the results of student surveys taken in 1996. These surveys were created by the NSSE (National Study of School Evaluation) and administered to all students in a random selection of classrooms. They were administered in randomly selected second through fifth grade classrooms. Two hundred sixty-six students participated in this survey. The results highlighted areas of strengths and areas of concerns. The students polled gave the school 80% or higher rating in the following areas: programs appropriate to student needs, teachers help students learn, teachers use activities that involve students, and teachers are concerned about students. Areas of concern included the students’ desire for a computer lab, more tutoring from teachers, more playground equipment, and some concern (28%) that sexual harassment exists.

These surveys made the topic of student voice relevant, as these were our students’ thoughts about our school. It also provided a bridge to the topic of student voice in the curriculum.

The faculty’s initial concept of student voice listed their responses into three main categories. Twenty-eight faculty members defined student voice as students being allowed the
opportunities to express their opinions on a variety of topics in creative ways. “Each student is entitled to his/her own ideas and opinions. It needs to be explored on a daily basis through written and oral avenues. The right to speak out without fear of reprisal. Opportunities to express individuality” (RJ-1/5-8). While most teachers believed in students expressing their opinions, students do that when they are misbehaving, dyeing their hair purple or wearing a shirt with hate messages on it. Isn’t that also student voice? This workshop created the rationale as to why the topic of student voice needed to be focused and linked to learning.

Eight faculty members specified that student voice consisted of the students having input into planning for the classroom, their school and their learning. “The student has the opportunity to have a voice in classroom learning” (RJ-3, 1/13-14). “Letting students say what they think about our school and their learning” (RJ-2, 1/6-7). Having opportunities for students to “show their individuality by expressing themselves creatively through art, written and verbal avenues” (RJ-3, 1/16-17).

Six faculty members linked student voice to empowerment and democracy. “Student voice is the right of a student to be involved in decisions being made about his/her education” (RJ-2, 1/15-16). “Student voice correlates with control and empowerment” (RJ-3, 1/4). “I believe that student voice is students genuinely sharing with us and us genuinely listening. Student voice is a precious and powerful thing, a tool for us to teach them more effectively as we listen to them” (RJ-1, 1/1-3).

Phase 2: The Buy-In

After the introductory faculty meeting, interested participants were invited to commit to the action-research process to study student voice in their classroom, determine their focus, decide upon the action and the data needed to be collected. Teachers buying into this project
could use it as their alternate plan for their annual evaluation. The alternate plan is the teacher evaluation form from the school that would serve as a process for the teachers. The teachers created their alternate or action research plan to be approved by the administrative team. This needed to be done by October due to the guidelines established by the district for approval of alternate plans. The data from this phase established strategies and created opportunities to facilitate meeting the goals of the school system and the inquiry.

A second meeting was held only for staff who were interested in hearing more about the action research process as related to student voice and their roles and responsibilities as researchers. Four teachers volunteered to participate in this inquiry. Participants verified their interest in student voice and the general area they would like to study.

My role as the principal lent itself to bias. How can I be sure that I am not manipulating the people that I evaluate? Miles & Huberman (1994) believed, “To be totally bias free may be impossible; however, not to lead with your conceptual strength can be simply self-defeating” (p. 17). The strategies of reflective thinking, journal writing, and removing myself as their evaluator assisted with this concern. Research on coaching also facilitated my role. The goals of this inquiry became the participants’ school goals for the year. Due to teacher time constraints, this synthesis of goals was critical in the participation of the volunteers in this process.

Phase 3: Fall/Winter Action Cycle

Upon completion of approval of all action research (alternate) plans, implementation was next. The participants’ objectives for their annual (1997-1998) evaluation were established for this inquiry and for the school’s objectives. Each group or participant’s data had common components throughout the inquiry; however, there were certain components that appeared in all participants case studies. All data were utilized and coded for patterns, common themes or
concepts. Each teacher met with me to discuss progress and share reflections on the process. The alternate plan also served as a reminder of the time line that existed and gave an overview of each participant’s progress. Each participant kept a researcher’s journal so more frequent dialogue could occur. My role became more of a coach during this process as we discussed their area of interest and they began to implement strategies to fulfill their goals.

**Phase 4: Spring Action Cycle**

As completion of the action research ended a final analysis of all data was done and case studies developed. Data from all individual action research projects were retrieved from the participants. All data were unitized and coded from each participant’s portfolio. From this analysis new and expanded definitions of student voice evolved along with new and expanded opportunities to engage students in the curricula.

**Phase 5: Synthesis**

This phase included reflections on each participant’s year long inquiry and the process utilized to enhance student voice in the curriculum. All four case studies were presented along with common generalizations from each on promoting student voice in the curriculum. An analysis of all case study findings brought closure and meaning to our year long action research project on student voice at Southside. These findings served as a springboard for changes at Southside and provided an understanding of the concept of student voice and what strategies promoted it.

**Final Product**

All data were organized in a case study format. The case studies are descriptive and offer insights into the phenomenon of student voice and how it was promoted in the curriculum. The qualitative inquiry focused on process, understanding and interpretation (Merriam, 1988).
The four cases are presented in chapter three and four using a common organizational framework. They begin by providing some general background for the case and a classroom scenario that is intended to represent a snapshot of the teacher creating opportunities for student voice. A description of the context for the participation of each teacher in the classroom inquiry is also provided.

This description includes antecedents that help explain why the teacher chose to participate and what beliefs and assets they brought to the inquiry. The development of the action research plan and the implementation process for the plan are delineated. These sections describe the teachers’ general approach to framing the problem and the specific strategies selected to solve the problem. Finally, the perspective of the teachers related to their inquiries are shared in a reflections section.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIENCING SUCCESS IN PROMOTING STUDENT VOICES

Based on the analysis of the data, two teachers, Wyann and Sara, emerge as having experienced more success in their studies that promoted new opportunities for student voice in their classrooms. The reasons for their success are complex and embedded within the fabric of their cases.

Applying Technology and Encouraging Student Voice: Sara’s Journey

Sara was a third year teacher at Southside Elementary Magnet School for Performing and Visual Arts. Sara taught vocal music and keyboard. As with the other magnet disciplines, she saw all students, kindergarten through third grade and only worked with the fourth and fifth graders that selected vocal music or keyboards as their choice of magnet.

Her classroom was one of the first modular units purchased in our system in 1988, around the beginning of the federal grant magnet initiative. The modular unit is framed with a small deck, wheelchair ramp and awnings. Inside is a long brightly decorated classroom with a keyboard lab on one side and piano and chairs on the other. Everywhere are storage boxes of costumes and props for performances; however, everything is neat and organized.

Hard-working and vivacious, Sara has proven to be an excellent asset as the teacher representative on the PTA Executive Board by supporting all of their initiatives and scheduling all of the PTA programs with performances from the magnet students. Her students, as well as students in other magnet disciplines, demonstrate their learning through recitals and major performances throughout the year. Sara possesses good interpersonal skills that are critical in working with this magnet department of artists and in integrating her discipline with the
instruction of thirty-five classroom teachers, which is no small feat. She brought an enthusiasm to her teaching and created a nurturing environment in her classroom.

Sara appeared throughout this inquiry as an enthusiastic learner and teacher. She maintained all documentation for her inquiry in an organized way. Sara put her plan into action. She was methodical with her action research and lively. She doggedly pursued her resources, obtaining a new computer and software that would facilitate her inquiry. We also researched the benefits of technology as I acted as her informational and support coach (Kram, 1985). Sara was a determined implementer.

Sara didn’t vary far from her prescribed action plan. She had a plan and worked it to fruition. The end product of students playing their own music to a background of their choice belied the year long toil it took to get there. This project and the feedback from the students helped change the face of Sara’s recitals in the future. The following is the analysis of data that illuminated the opportunities in Sara’s classroom that promoted student voice.

Classroom Scenario

The software was amazing! It allowed students to select a background orchestration to a song they played on the piano and recorded on the computer. The individuals in this case were six, fifth grade keyboard magnet students under the direction of their teacher, Sara. This task was preceded by months of teaching as students acquired the basic ability to read written musical notation and play the piano. The keyboard lab was housed in a modular unit behind one of the main buildings at Southside Elementary Magnet School. The lab contained nine standing YM22 keyboards, so six students was not unusual for this kind of highly specified magnet class. The size of the class helped promote Sara’s work with technology, which in this case consisted of an Apple Power Macintosh 5200 and a YM22 keyboard hooked up to the computer.
Macintosh’s *MusicShop* software was utilized to provide students choices in the background music of the piece they played. Students selected the orchestration for the background of their song from the software *MusicShop*. They could save this background on the computer or they could try other backgrounds from the menu until they found one that was musically pleasing to them. In the preceding months, students had learned a variety of short songs/refrains to play on the keyboard for this purpose.

On this day in January, students were called one by one to have an individual session with Sara. While one student worked with Sara, others practiced their song or did a word search on musical vocabulary. All of the students were on task and engaged in their work.

Some students had a difficult time selecting the background for their songs. Many instantly knew which sound they liked while others seemed baffled by the choices. Two students out of six demonstrated some hesitancy. One such individual was a student of Asian descent. The student recorded her song and tried all the backgrounds, as most students did. Whatever the teacher thought was an appealing background, the student readily agreed with a nod of her head. The student never articulated any specific choice. Why was this student deferring to the teacher? Was there a language or culture gap? Did the student just want the teacher to make the choice by deferring to her elders? (O/S-7)

Most of the students after hearing the choices of the software background orchestration, which they did many times, had already made up their minds when they came to work individually with Sara; however, they couldn’t resist hearing their song set to different backgrounds and patiently Sara let them hear each selection. Nonetheless, four out of six students knew what they wanted their finished product to sound like. (O/S-7)
The other student who exhibited difficulty with the task was a girl diagnosed with ADHD. Sara showed tremendous empathy for the student’s need for more assistance and patience in completing the task. In this case the student’s difficulty was in playing the notes to the song rather than selecting the background. The young girl labored over playing the notes looking many times from the sheet music to the keyboard. (O/S-7)

The keyboard students’ excitement for the task before them proved contagious. Students could not wait to make their selection. They had power over what their product sounded like. The classroom was one of busy purposeful creativity.

Having a beautiful background orchestration such as Ice Palace really did make it seem like an orchestra was playing your song. The orchestration was so rich and deep, it immediately transported you to another world. Whether the background selected was the cold northern tinkling sounds of crystal ice or a delicate light Oriental influence, this opportunity provided for the individuality of each students’ creation and choice. These experiences demonstrated Sara’s interest in the relationship between student voice and technology. (O/S-7)

**Context for Participating in Classroom Inquiry**

In the summer of 1997 Sara needed to take a three-hour course for teacher recertification. This mandate led her to a music computer class being offered at a nearby university, titled *Introduction to Music Technology*. Two pieces of software that impressed Sara during this course and continued to influence her teaching were *MusicShop* and *Finale*. *MusicShop* is a sequencing program. As students played a song on the keyboard or as they created a song on the keyboard, it automatically transferred over to the computer. While the song was on the computer, they could change the sequences of voice, instrument or rhythm. They could also select a background
orchestration for their music. A student could take a simple piece of music and manipulate it in endless possibilities.

*Finale* is a software notation program. This program also allowed students to write music. The student selected the notes and the computer played them, thus making each student a songwriter. The intent of both pieces of software programs was to foster creativity and expression.

To facilitate Sara’s inquiry, she requested and received an Apple Power Macintosh 5200 from the site-based management team of the school. Each year schools within the system are given a set amount of dollars for technology and for facilities. Some years our orders are filled and some year’s budget restraints cancel or reduce all orders. The site-based council approved her request for the Power Macintosh 5200 and she received it within a year.

As demonstrated, there were two important variables that led Sara to her inquiry. Sara’s motivation was high having just completed a music technology class. The path Sara followed also had a lot to do with her resources at hand. The Magnet Fine Arts Department at Southside has its own budget from central office; however, this is mostly for costumes, instruments and props and is separate from each school’s allocated monies and separate from the site-based budget process. Purchase orders are filled out by the individual magnet teachers, signed by the school administrator and approved by the Director of Magnet Programs prior to ordering and receiving any goods. Sara’s budget is directly linked to Central Administration rather than the site.

Sara utilized this process to purchase two software programs, *MusicShop* and *Finale* and the necessary hardware to connect the Macintosh computer to the Yamaha SY77 keyboards. Her
resources had just expanded with the approval and purchase of a new 5200 computer and these additional requests would launch her plan.

With her brand new computer the possibilities of utilizing software in her curriculum became limitless. How could she use technology to individualize student voice in the curriculum? In Sara’s dialogue journal, she described the software’s ability to allow students to choose their own songs at their ability level. It allowed improvisation, choice of instruments, and choice of background orchestrations while recording various numbers of tracks, changing tempos of songs and allowing students to work independently, interdependently or with the teacher. This became her instructional focus for the year. She then began to formalize this plan as her school goal: Students will be given opportunities to express themselves and to voice their feelings through music and music technology.

During the time Sara waited for her purchases to arrive, she taught the six keyboarding students how to read and play notes. Sara’s lesson plans reflected this intense instruction. All of this direct instruction was necessary to give students a foundation from which to make informed choices. It also demonstrated the real life day-to-day process of bringing students to a live performance.

In addition, Sara became particularly interested in promoting individual student voice in the curriculum after a faculty meeting was held on student voice at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year on September 24th. She was one of the first to volunteer for this project.

At this initial workshop on student voice in September of 1997, Sara initially defined student voice as “students expressing their feelings” (MT/S-2). She also listed current strategies that she felt currently promoted student voice like TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement), DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education), cooperative learning and the student
selection process of their magnet classes (MT/S-3). Sara listed several future strategies that may promote student voice such as a suggestion box, clubs, student government, and peer mediation (MT/S-3).

Being a magnet teacher, Sara spent teaching time promoting student expression. The performing aspect of her discipline, vocal music, became very important by providing a framework many times for student voices to be heard. It also narrowed student voice to their talents and the expression of those talents, while students “expressing their feelings” (MT/S-2) may implicate a much larger boundary for student voice. Suppose students wanted to express their feelings in a negative way about noninstructional or instructional issues. How would Sara handle both of these aspects of her inquiry and would they cause any tensions?

Another concept of student voice from Sara came from a meeting on March 27, 1997, with all the volunteer participants in this inquiry. Sara stated that, “they, students, already have it (voice) and you have to deal with it” (MT/S-1). This acceptance in her answer could manifest itself in many different areas of education such as: discipline, government and curriculum. Was Sara’s acceptance one of resignation or discovery?

Further narrowing her inquiry, Sara reviewed her daily schedule. The majority of Sara’s classes were kindergarten, first, second and third graders, rotating through her vocal music class as part of their journey through all of the magnet disciplines of vocal music, strings, drama, art and dance. The rest of her classes were fourth and fifth grade students who had selected to participate in the particular area of vocal music or keyboarding for the year. Sara’s keyboarding class is usually the smallest of the magnet disciplines with six to nine students participating. The small size of this class facilitated Sara’s inquiry and provided the one on one assistance needed
to promote student engagement. It is this class that became the focus of Sara’s action plan, although her instructional strategies permeated all of her classes.

Another factor that helped form Sara’s research is her desire to promote student expression through vocal music. This provided the students with a basis from which to choose their discipline in their last two years at Southside wisely. Certainly another purpose of the magnet program is to promote individual student talent in all areas, no matter what the grade or age.

**Developing the Action Research Plan**

Although Sara’s graduate work at Radford focused her interest on music technology, her commitment in promoting an individual’s talent led her to participate in this inquiry on student voice. Sara had several initial concerns: the need for an instructional framework that was research based to help focus her plan, the need to streamline all school board goals and objectives for the year into one inquiry and the necessary resources for implementation of her study.

To provide a framework, constructivism through technology was researched. Tapscott (1999) asserts that educators will have to look to the students to help shift to more student-centered learning. As computers become more pervasive in the schoolroom, “Technology will alter the content of education and our entrenched social system.” (Scherer, 1999, p.5). Cuban (1993) purports that computers have the potential to guide students in self-directed learning. This condition was reflected in Sara’s use of certain software such as *MusicShop* and *Finale* that demanded student input. Sara also thought “that constructivism would be a good way to motivate my students to learn piano and music technology” (J/S-2).
Continuing to build her framework, Sara also noted that differentiated instruction could play a part in her study. “I was reminded that not all children develop, learn, or achieve at the same pace. Because keyboard is primarily a solo instrument, it promotes individual achievement at an individual pace. The computer programs I implemented contributed to this differentiated instruction and empowered the students because they were learning through what interested them” (R/S-1).

The size of Sara’s selected target group and the availability of the technology would allow and promote this differentiation. Sara had already researched and purchased software that allowed individual choice and growth. Sara was able to differentiate not only the process of instruction but also the content of the class (Tomlinson, 1993). From her graduate work and recent research, Sara realized that technology could foster both differentiation and constructivism. Knowing where students are functioning helps educators know where to begin construction of knowledge and how to differ activities for each student.

An action research model (Calhoun, 1994) provided the structure Sara needed to combine all of her objectives. Sara’s division goals were flexible enough to facilitate this inquiry due to its instructional framework and this was transposed easily into an action research model. This assisted Sara in streamlining her objectives and her action research project while saving valuable time.

The path Sara followed also had a lot to do with her resources at hand. Sara requested and received a computer and the appropriate software to implement her study. The schedule of the magnet program also provided Sara with a small class of six keyboarding students. This class size proved beneficial in her foray in using technology to promote student voice. Sara was now ready to get down to the real work of implementing her proposed plan.
Implementation Process

Sara’s action research plan focused on the objective of promoting student voice by using technology. After an overview of an action research plan (Calhoun, 1994) was provided, Sara submitted her plan, *Student Voice through Music and the Computer (using the computer to make music and to express selves)*. This plan was approved by the principal or assistant principal of the building for its instructional content and Sara began her work.

It became apparent that the software Sara ordered would not foster creativity without her planning and initiative. Sara’s planning soon revealed that choice was the prevailing factor in the software. By allowing students to make decisions about song selection and arrangement, by creating their own melodies and rhythms and by allowing choice in their background orchestration, Sara set the stage for students to influence the curriculum.

How does the purchased software promote student voice in the curriculum? The software task consists of having the six keyboard magnet students choose their own songs to play on the piano, record them and select background orchestration for embellishment. The students would then present their musical piece in the form of a recital to an audience: first, by the playing of their song on a piano; and, second, by the student playing a tape recording of the embellished orchestration of their song from the computer. This would create the effect of an orchestra playing. This final product was preceded by months of students learning the basic ability to read written musical notation and how to play the piano from Sara. What other factors facilitated student voice?

Organizational factors such as the pupil/teacher ratio also played a key role in recognizing and fostering student voice in the curriculum. Sara’s small class size of six students
motivated the teacher to risk trying new instructional strategies. These two factors, time and size, are repeatedly mentioned by Sara in the process of doing this project.

As Sara continued to utilize technology in her keyboarding class, she also expanded her instructional strategies that promoted student voice to include the following.

**Reflective Journals**

The opportunities to discuss or write about the class helped students examine and express their opinions in an appropriate manner. In addition to Sara keeping a journal, students kept reflective journals to express their feelings. Sometimes Sara lead the reflective journal by posing a question such as what would make vocal music class better (SJ/S-3). Students wrote responses in their journals. Many concrete and positive suggestions came out of student journals. These suggestions are listed on the raw data matrices.

The students were very insightful when speaking and writing about the appearance of their recitals at Southside. Primarily major performances have gotten larger audiences than our recitals. They also have more elaborate stage decorations. Keyboard recitals, due to the small number of children enrolled, have usually consisted of the students, the piano and some fifth graders watching. No decorations, no big audiences, no costumes, just a student and the piano.

The students’ journals proved to be an eye-opener for Sara! Instead of downplaying their recital, the students in Sara’s keyboarding and vocal music class wanted to embellish it and wanted more people to see their finished product (SJ/S-5).

In addition, Sara posed the same question, what would make vocal music class better, to her fourth and fifth grade vocal chorus. She found that they also wanted to do more than stand on risers and sing (SJ/S-4). How would Sara have known the students’ feelings if she hadn’t set up the instructional strategy of reflective journaling to gather input from students after
performances? Sara planned for student input formally by establishing instructional vehicles, such as reflective journaling, for that purpose.

Student feedback also addressed the organizational structure of the magnet program. Students voiced their opinions on such subjects as combining magnet disciplines, selection of soloists, length of practices and choice of material. Not only did her students evaluate their own performances but also the performances of others. Southside magnet students were also fortunate to take many field trips that showcased national talents. Sara had the keyboard students reflect upon these performances in their journals. One such performance they attended was the Alvin Ailey Dance Company at the Civic Center on March 2, 1998. Student journals reflected their frustrations at audience members that were rude. “The Alvin Ailey dance ensemble was excellent. But the audience was rude. The best part was the last dance. It made me feel great” (SJ/S-1). These statements help the reader realize that not only do teachers have to deal with behavior problems but students do too.

Their journal entries demonstrate the depth of their feelings that sometimes only performances can evoke. “My favorite song was God Bless America because it was inspirational to everybody’s history” (SJ/S-2). “My favorite song was Who Can Sail because it sounded like my grandpa’s funeral” (SJ/S-2).

Discussion

Sara also provided a forum for students to discuss their choices. She had each of the six keyboarding students present their orchestration to the class and then explain why they made their choices and what they would like to do in the future differently. The students were given the opportunity to make any necessary changes prior to their live performance. These creations were presented to the parents and all fifth graders in a recital.
Were there instances of students making inappropriate choices or having too much power? Did they step across democratic boundaries? Who set the boundaries? Sara cited one incident in a March discussion among fourth and fifth grade vocal music students responding to the question, what would make vocal music class better? Some students wrote in their journals comments that were negative to individuals. (J/S-11) Sara immediately set the boundaries on that conversation to establish lines of respect and civility in discussions. After all, the focus should have been on the content and process of the class, but the students tended to focus on people. Sara’s redirection insured student voice to be a positive effect.

The students wanted the teacher to know they too recognize the students that created problems. The language of students plays a powerful role in helping a teacher understand how students position themselves in the world and helps shape meaning for the teacher and the students (Giroux & McLaren, 1986).

Sara also planned for discussions as evidenced by individual and group student summarizations of her lesson plans. Sara’s planning for her magnet students carried over into all of the grades, kindergarten through fifth grade. For example, on December 5, the fourth grade vocal music students discussed things needed for a successful performance while the fifth graders discussed what they could do to make a better keyboard performance possible (SJ/S-5). The keyboard students, on January 5, summed up their lesson by discussing how they could play their song more interesting. On January 12, third graders discussed three good things and three things that needed improvement in their performances. Likewise first graders and kindergartners discussed important things to do in a performance on January 13 and April 2. Most written critiques were also integrated with discussions (L/S-4, L/S-20).
Critiquing

As an opportunity for students to express themselves, Sara solicited students’ critiques of their performances. It was this instructional strategy of critiquing that changed how keyboard recitals would be presented. Once Sara asked her students to reflect on how they would do things differently, many good ideas were offered verbally and in writing. “We need to stand still and be like a choir. We also need to do the movements together. We need to do the choreography at the right time and not rely on the teacher to show us what to do” (SJ/S-3). “It is important to wait for the music before we start the movements. Also, when we perform, we should not look at other people. We should do the choreography ourselves” (SJ/S-3).

After each recital, Sara’s students watched and listened to their performances that had been videotaped and evaluated it. Students discussed or wrote in their journals things they liked about the performance and things that needed improvement. This was done after each performance. The input gathered from student evaluations of their own performances served as a catalyst for real change. “I think we should take a vote on the soloist. We could also vote on the songs. We might be able to let other magnets vote on the soloist” (SJ/S-3). “I think we should take turns singing in the microphone. I also think we need to work on our projection so our audience can hear us” (SJ/S-3). “I think keyboard class would be better if we got to practice on full-size pianos or keyboards. I would like to borrow dressy clothes again in the next recital” (SJ/S-5). “I would like to decorate the stage and the piano at the next recital” (SJ/S-5). “I wish we could play more than one song” (SJ/S-5). Many of these suggestions were implemented in Sara’s program and changed the face of recitals.
Choice

Choice was a criteria in Sara’s lessons: choice in song, tempo, instruments, background and presentation. Students had to actively participate by selecting their own songs and their own background orchestration. The gifted musician could do their own creating while the novice could play a song either picked by them or by their teacher. That level of individualism is the foundation of Sara’s inquiry. Students playing notes in a song or creating a song allowed for students to put their voice in the final product. The students also helped choose costumes and assisted in hanging, labeling and organizing costumes for performances. Students took responsibility for all aspects of performing.

Strategies to promote student involvement and ownership became pervasive in Sara’s classes as evidenced by Sara’s lesson plans from November 14-April 3. These plans demonstrated and confirmed her promotion of student voice through the instructional strategies of discussion, choice, journaling, critiquing and improvisation. Lesson plans also documented students creating costumes, lyrics, songs and movement.

Vocal music students acted out lyrics through movements and words. Many of these lyrics were of their own creation. Creativity and choice were evident as students created costumes and stages sets for recitals and performances. Student journals revealed students’ thoughts. “We need to put a little bit of action into our choreography. We need to put more acting in what we are doing. The Elephant’s Child is a play and it has people singing in it too. So, we need to act a little bit just like the drama people” (SJ/S-4).

The addition of choreography instilled pride and ownership for the students, “Vocal music class would be better if everybody around me would listen to the teacher. We are not in here to play, daydream, or sing as high or low as we can. Regarding choreography, we need to
stay on track and do the movements together. We need to work on singing together and standing still on the stage. We need to be quiet and listen more” (SJ/S-3). The performances were always touched by each individual student’s character, personality and what they bring to each performance. Performances may have been the end result and a high indicator of students truly expressing themselves.

Utilizing technology, offering choice, reflective journals, decision-making and student evaluations of performances were all factors that fostered participation and promoted student voice in Sara’s inquiry.

Climate

Instructional strategies, organizational factors, and organizational climate evolved in the classroom as an important role in promoting student voice. Does the teacher/organization think student voice is important? Students must feel comfortable with their identity and position in the classroom to concentrate and meet goals (Schein, 1992).

One factor indicative of Sara’s values is the fact that she volunteered to research this subject. She didn’t have to care about getting students engaged in their tasks or what their opinions and feelings are. As evidenced by Sara’s observations September 15, January 9, and February 12, Sara promoted a positive climate, handled discipline problems in a professional manner and utilized positive feedback consistently. “Positive reinforcement was given throughout the lesson and the teacher was positioned at all times to monitor student progress and behavior” (O/S-6).

It was also evident by observing that she created an environment that promoted student voice. This positive environment was led by a teacher that epitomized respect and fair play and demonstrated her commitment in planning for student involvement. Her rapport with students in
small and large classes continues to be exceptional. Her demeanor is positive and professional as evidenced by all three formal observations (O/S-2,4,6).

Sara’s Reflections

Sara summarized her experience with her action research project. First and foremost she felt “that technology, especially music technology, is a great strategy for promoting student voice. Students can be successful using this vehicle for self expression and voicing their feelings” (R/S-1).

Sara also felt that differentiated instruction was important and the computer software programs and her keyboards allowed students to progress at their own pace. It also provided choices for students that ensured their interest in the task at hand. Sara wants to continue her learning about constructivism and differentiated learning and utilize both to engage students in the curriculum and promote their voices (R/S-1).

Student voices taking control of their learning through instructional strategies established by the teacher and the students. A demonstration that it can be done. (Appendix-A)

Raising Girls’ Voices: Wyann’s Journey

My first glimpse of Wyann was prior to her employment at Southside Magnet Elementary School. She approached me at the Magnet Fair Exhibit for our system to let me know that she was a certified dance instructor and would love an opportunity to teach at Southside. As fate would have it, our dance instructor at that time decided to move back to Chicago. Right away we needed to find a new dance teacher, and I wished I had spent more time talking with Wyann that day. Luckily, her application was on file and I, along with a team, interviewed her for the position of Dance Magnet Instructor.
Wyann’s credentials put her above the competition. She had done extensive choreography in Washington D.C. and other localities. She also had the best interpersonal skills and displayed a natural enthusiasm for her discipline. As we found out, this was not just for the sake of the interview, but rather a personal trait.

Unanimously, by the decision of the interview committee, Wyann was offered and accepted the job. That was the beginning of changes for Southside’s dance program and Wyann’s introduction to the world of classroom management. These were not students that were paying for private lessons but rather students that were there mostly by the fact that they lived in our attendance zone. Some students had applied and been granted magnet status; however, by and large, Wyann taught the general population.

Wyann always had a love for the students and a desire to gather their input; however, as with most new teachers, she had to get a handle on classroom management. There were tears and some parental concerns in her initial years. Wyann had a difficult time understanding the postmodern child in the urban setting. Wyann questioned everyone as to why students couldn’t practice self-discipline. It simply amazed her that if students were treated with respect, they didn’t automatically return it. Creating an atmosphere that respected student voice overpowered her at times. This wasn’t how she imagined it would be.

As with all of the fine arts teachers, Wyann taught all students. Kindergarten through third grade were scheduled on a rotating basis. Fourth and fifth graders selected one of the fine arts disciplines and remained with it all year. Recitals and major performances are held throughout the year as authentic assessments of the fine arts program.

For the purposes of this study, Wyann particularly focused on one of her fourth grade classes to conduct her inquiry into student voice. Southside Elementary had been allocated the
funds to construct a new building with six rooms, which would still leave most of the fine arts’
teachers in the modulars. We are in the process now of trying to reverse that decision.

None of this, however, affected Wyann and her students. What comes out of that small
trailer is a testimony of teacher commitment to fostering creativity in each individual student.
What has been interesting is seeing how Wyann has come to terms with classroom management
in her four years at Southside, how she has utilized this project to promote student voice in the
curriculum and where that has led her program

Unlike previous years in dance where students were taught each step preplanned to
preselected songs, Wyann has taken the dance students and programs in new directions. Students
are more involved in all aspects of the dance. A greater emphasis was placed on student input
into the choreography and student selection of dance routines and songs as evidenced by recitals,
classroom observations and major performances of the students. Wyann’s reputation has grown
in all areas as she travels with her dancers to all types of functions, organizations and schools.
Her journey is one that brought excellence to her program, her students and our school.

How did Wyann go from the insecurities of her first year to what many consider a master
dance teacher? Although there are never simple answers, her value of student voice played a
major role. She was the opposite of the stern disciplinarian that never allowed students to speak
much less provide input. She established a nurturing atmosphere that promoted student voice by
utilizing specific instructional strategies. Her desire to “hear” the students was the solid basis
Wyann needed to form her action research.

Classroom Scenario

Wyann teaches in an instructional module, that we are not supposed to call a trailer. It is
one of the oldest trailers in the system, dating back to 1988. The doors look horribly worn and
most of the tiles have come up on the vinyl side of the floor. Three-fourths of her modular is comprised of a dance floor and a long mirror and barres. The other fourth consists of vinyl tiling on the floor and stacks of shoes and costumes from the floor to the ceiling.

Wyann starts her class in a circle with her being part of the circle so as not to block anyone’s view or isolate anyone. This class is made up of twelve fourth graders at Southside Elementary School that have selected dance as their discipline of choice. It is an early morning in February. Everyone is sitting cross legged, Wyann brings her students into the inquiry by starting with a question, “What is gender equity?”

By probing and broadening the children’s definitions of gender equity, Wyann begins to ascertain their opinions on the topic of voice. As with any teacher/student relationship, the content of the subject matter is affected by the bias of the teacher. But here in Wyann’s class she tries to create and foster a situation where students’ voices can be heard. Wyann makes sure she seeks each person’s opinion in the circle. By going round robin she ensures and promotes student voice. Wyann wrote in her journal, “I just did a fun experiment with my fourth grade classes. We had a discussion beginning with the topic of student voice and narrowing it on gender equity. Once they began to understand the topic they were eager for input. I began by telling them I needed their input for some research I am doing” (Wyann-J/W-10).

Wyann stressed the importance of the students’ opinions and the students became eager when they realized the personal stake in this discussion.

The students in this class stated that boys and girls are not treated equally and cited various reasons to support their statements. Girls said boys are called on more often and boys said the opposite. Both genders agreed that male teachers took up for boys while female teachers took up for girls more (J/W-10). Once unleashed, the students uncovered a wide array of
instances where boys and girls were treated differently from who gets called on to who gets to do the errands. As students’ awareness increased, they wanted to evaluate other teachers on their fairness in gender issues. Some students felt that they did not get enough opportunities to voice their opinions. One girl said, “that a teacher’s day is planned and there is not much room for flexibility” (J/W-10).

“However, the most interesting piece of this lesson was to watch the discussion unfold. Boys overwhelmingly dominated, interrupted and raised their voices during the forty minute session. They had difficulty waiting for others to finish what they were saying. Several of the boys actually got up, left the circle and engaged in disruptive physical activity. This occurred mostly when I was speaking with the girls” (J/W-12).

This disturbed Wyann enough to jump at the opportunity to volunteer to work on a year long inquiry on student voice. She was hearing student voices but not always in a positive way.

**Context for Participating in Classroom Inquiry**

Wyann’s initial concept of student voice was written at Southside’s faculty meeting, September 24, 1997. Wyann felt student voice consisted of “students expressing themselves creatively through art and written and verbal expression. Student voice showed student individuality” (MT/W-7). It was this student individuality, or management of, that concerned Wyann.

Wyann realized the impact behavior had on student participation in her classes. She also knew that three times a week for forty minutes, she met with ten students for dance instruction and boys dominated her attention. Wyann wondered “where the girls’ voices were and what they had to say,” (J/W-15) as she worked with the daily challenges of classroom management. It was on this feminist basis that Wyann questioned the equality of education for all.
During the course of the school year, Wyann was also pursuing graduate work by participating in a class at Hollins on gender equity. Not only was Wyann researching the topic at a local university, but she was also observing gender behavior on a daily basis at Southside with her classes, mixing theory with practice. Both of these factors influenced Wyann to become the first teacher to volunteer to participate in an action research project on student voice. While Wyann initially focused on students diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and determining their needs to be successfully engaged in the curriculum, her reflections and observations of her classroom led her to take a look at females in the educational setting. This resulted into the evolution of her study into a topic of gender equity and a broader umbrella of promoting all students’ voices.

**Developing the Action Research Plan**

Wyann’s action research plan initially focused on the needs of ADHD students to be successful in the classroom. Their success would pave the way for other students to participate equally. This led her to her second area of inquiry: gender equity. Wyann’s inquiry centered around research questions of how to provide a supportive environment for ADHD students and what particular instructional strategies would assist in their success. Wyann found these questions were also applicable for the topic of gender equity. Both topics were crucial for promoting student voice in Wyann’s class.

Wyann was definitely feeling the effects of working with ADHD students. Although she did have several students on medication for ADHD, it certainly was somewhat an atypical number based on the fact that there were eighty to ninety students on medication at Southside at the time. Out of a population of about six hundred seventy students, this is approximately thirteen percent of the students on medication. Wyann had six to eight ADHD students in her
fourth grade dance classes, thus resulting in a much greater percentage of ADHD students versus non ADHD students in this particular class.

Dancing and all it entails is quite different from having students sit in rows and work independently and is even different from students working in groups. Wyann stated, “A more provocative thought of mine-again just an idea-is that maybe some of these kids are not so much ADHD as they are in need of having visual and kinesthetic methods used in the classroom” (J/W-8).

All this energy needed to be channeled. Wyann now was expanding her concept of student voice. “I think students express their voice powerfully through their movement. I can often learn so much about a child through observing their movement. I often see the creative potential of a behavior problem labeled child. I think students need more opportunities to express themselves. It is an important part of their language development” (J/W-3).

How could all students, including her ADHD students, participate in class and voice their individuality? Wyann strongly felt both targeted groups were intertwined when it came to expressing their voice. Research and personal observations noted in her journal were the cornerstones for her inquiry. This led to instructional strategies that she utilized to promote student voice for both groups. She also took a class at Hollins College on gender equity, which paralleled her inquiry into student voice and furthered her professional development.

Through our dialogue journal, Wyann realized that she needed more research on ADHD students and wrote, “The ADHD kids bring a powerful challenge to teachers. Can we maintain a high level of interest and excitement in our lessons? All of our students deserve it. If it is our goal to make students lifelong learners, it is our job to spark their interest in learning” (J/W-15).
Two researchers, Hallowell (1994) and Barkley (1997) helped our understanding of ADHD. Nine articles/books on gender equity provided a more extensive research base to assist Wyann with her action plan. This action plan helped Wyann formulate her thoughts and allowed time to observe and reflect upon the process.

Her personal quest for knowledge and desire to be a better teacher motivated Wyann to pursue this topic. Establishing a democratic nurturing atmosphere where all voices are respected became her vision.

**Implementation Process**

Research helped guide Wyann in implementing instructional strategies that would promote student voice in the curriculum. Wyann found inspiration in some basic tenets of a strategy called HOPE, which is an acronym for Hello, Objectives, Plans and Encouragement. This coaching program was established to promote verbal interaction between ADHD students and their adult coaches (Hallowell, 1994). The coach makes daily contact with their students and assists the child in verbalizing and discussing their goals for the day. With the high percentage of ADHD students in Wyann’s dance class, this would become the precursor to her utilizing discussion in her classroom.

It isn’t that ADHD students/adults can’t pay attention, but rather they have difficulty with the action or output component. This can be affected by the appeal of the task and the reward available for doing it. Why else can ADHD students sit and watch television or play video games? Most ADHD kids display a lack of self-control (Barkley, 1997).

“I agree, that these students have a good capacity for attention” (J/W-8). Wyann’s observations of ADHD students in her class demonstrated that their needs could overwhelm everyone else’s in the classroom and many times that everyone else was a girl. “I seem to get a
high ratio of ADHD kids. I find that they are often visual and kinesthetic learners. For example, three ADHD students in my tap class are definitely the most alive and disruptive students, but they can stay focused for forty minute periods if the material is interesting and meaningful to them” (J/W-2).

As Wyann is researching ADHD, she is also interested in gender equity. She connects voices more to inequality and cultural issues that spill over into the classroom. She also observes that black females showed far more assertiveness than white females in her class discussions. Wyann searches for connections to understand why people are more assertive than others, while trying to see the connection between student voice and instruction.

As a teacher who is continuing her education, Wyann can not help but bring her current experiences to this topic. “I have been watching discussions in my Education class and even with an overwhelming majority of girls (women), the men speak at least half of the time. And often, a certain impatience can be felt when a woman is speaking. Men receive full attention whether or not what they are saying is interesting” (J/W-15).

This is excellent rationale for Wyann’s practice of seating her students in a circle and making sure everyone has an opportunity to discuss the issues at hand. This strategy raised the students’ awareness of voice and equity.

Wyann’s initial concept of students expressing themselves creatively evolved to include two factors very important to her, ownership and inclusiveness. “Students are more eager for input when they understand what they are studying” (J/W-10). Ownership promotes motivation (Johnson, 1991).

Wyann utilized specific instructional strategies to promote inclusiveness. One of these strategies was discussion. When you want to know what students think, ask them. Wyann spent
considerable time discussing topics with her fourth grade students. In Wyann’s observed lessons, discussions were present in all of them. These very active dancers were forthcoming when directed in discussion groups. By beginning with a focus question, such as the definition of gender equity. Wyann was able to promote students’ thinking.

The girls in Wyann’s class felt that although they raised their hands, they never get called on by the teacher. Student discussions demonstrated how students feel about equity and voice. One student responded that, “The teacher looks at me, then calls on someone else” (J/W-10). Girls were also acutely aware that “boys get in more trouble than girls” (J/W-110).

Conversely, boys felt that, “girls get more attention and get to go to the bathroom more” (J/W-11). The classroom discussion found white females, in this particular small class setting, being the least likely to voice their opinions. It becomes more apparent how difficult it is to allow students to express themselves in a large group and the importance of planning for instructional strategies and organizational structure to promote student voice.

Wyann also led discussions of the concepts of dance. “Teacher focused students by discussing various sizes and shapes and demonstrating different dance positions” (O/W-6). Discussions demonstrate Wyann’s commitment to promote student voice by allowing time for students to discuss how each motion, such as smooth and sharp, felt to them as individuals (O/W-8).

Wyann realized in her inquiry that children aren’t the only ones that have difficulty in expressing themselves. During a conversation March 27, 1998, with all four participants in this inquiry, Wyann was most preoccupied about an incident that happened with a male teacher. Previously, a dancer with a professional dance troupe came to Southside for several sessions to assist the students in choreography and dance steps. The local newspaper did an article on one of
those sessions with accompanying photographs. The reporter wrote that our dance students were flailing around and gave the impression that our dancers may have been floundering. Of course, our students were learning or creating their own choreography, which escaped the reporter.

Several students were upset about this article and said something to their male teacher. His reply was, “that if we didn’t want to be insulted by the paper, then maybe I (Wyann) should teach the students how to dance decently (MT/W-5).

Although this particular teacher jokes a lot, the following second incident really made Wyann question when to use her voice around him. Three male students in this particular teacher’s class are all in the dance magnet with Wyann. They had also, “been consistently goofing off” (MT/W-5a). Wyann, after a trying time, related to their teacher the trouble she had been having and the fact that she had called their parents to inform them of their sons’ recent misbehavior. The male teacher exploded. He “makes a big thing in front of the whole class. Told one student, basically that his momma would beat him” (MT/W-5a). The teacher continues his lecture calling all three boys up to the front and told them, “if the three of you can’t get yourselves together, you can take your little twinkle toes and …” (MT/W-5a).

However you view this exchange, Wyann viewed it as negative, stifling and an insult. “I just think at an art school, for a teacher to stand up and call three boys twinkle toes and to put that kind of connotation with dancing was really insulting to the whole program and every child that performs here. I just won’t do it again. I won’t handle things that way again. I won’t bring behavior problems to him. I guess that’s the best way to handle it” (MT/W-5a). It certainly demonstrates how adults can limit each others’ voices, whether meaning to or not.

Is there a limit on student voice? “Yes, in terms of disrupting a class. No, in terms of inviting input” (J/W-9). “One of the ways I try and give another avenue to student voice is
through journal writing. I find this is a very effective way of finding out what kids are thinking and its often a complete surprise to me!” (J/W-9). One male student refused to do ballet. The journal process lets the teacher know that he thought ballet was hard. This opened the door to communication and success. “Yes, kids can go over the line and will go over the line but they are kids—it is our job to give them the skills they need to be more successful and if those are social skills, so be it” (J/W-10).

Again, Wyann focused the students’ writing by having them write down their qualifications for dance jobs. One student, vying for a position wrote, “I will not let you down” (SJ/W-6). Other students extol their fairness (SJ/W-4) and their qualifications of experience for the job (SJ/W-5).

Wyann also encouraged student journals to include critiques of self, class and outsiders’ performances. “If I had a choice of what to change in dance class, it would be attitudes. I picked attitudes because some people like me have mood swings. Other people like L. are always happy” (SJ/W-2). This revealing statement was coming from a student living in a homeless shelter. This information is critical when working with young people. It doesn’t excuse behavior but helps explain and understand it.

The students reacted to the journal writing with honesty. “I like dance a lot, it helps me a lot to get my freakyness out and my madness out” (SJ/W-3).

Wyann believes in the benefits of expressing one’s self and the vehicle that movement/dance provides. She also believes students should have a voice in their instruction. Another instructional strategy used extensively by Wyann was choice. Certainly the school organization had already established that fourth and fifth graders selected the magnet discipline
of their choice; however, this was organizational structure not instructional strategies and Wyann felt more choice needed to happen in the classroom.

Wyann’s students consistently were encouraged to create their own dance steps and choreography. Continuously, students were expected to be creative. All of Wyann’s recitals and performances demonstrated students’ creativity. When Theresa Howard from the Dance School of Harlem came to work with Wyann’s magnet dance group, the students were encouraged to create all of the choreography to the dance. Wyann’s students are always asked for their input into the choreography of the dance and more importantly it is expected. “Students demonstrated their dance talent by developing and exhibiting dance steps” (O/W-4). “Students demonstrated different dance positions” (O/W-6). “Students created dance steps that demonstrated their knowledge of dance concepts such as speed and rhythm” (O/W-8). “Students demonstrated three different types of movements using their own patterns” (O/W-10).

An observation on September 15, 1999, demonstrated the height that student voice has reached in Wyann’s classroom. From 11:05-11:45 on this Wednesday morning eight students in Wyann’s dance class were practicing their dance movements. What was so fascinating is the process Wyann utilized for the lesson. The previous week found the students writing in their journal of the first movements in life. Each student got to pick one movement, vocalize it and create movement to it. Here are two examples: “My mama said I was squirmy. My mama said I came out butt first” (O/W-7). So, as the dancer approaches the front and says, “my mama said I came out butt first,” she proceeds to walk backwards very fast with her butt stuck out. Before she finishes, the second dancer comes to the front vocalizes her movement, “my mama said I was squirmy” and proceeded to slither her body to and fro. Nor do they stop, until all eight students are cavorting around the room with different movements while saying their sentence. These were
the first movements and words said about them by their mom, dad or grandparents. The students were delighted to express that. Wyann put the finishing choreographed touches on this exercise by teaching them timing and pitch and gathering their input when she needed a common stopping point to pull the audience back into the performance. It was very organized chaos and turned into an impressive piece of work that was shared in the annual Magnet Fair. All of this was based on the students’ recollections of early movement and moments in their life.

The three instructional strategies of journal writing, discussion and choice revealed what the opinions of the students were and fostered creativity in their dance. Wyann consistently encouraged students to be creative and demanded it in their performances. A major performance demonstrated the final dance product of these students’ choices. As they created their choreography, their individual voices became one voice of beautiful music and dance.

By utilizing circle time, discussions, journals and reflective feedback, Wyann took the dance class to new heights. Applications have doubled since she has directed the program. Boys are lined up to get in her class and have no problem with any of the movements. She has created two classes of girls only and has created partnerships with a number of dance troupes. While initially I served as an informational coach for Wyann, she quickly overtook me and provided me with research on equity which has been valuable. Her enthusiasm and poise, coupled with an earthiness, has won the respect of all that come in contact with her. While there are many good teachers at Southside, there are a handful that change students lives, Wyann is one of these. Her true desire to promote student voice is seen by students as an avenue for them to share power. I still serve as an emotional peer support for her (Kram, 1985).
Wyann’s Reflections

The whole basis of Wyann’s action plan rested on her beliefs about voice and equity. Her inquiry into the aggressiveness of ADHD boys and her intense interest in gender equity were really the reflection of Wyann’s own journey of discovery of her voice. “I realize that the female voice continues to be a theme in my teaching as well as in my life. My interest and concern for the survival of this voice is reflected in everything I do. I continue to see females excluded and unnoticed because of the enormous amount of attention that many boys demand” (J-R/W-1).

The entire definition of a postmodern child is played out on a daily basis in Wyann’s classroom as she struggles to balance aggressiveness with respect. “Nevertheless, I try to look at the positive changes I can make to help manage my very physical classroom. My students are beginning to establish small improvements to gender equity issues in the classroom. Responding to my concerns, they (students) will make sure each line has boys and girls. When choosing a partner—they know—the first time you may choose your favorite friend in the class. The second time you must choose someone new, and new again, and new again. I have noticed that not only have boys and girls begun choosing each other, but blacks and whites, heavy children and thin children, etc. It is amazing how early prejudices against anyone different can develop” (J-R/W-1).

Wyann does express concern that she is being “too hard on the boys”; however, she has noticed that “students who have worked with me for three or four years do not think about what kind of dancing is for girls and what kind is for boys. I am reminded of this when I get a new student who has strong preconceptions of what male movement should be and what female movement should be. I believe strongly for children as well as grown-ups that we could all
benefit by developing some of the qualities that are not stereotypically attributed to our own sex” (J-R/W-1).

Wyann continued to follow her action plan by implementing strategies to promote student voice in the curriculum. She utilized the strategy of choice, not only by having students choose their movement and costumes, but also by having students rotate their choice of partners to experience that diversity. She elevated choice to creativity by setting the stage for students to create their own choreography.

Discussion was utilized frequently and as needed when a slight was real or imagined. Time was allowed to discuss the unfairness if it existed. “If a comment is made about gender—ex. that’s for boys (girls) … we sit down and talk about it right away. We identify sexist comments and talk about equity” (J-R/W-1).

Wyann put a high priority on students participating in classroom discussions. She counted oral participation as fifty percent of each of her students’ grade. Performances counted only twenty percent towards their grade (SJ/W-10). This is bringing the concept to reality for the students.

The importance of organizational structure in pursuing student voice was evident in Wyann’s inquiry. Her schedule and number of students in her class fostered the time and desire necessary to promote student voice. She also has “an interesting new schedule—two all female classes. I am already amazed at the amount of uninterrupted instruction I can achieve” (J-R/W-1). Wyann is committed to helping students “develop their own voice, express their own ideas, and have the confidence to take part in their education rather than be a passive presence in the classroom” (J-R/W-1).
Wyann’s intense passion on voice laid the framework for her inquiry. Her personal strife to find her own voice led her to great empathy for anyone, including students, to express their voice. To her great dismay, she also realized some students expressed their voices in an inappropriate way. This only confirmed her dedication to those instructional strategies that would serve as guides for appropriate student voice in the curriculum.

This passion brought student voice alive in Wyann’s classroom. Her instructional strategies kept it promoted and treasured. (Appendix-B)
CHAPTER IV

STRUGGLING TO PROMOTE STUDENT VOICE: AN UNEASY JOURNEY

Students’ Voices Through Storytelling: Betty’s Journey

Betty is a drama teacher at Southside Magnet School for Performing and Visual Arts. Betty was teaching drama when I became the principal of Southside five years ago. She had one year of teaching experience at that time. She is a member of a team of five fine arts teachers that represent the magnet block of the curricula and She attended State Teacher’s college in Westfield, Massachusetts, and graduated with a degree in English and a concentration in Theatre. In addition, Betty is engaged in the process of working on her National Board Certification as a middle childhood generalist.

Southside Elementary is a campus style school with three main buildings. Betty has a room at the end of the hall of Building C. Her room is a theatrical treat upon entering. One never knows if you are walking into a haunted house or in a jungle surrounded by “live” animals, played by children. Her room is not filled with desks and chairs but costumes, shoes, cotton, sequins and an abundance of props used by the students during the course of their work, whether it be two barstools for the famous comedy routine, “Who’s on first?” or elaborate stage backdrops for angels in a play.

Renowned for managing a stage, Betty spent many hours after school in rehearsal with her students. She was also the person the school system seeks when staging their biggest extravaganza, which is normally the Superintendent’s Opening Convocation Day. Betty’s initiative was also demonstrated in a trip to Norfolk with her students. She took ten fourth and fifth grade drama students to participate in a statewide drama competition that featured only secondary students. She asked the organization if they would make an exception to include her
students and they did. The students performed, “The Emperor’s New Clothes” and received awards for best costumes. To culminate that event, Betty and her students were recognized for their excellence by the City Council and Mayor.

Betty’s room is a visual, colorful journey of the theatre costumes used by Southside’s drama students in years present and past. Most props are usually discarded after each performance due to the lack of space; however, there are mountains of costumes and other items. Most of the fine arts teachers store racks of costumes in their rooms. Betty’s room is no exception. Upon entering, one sees racks and racks of costumes boxed up and labeled for easy reference. Some are hung up with wire hangers on a rolling cart.

This room was packed with fairy tales learned in childhood. Boxes were stacked one on top of the other holding costumes that ranged from the Tin Man in the Wizard of Oz, a Cinderella gown, to the Seven Dwarfs’ costumes, ranging from sizes six/eight to twelve/fourteen. Other boxes contained square dance costumes, oriental costumes, wands and scepters, bats, Dracula wigs, a sorceress costume, policeman costumes, cat costumes, king costumes, space costumes, taffeta dresses, wedding and funeral dresses and lots of white poet shirts. Animal costumes included monkeys, big birds and big dogs.

Cubbies of shoes, heels, flats, boots and spats, towered on their racks in her room. Hats of all kinds and colors; white glitter derby hats, sailor hats, cowboy hats and wizard hats, prodded imaginations to a different world.

On the rolling clothes cart were clown outfits of all colors; midnight blue/white, red/black, and a rainbow colored costume. Around the necks of the clown costumes were collars made out of mesh that matched the color of the outfit. On another rack were grass skirts, chiffon dresses and rows of crinolines. The basics were also there; hair bows, long white, black, silver or
multicolored gloves, pantyhose and tights in all sizes and shapes. If you couldn’t buy a costume, you could make it with the boxes of material, and glittering sequins of all colors that were sealed up in plastic bags. One whole wall was a mirror for everyone to see themselves dressed up in costume and watch their own performances to self-reflect.

Betty’s Rules of Theatre were posted up front, large in neon markers on black paper. They read: Be prompt, Be alert, Ask questions, Give in, and Pick up. Resources were also categorized and filed. There were many videos from “Babar” to “The Art of Mime.” There were also videos of past performances at Southside. Board games from Charade and Guesstures to Scattergories were on the shelf. Betty’s work space consisted of a computer, printer, television and work space. On the bulletin board was a history of The Globe Theatre in London (1599-1613) with a diagram of the building. Quotes from Shakespeare line the wall. Books and plays were filed in order and ran the gamut from “Basic Drama Projects” to “Thirty Plays from Favorite Stories.” Orange magazine holders housed all the scripts and on the window was a sun with huge elongated rays covering the light of the window.

There were the requisite bulletin boards of a wide variety. Posters of Greek knights line the end of the bulletin board. One included a world map, while another detailed the parts of a play: Introduction, Rising Action, Climax, Falling Action and Conclusion. Another board on the side of the room simply stated: Constructivism, Actively Constructing Meaning—New Knowledge. This was used as a remainder from Betty of her recent educational courses.

There were many odds and ends that served as props in a play scattered about: a Christmas tree, a puppet theatre with curtains, hand puppets, an ironing board, markers of all kinds, an old phone, the American Flag, a video camera, a boom box, a huge black kettle, a mask a barrel, various lamps, a few chairs, a kidney shaped work table blanketed with papers,
encyclopedias, a 2x4 piece of wood with holes in it, a tray with shells and dried starfish for the boys and bangles for the girls. These starfish and bangles were used for a homework assignment. The last item that caught my eye was a calendar where the students marked their birthdays.

Betty’s room was literally like taking a tour of a movie studio.

Betty’s daily routine, as did all of the participants, included working with all kindergarten through third graders in a rotating schedule. Selected fourth and fifth graders were seen on a regular basis all year long. The discipline of drama has no choice but to seek student voice. There will be no play without someone speaking. Student voice can be the soul of drama or pure memorization. However, memorization with certain qualities of pitch, intonation and innuendoes of that individual make the performance. The basis of Betty’s job was to promote students’ self-expression. Although there were certain standards for secondary students that address theatre, Betty and her students were basically free to choose the plays or other mediums to present. The Virginia Standards of Learning were also integrated with drama when appropriate.

The success of much of Betty’s work depended upon student voice and whether the audience could hear their projections, understand their diction and accept their roles. Literally, her students’ voices must be heard for them to perform. Her interest in student voice is different from anyone else in the educational setting. While other areas certainly have felt the influence of student voice in the curricula, drama is spoken words. Yet, acclaimed actors do more than memorize and recite lines. It is the authenticity they add to their lines that elevates them from their peers. Betty has transformed more than one passive child into a leading actor or actress.

Classroom Scenario

It is March 20th at 9:30 a.m. and Betty walks down the hall of Building C to pick up her magnet students in fourth grade. Betty goes to each fourth grade class and sticks her head in the
door to let the students know she is ready for them. One by one nine students from five different teachers come out of their classrooms and line up in the hall with Betty. There are a few whispered questions to the teacher to figure out what the agenda is for today. Betty leads them, not to her room, but to the stage in the cafeteria for a rehearsal of Rumplestilskin. The cafeteria is empty except for two maintenance men passing through and the distant noise of the cafeteria ladies working on lunch.

At 9:35 a.m. the students take their positions on stage and Betty is busy monitoring and answering their questions. There are nine students, three of them have major parts, Rumplestilskin, the Queen and the Queen’s assistant. The other six students play supporting roles.

Betty begins, “Tiffany, are you set?” (O/B-7). When two boys have a conflict over their spot, Betty responds, “What can you do about this? How can you solve this problem?” (O/B-7). Betty prepares the students by asking them to think about your character, are they rich, poor? “This is when you take all of that nervous energy and perform” (O/B-7).

As the students rehearsed, Betty would monitor by providing immediate feedback. “Josh, she just told you she knew someone that can spin straw into gold. Think about a new bike, helmet, gloves, etc. How excited would you be?” (O/B-7). At 9:45 a.m. the teacher tied a piece of paper on a student that was acting as the queen in the play. This paper was placed on her waist around the back to prevent the student from turning her back on the audience, which she continually did.

As Rumplestilskin recited his lines, Betty interjected by asking him, “How can you behave like a funny little man?” (O/B-7). Betty’s continuous feedback stresses the actors to trust themselves. If their lines do not ring true, she halts the rehearsal to let them know. “I don’t
believe you not believing him” (O/B-8). Continuously she stresses for the students to remember Rule #2—Be Alert. This is a must for actors and it soon becomes apparent those students that are not alert.

At 9:50 a.m. Betty is working with the queen on enunciation and feelings. “Why are you laughing when he said he is taking your baby? You have got to be thinking about what you are saying” (O/B-8). As the queen is guessing Rumplestiltskin’s name from the thousands of names, the students wanted to add Mini-Me from a present day movie. Barbara agrees to let them use it.

A continuous problem occurred when students wanted to turn their backs to the audience. Betty brainstormed with the students as to what they could do besides taping paper on their back side, leading them to taking the actor’s arm and actually turning them. Again at 10:00 a.m. Betty is reiterating for the students to anticipate and be alert. “When you are given a direction, write it down” (O/B-8).

At 10:05 Betty had the students rehearse the scene with the baby from the top. After the scene at 10:08 Betty calls everyone to the center of the stage for feedback and to answer questions. The questions included clarification on stage positions, time of dress rehearsal and lots of questions about choices for their costumes. Betty praises them for the progress they have made.

**Context for Participating in Classroom Inquiry**

There were two major influences that led Betty to volunteer to participate in this research on student voice. The first involved her continuing education. She was near completion of her masters degree at a nearby university with her main area of focus being constructivism. She was drawn to constructivism “because that is the way I was taught to think. Teaching that way then,
is a fascination for me. Discerning a student’s cognition, then striving to engage that student in formulating his own learning is what constructivism is to me” (J/B-3).

The second major influence revolved around two outside agencies and the grant process. The Satellite Educational Resources Consortium, Inc. (SERC) initiated a pilot program called, “Arts & … History and Storytelling” for students in grades 5-8. This program was a cooperative effort of SERC, The John F. Kennedy Center of Performing Arts, Washington, D.C., and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). The goal of the program was to actively involve students in learning about American life from 1850-1870 through storytelling. Betty agreed to be considered as a teacher-evaluator for this pilot program, use their materials and participate in all evaluation components. She applied for the pilot program and was accepted as a participant.

Betty also applied for and received a $300.00 Teacher Incentive Grant Program from another agency, The Virginia Commission for the Arts. The goal of this grant was to teach students to use and exhibit voice through storytelling. The Virginia Commission for the Arts and the SERC (Satellite Educational Resources Consortium) projects were to mesh all the goals and objectives of each program along with Betty’s school objectives for her evaluation.

Betty’s interest in student voice was affirmed in a faculty meeting at Southside in which we discussed student voice and ascertained faculty interest in working on a project related to it. Betty was already interested in storytelling and that project was aligned with promoting student voice. Betty felt that children loved listening to stories; however, when they learned to tell stories, they reaped the rewards of confidence, pose, improved verbal skills and learned how to think creatively (Hamilton & Weiss, 1993). The storyteller’s voice is students’ most important tool in expressing themselves (Hamilton & Weiss, 1993). Rather than my asking her assistance
in this inquiry, my inquiry became a validation for her desire to promote student voice through storytelling thus prompting her to volunteer.

**Developing the Action Research Plan**

The grants formed Betty’s framework for her inquiry and the school board evaluation process became the tool to develop the inquiry. All goals and objectives were synthesized into one objective—Fourth and fifth grade theatre arts/drama students will study the art of storytelling to focus their talents in expressing themselves publicly.

The SERC pilot program had specific guidelines and timelines for implementation. A series of six videotapes were to be sent to Betty. Use of the materials would occur between February 15 and May 1st. The teacher would provide feedback on each video to the consortium. The goals were based on the assumption that students are curious to learn about storytelling. The thrust of the storytelling would include the historical content of the Civil War with perspectives on math, science, history, social science and language. The teacher was also expected to develop this project into an encompassing study which related to current trends in curricula for reading, writing and public speaking. This project would engage students in developing an appreciation for their own voice for social as well as cultural histories. Critical appreciation of the art of storytelling would be developed throughout the project. Of fundamental importance to this grant was the use of primary and secondary sources in the art of storytelling.

Thirty-six fourth and fifth grade students elected theatre arts/drama class as their choice of magnet. These students would be targeted for participation in this pilot program. In addition to all goals and objectives, Betty planned on students designing bulletin boards to keep the whole school community involved in the progress of their storytelling objective. Students would also write their own stories and present them in a storytelling festival at school.
Betty developed a budget to implement her Teacher Incentive Grant. Allocations were set aside for professional storytellers from Mill Mountain Theatre and other locally renowned storytellers. These speakers were invited to teach students about language, timing, intonation, and pacing of a story. One retired drama teacher came as a storyteller while the director of a local theatre declined due to his schedule. Betty also attended the National Storytelling Festival in Jonesboro, Tennessee, for ideas and motivation.

Betty furthered the framework for the project by correlating all standards to be used as guidelines. The Virginia Standards of Learning for fourth and fifth grade English in oral language, reading/literature, writing and research would be met along with Theatre Arts standards in growth and development and interdisciplinary relationships and Technology standards.

Use of computers, recording devices and videotaping were integrated into this project. Funds were used to purchase computer discs, games, and writing supplies for hands-on activities. Computer discs were bought to facilitate the students going from written stories to oral presentations. Students were to write, illustrate and record (audio and video) original stories.

Implementation Process

Betty targeted her thirty-six fourth and fifth grade students to implement her project on promoting student voice through storytelling. The tapes had arrived through the mail. SERC was to send six videotapes via satellites from Washington, D.C. This became the first obstacle. Due to a lack of technology at Southside, SERC had to send Betty copies of the tapes for her classroom versus having them downloaded at site. The videotapes contained instruction on how to look at and distinguish between primary and secondary sources of information.
It quickly became evident that the content of these tapes might have been engaging for an older child but were too difficult for elementary students. According to Betty, the whole unit was standards based, standards unachievable in existing time frames and the content was too difficult (J/B-20). While that was a huge constraint, an even bigger one existed in time management. “Having these students for forty minutes did not give enough time for delivery of material, discussion and homework” (J/B-20).

Using the dialogue journal as a springboard for change, Betty decided to switch the SERC given topics to Aesop’s Fables for several reasons; the stories were more manageable, students were able to identify with morals and the fables contained sentences that were short, clear and concise with good sentence structure (J/B-22). As important, the content of the fables were more manageable for the forty minute time frame Betty had with the students.

Betty’s students worked on learning Aesop’s Fables and presented them in two festival type settings to kindergarten, first, second and third graders. They then expanded the project to Rudyard Kiplings’ “Just So” stories. The “Just So” stories were more myth. It gave the storytellers more range to develop characterizations in voice and tone. Students could put themselves in character in greater depths (J/B-22).

This switch in stories also tied into Betty’s research on constructivism. The fables and the students’ choices about their stories supported constructivism. The long range goal of autonomy is supported by the fact that the students were in control of their story and teaching others.

Betty felt that the “majority of students that I teach this year have not been taught about their own thought processes. What I mean is that they have not had opportunities to decide how they feel about what they know, have not been asked introspective questions by the adults who play major roles in their lives, and have not decided that learning is a goal for themselves” (J/B-
8). Betty regularly tells every class that they have a right to know why what they are learning is important to them. She encourages students to take responsibility for the content of their curriculum.

As part of her portfolio on student voice, Betty submitted months of lesson plans. These lesson plans provided a clear picture of how implementation of an inquiry played out on a daily basis. Betty’s plans are so detailed that they read like a narrative. The following timeline reflects Betty’s implementation of her objectives or how one teacher planned to promote student voice in the curriculum.

January

On January 9, Betty began teaching by having her fourth and fifth grade students review a video provided from her grant from SERC. The students discussed sources for stories and the differences and similarities between primary and secondary sources. These fourth and fifth grade classes were split into two sections. The fourth grade ran from 8:35-9:20 a.m. and 9:25-10:10 a.m. The premise was that while the magnet teachers have half of the fourth graders, the other half of the students are receiving small group instruction with their homeroom teacher. They then switch groups. The fifth graders were on the same schedule but different times: 12:45-1:25 p.m. and 1:30-2:10 p.m. This translated into Betty teaching each lesson from this grant four times.

By Friday of that week, Betty’s fourth and fifth grade students were analyzing historical photographs as a springboard for storytelling. This activity promoted recognizing point of view or the reasons why people see different things from the same picture. Discussions in class helped the students learn what a storyteller wants from an audience.

Preparation for her inquiry into student voice, with the focus on storytelling, began with the fourth and fifth grade magnet classes having a kickoff lesson on January 12, from 8:35-10:10
a.m. and 12:45-2:10 p.m., called Watching Pros Tell Stories. This video featured Jackie Torrence and Mary Carter, nationally renowned storytellers telling stories. The students identified the strengths of these two storytellers. Students cognition of the steps involved in storytelling evolved as they evaluated the steps each of these storytellers took. Betty then facilitated an introspective look at the kind of stories these fourth and fifth graders liked and why.

On January 14, from 8:35-10:10 a.m. and 12:45-2:10 p.m., the fourth and fifth grade magnet students focused on starting to tell stories by inventing a story from cards with ideas written on them. The cards were materials provided by the SERC pilot project. The students selected a card, worked with the idea on it and then presented it to the group (L/B-13). For example, you are reading a secret diary and the entry talks about helping to birth a calf. Students are supposed to create a story and place themselves in a scene to tell a story. Betty concluded the lesson by having the students express where they thought the stories originated. Their homework assignment that Wednesday, January 14, was to notice an unusual person and write down a description of that person.

Betty continued their instruction on January 16 by having students create a story about the person mentioned in the cards they selected, carefully weaving the historical background into the story. A discussion followed as to the criteria of a captivating story and the origins of stories. Students’ homework assignment that Friday included writing down the sequence of a television program or scene from a movie that you will watch this weekend (L/B-14) to reinforce the idea that a story has a sequence or flow to it.

On January 20, Betty planned for her fourth and fifth grade students to become storytellers by breaking down the sequences a storyteller follows. Subsequently, the focus activity began with memorizing the order of things. Taking the hands on approach, the students
played a concentration card game to focus student activities on gaining confidence and skill in remembering sequences (L/B-10). They then transferred that skill to working with sequences of storylines using radio shows. Again the summary had the students thinking about their thinking. 

*What must someone do in order to remember something?*, a critical skill in storytelling.

On Friday, January 30, Betty introduced the unit, *Arts & History*. The students watched a video on America in the Era of the Civil War and took notes. Betty had a discussion with students about their ideas and had students list their events under the headings of the geographical locations of the United States; “North,” “Midwest,” and “South.” The teacher then explained the criteria for essay evaluation: (1) inclusion of at least three events, and (2) explanation of how each event affected you (or your family’s) daily life. Students assignment was to write an essay using the criteria stated above.

**February**

At this time Betty realized that forty minute classes three times a week were not enough time to fulfill the stringent requirements of this SERC project. “Not only was there a time constraint in presenting the material but also the content of the material was difficult” (J/B-22). After discussion in her dialogue journal, Betty decided to continue the storytelling theme with the students telling Aesop’s Fables and/or Kipling’s stories.

On February 2, 4 and 6, the fourth and fifth graders wrote essays, read them to each other and critiqued them. February 16, 18 and 20, the students watched videos on storytelling and described the traits of a good opening sequence of events and closing. Students discussed why all of the elements must be in a story. Their homework was to figure out from which point of view the stories were written.
February 23, 25 and 27, Betty had students tell a first person fairy tale before the camera and students critiqued each other. The numerous critiques in Betty’s defined set of lesson plans demonstrates the value the teacher places on self-assessment. Students then began to write their basic outline for their fairy tale.

March

Betty went back to her roots in constructivism March 4, and had the students tell a personal story by describing an event that happened in his/her life. This is followed by a critique, March 6, and introspective questions such as “Why must a storyteller reflect on improvements?” (L/B-31).

On March, Monday the 16\(^{\text{th}}\) and Wednesday the 18\(^{\text{th}}\), students told Aesop Fables to their peers. Afterwards, the class divided into groups for discussion of delivery techniques. After much discussion and critiquing, the students were ready to tell their fable to an audience. Now, students were ready to have a Storytelling Festival. On March 20 selected classes came to Betty’s classroom to watch Aesop’s Extravaganza presented by these fourth and fifth grade drama students. The room was crowded as these students took center stage and told their stories in their voices.

Reflections

Betty utilized many instructional strategies that promoted student voice in the curriculum. Choice of plays and costumes, discussions and critiques all set the stage to promote student voice. Providing opportunities for students to verbally express themselves helped this teacher understand the power of language and fostered that power in her lessons. Realizing that a child’s imagination is part of their individualism, Betty planned to tap into the student voice on a daily basis.
Betty also allowed students’ voices to change instructional plans. When students’ feedback told her that the content was too difficult, Betty listened. When negative actions resulted from the older students expressing their voice, Betty didn’t hesitate to insert her values and her boundaries and refocus their time on a different project or no project.

Betty was the most articulate in her journal on introspective development for students. She stressed good citizenship, fore thinking, reflection, questioning strategies, thinking skills, dialogue and expectations. She actively engaged students in formulating and articulating one’s own learning.

Time was an important factor for Betty. Think time for students along with the appropriate pacing of instruction was critical for good teaching. She emphasized the time needed to teach in a way that fostered student voice. This was the one case that organizational structure negatively affected promoting student voice. Her forty minute sessions, although three times a week, were insufficient to cover the content of the grant that she had received. She found her targeted fifth graders weren’t ready to identify primary and secondary sources of the Civil War and tell stories based on those sources when taught intermittently. With her strong belief in constructivism, the scaffolding for the content was not there to bridge the gap for the students.

Betty quit the Civil War project fairly soon which either meant the criteria from the grant were too difficult, the content was too difficult or the restraints of time proved too limiting. However, Betty also wanted to relinquish the inquiry into storytelling completely and through my “gentle prodding,” decided to go into the direction of “Aesop’s Fables.” These fables were shorter and far more manageable for the students and did culminate in a storytelling festival.

Betty’s inquiry raised the most dichotomous questions. Betty was adamant at times about students creating their own plays and making their own choices in scripts, costumes and props.
This certainly could be demonstrative of promoting student voice; however, the reality consisted of Betty’s students performing plays that sometimes were not being understood by the audience. She would fluctuate between content too difficult for the students and/or totally letting the students take responsibility for the play and its contents. She tried and is still trying to get a balance between the two.

It was clear that student voice had stepped over Betty’s boundaries. There is a premise of democracy and positive values that student voice must stand upon to flourish, and Betty did let the students know when they had crossed it.

Betty made detailed lesson plans that utilized Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences. She also planned for questioning strategies and was observed utilizing them and trying to have students think about their learning. By allowing students’ powerful voices to change your instructional plans, students will take more ownership in their choices and the product will be more authentic because of their voice. In Betty’s case authentic sometimes meant a ten year old’s voice. While sometimes powerful in the classroom, it wasn’t necessarily so on the stage, so back and forth, Betty struggled.

Organizational structure played a major part in Betty’s inquiry. The schedule dictated short classes. The magnet performance schedule didn’t leave enough time for Betty to work out all of the details on her grant, but did allow for monitoring and adjusting. Recitals and major performances keep the magnet teachers on a treadmill.

Betty led rich discussion about the traits and motivations of the characters the students were reading about. She engaged students in conversations and promoted their verbal and nonverbal expressive skills. She also strongly felt that a character development program was
needed to teach Southside students how to use their voice and the boundaries that exist in a democracy. (Appendix-C)

**Negotiating Student Voice Through State Standards: Rosa’s Journey**

Rosa is an experienced art teacher in our public school system of fourteen years. The year she volunteered to participate in this inquiry was her first year teaching at Southside Elementary. Rosa interviewed for this position with a team from the school. The interview team was comprised of the magnet fine arts teachers and administrators of Southside Elementary. There were several strong candidates for the job, but Rosa’s outstanding work with the system as an events coordinator compelled the interview team to offer her the job. The opening at Southside had actually drawn Rosa to the opening as insiders of our system knew first of the vacancy. She had spoken to the resigning art teacher and was cognizant and supportive of her schedule. I had also worked with Rosa at another school for several years and was familiar with her demeanor, and expertise. Rosa was also known as a teacher that demonstrated good classroom management. The position was offered and accepted.

Rosa’s arrival at Southside coincided with the school’s implementation of block scheduling. The entire schedule was changed. Rosa was not satisfied with her schedule and shared her concern repeatedly with me. She did not have the same amount of planning time her magnet peers did. However, she did have the same amount of planning time as classroom teachers. The scheduling issue seemed to pervade her thoughts that first year during our conversations. Rosa questioned her decision to come to Southside. Thus, it was a great surprise when she volunteered to participate in an action research project on student voice following an introductory faculty meeting.
Rosa originally volunteered for participation in this project in the fall before she realized the full impact of her schedule at Southside. As she became familiar with her schedule, her focus narrowed on the implementation of the Standards of Learning as many teachers’did. It is in that direction her inquiry proceeded.

Classroom Scenario

On the last day of classes for the art magnet students for the year 2000, nine students came to the art room with its paint, clay, crayons, markers and paper all shelved in an organized method for next years’ class. These nine fifth graders were experiencing what might possibly be their last art class in school. They were sitting around a table at 11:20 a.m. watching a video on M. C. Escher, a Dutch artist.

Rosa guided the dialogue by sitting right beside the video and pointing out nuances and points of interest to her students. “All of Escher’s work messes with perspective. If you look at his drawings, birds and fish are upside down from each other” (O/R-2). Escher’s art is drawn so that it is hard to tell where the fish ends and the birds begin. Another piece of work from Escher has two figures, a man going down the stairs, while another man is walking up the same set of stirs. All of his works are in shades of black and white. “Escher knows geometry and perspective so well he can mess with it” (O/R-2). This surreal artist has roly polys climbing stairs while they roll down the sidewalks. Red fish and black fish swim out of a hold in a spiral going the opposite ways. The students’ remarks were continuous, “Cool, Wow, and Unbelievable” over and over (O/R-3). The students could not wait to point out the geometric impossibilities or to distinguish the animals in that particular setting. Cubes turned into a honeycomb for bees, which turned into
fish turning into birds turning into a chess board. The metamorphosis of Escher’s art was spellbinding as the students viewed his work.

Rosa pointed to two SOL’s posted on the board. “Remember part of the standards require you to comprehend work and develop an opinion about someone’s art work” (O/R-3). “You are also sharing your opinions in a group discussion” (O/R-3).

Rosa connected the students’ fascination with the video to the work they had already done by asking one student about her kaleidoscope project. “I made mine out of different colored triangles. I picked our school colors and then added more of my favorite colors” (O/R-1). The teacher responded, “Our toothpick sculptures were also based on triangle and pyramids” (O/R-2). “Remember (students), artists continually revisit themes, get good at it and come back to it. Modern art breaks the rules and one day you will be the ones breaking the rules” (O/R-4).

Context for Participating in Classroom Inquiry

Rosa’s inquiry was formed around the Virginia Standards of Learning. Rosa targeted all of her art students, kindergarten through fifth, for this inquiry. Her plan was to coordinate both the Arts Standards of Learning and the Virginia Standards of Learning in the four content areas: math, reading, science and history, where appropriate. It is through these standards and this process that she looked for and fostered student voice in the curriculum.

Rosa’s only purpose, articulated or written, in exploring student voice “will be to help magnet students take more responsibility and to think more independently and have faith in their own ideas to follow through to the end product” (J/R-3).

Initially, Rosa was very concerned with the impact of student voice and its’ limitations and “felt at the elementary level there should be guidelines and boundaries as well as a
background of information, skills and practice before allowing a high percentage of student voice in the curriculum” (J/R-3).

For Rosa, student voice was linked to student performance. If the goal was to implement certain standards, then student voice came within that instructional framework. This philosophy guided Rosa as she proceeded with her inquiry.

**Developing the Action Research Plan**

The voice of politics and legislature play an enormous role in public education. The legislature mandated the Standards of Learning as state assessments. Issues surrounding the standards include the process for schools passing/failing and the appropriateness of each standards’ content area. These issues surface frequently in editorials of the local newspaper where the community’s voices are heard. Schools implemented and will continue to implement the standards although voices are continuing to be heard. Rosa utilized these standards to implement the curriculum and to follow the line of inquiry of student voice.

Rosa cross-analyzed the Arts Standards of Learning and state Standards of Learning in the four content areas of history, science, math and reading. The results were art lessons that met both criteria. Rosa’s students met the state standards with goals that provided opportunities that promoted student voice.

**Implementation Process**

Rosa utilized the state Art Standards of Learning as a framework for her instruction. Choice was a mainstay in Rosa’s instructional delivery. “I preselect projects which meet SOL’s in a variety of mediums, techniques and subjects. Most projects included some freedom of choice. New materials and how they are used help me to evaluate artistic abilities. I have an art rule that encourages creativity in projects to the extent that students with original ideas about
materials or subject matter different from the class theme are encouraged to follow through and are praised in class. Yes, this is an integral part of art education, but I still believe it is student voice” (J/R-3).

Rosa continued her thoughts about choice in a meeting. “I give them freedom in their projects. In the impressionism, I had a calendar of photographs of all outdoor landscapes and then gave them a choice of eleven pictures and told them to think about your skills and what appeals to you and how you think you’re going to interpret it” (MT/R-5). “I have allowed freedom to decide projects in the Egyptian Art Show and the American Indian projects by group or individuals” (J-R/4).

Discussions were fostered in Rosa’s class to promote students’ verbal participation. Rosa built a schema for the magnet art students of impressionism by building the background of concepts that were unfamiliar to the students with the intent that understanding pursued when students are engaged in dialogue. “We talked about the development of photography. Artists were losing money because it was cheaper and faster to have a photograph made and with the concept of the molecule, artists became overwhelmed with the idea that you aren’t looking at the building, you are looking at a light reflection through all of these bounding molecules in the atmosphere” (MT/R-3). Again, Rosa’s instructional strategies fell within the framework of the state assessments. Students expressing their thoughts are part of the Standards of Learning along with creating stories to share (SOL-2.1/English) effective communication in group skills (SOL-3.1/English) and developing an opinion (SOL-5.6/English).

Another instructional strategy utilized to promote student voice was evaluation. Rosa sought feedback from the students. “On every test I ask what was your favorite art project and why and what was your least favorite and why? And in the middle of the year, what would
improve the art magnet class?” (MT/R-1). Rosa does question some of these evaluations. “But it is hard for them (the students) to be honest. And to give good answers. I think the problem with that is the kids never get a chance to talk enough, they don’t express themselves so they don’t get good at it” (MT/R-1).

Grouping was another strategy utilized by Rosa to promote student voice. “I have tried to give them a voice in what they are doing because their end product is their voice” (MT/R-5). During the period that the students studied Egypt and Indians, Rosa let the students work in groups or individually. “Some groups were strong, some groups weren’t. When students finished early they were allowed the choice of selecting something from their portfolio to work on for the remainder of the class” (MT/R-5).

“I am so exhausted by trying to keep people on task” (MT/R-6). This summarized one of the difficulties teachers have in allowing groups to function instructionally. Discipline and order are always a concern for educators and has always been a top priority for Rosa. “Inappropriate student disruptions are down in number. I function better in a quiet orderly environment, so class structure has as much to do with me as it does with student behavior” (J/R-3).

Choice, evaluation, discussions, grouping and discipline were all instructional strategies Rosa utilized while meeting state standards. Embedded in those standards were goals that also fostered student voice along with Rosa’s specific instructional strategies of promoting student voice.

Rosa’s Reflections

Rosa’s inquiry is to promote student voice in the curriculum; however, Rosa defers to my views as her collaborator in this project. “I get the feeling that my ideas on the subject are narrower than yours. I may not be as comfortable having as much student voice this year as a
Rosa has concerns with the limitations of student voice. Her reasons for questioning student voice are all valid ones. Her “fear of letting go” may have a lot to do with this being her first year at Southside. Even though she is an experienced teacher, her first year at a site was a challenging one. Being a veteran teacher, she knows the importance of good classroom management. Rosa felt there should be limitations to student voice. “I have a fear of letting go, and concern that these students haven’t developed enough responsible skills to have control in the curriculum. I feel they need to understand what is important in the subject area and what the end result should be so they can evaluate their progress and keep on task” (J/R-4).

Facilitation of lessons and group work must allow some discussion and interaction and each teacher has a different tolerance level for both students working in groups and students’ talk. “Students are not responsible enough for control and do not understand what is important and what the end result should be, they can not keep on task” (J/R-4). Rosa felt that only when the students are acting appropriately will there be an initiative to promote their voice.

“I am still overwhelmed, but working hard” (J/R-3) – a snapshot of Rosa’s year.

(Appendix-D)
CHAPTER V
AN EMERGING UNDERSTANDING

The teachers’ understanding of student voice emerged over time. Their initial concept of student voice grew and expanded. Wyann initially felt student voice consisted of “students expressing themselves creatively through art and written and verbal expression. Student voice showed student individuality” (MT/W-7). Wyann, like many new teachers, experienced some difficulty adjusting to the demands of classroom management when she came to teach at Southside. However, unlike many new teachers, she wanted to investigate and explore the concept of student voice to help her adjust to teaching. Empathy and frustration were the two emotions constantly battling for her attention. She knew what it felt like not having a voice, but those student voices were creating problems for Wyann in the classroom.

Wyann’s overriding concern was classroom management. In looking at the problems in her classroom, she began to focus on ADHD students and, in particular, boys who disrupt. Wyann wondered “where the girls’ voices were and what they had to say” (J/W-15). Her inquiry centered on voices that were not being heard, and in her particular classes, those voices belonged to girls. Thus it was interesting that although she was struggling with management, Wyann wanted to delve deeper into the topic of student voice and volunteered to participate in this inquiry. It is a testimony to Wyann’s professionalism that even though struggling with discipline, she embraced an inquiry into student voice. Moreover, she had the perseverance to develop an action plan to study it. The frank discussions of student voice and gender equity opened up her students’ minds in new ways.

Stressing inclusiveness in her inquiry, Wyann would gather the students around to discuss gender equity and to bring them on board with this topic and her inquiry. It was very
much like Wyann to include the students in this inquiry. Wyann’s initial concept of student voice evolved to include two factors very important to her, ownership and inclusiveness. “Students are more eager for input when they understand what they are studying” (J/W-10).

Wyann utilized discussions and journal writing frequently in her classrooms to promote inclusiveness and give the students opportunities to express themselves. Wyann’s continued emphasis on journal writing promoted student thinking privately. Students expressed their thoughts on a variety of topics. All this while Wyann wove choice and creativity throughout her instruction. She also promoted ownership by having the students create their own choreography in dance class. This was evident in all dances created and performed by Wyann’s students, especially the ones created by students’ choreographing their first body movements. Paulo Freire (1988) has called upon educators to redefine the purpose and practices of education. Freire and others demand that educators help reshape our world into a more just one. This notion is joined to feminist pedagogy that insists education must start from the lived experiences of our students’ lives (Middleton, 1994). The instructional strategies of discussions, journal writing, choice and validation of ones’ life experiences were the cornerstones of Wyann’s day to day promotion of student voice. She strongly felt that dance movement should start from the lived experiences of her students.

The organizational structure of the building, in particular the master schedule, played a role in Wyann’s action plan. Having the luxury of six to ten children in a class is rare in public education. This certainly created the time for students to share and discuss. Wyann realized the benefits of her small classes and reworked her schedule to include two all female dance classes. These organizational aspects of time and size also helped promote the instructional strategies
Wyann utilized to promote student voice. These factors played an important role; however, Wyann’s values and beliefs in voice sustained this inquiry.

Wyann’s values, beliefs and commitment to helping students “develop their own voice, express their own ideas, and have the confidence to take part in their education rather than be a passive presence in the classroom” (J-R/W-1) sustained her inquiry into student voice. “How can one find one’s own voice and create a self in the midst of other selves? Greene(1988) questioned, “How in educating for freedom can we create and maintain a common world?” (p.116). Shapiro ( ) believes that dance, “can be a place where students make connections between the personal and the social; find their own voices, validate their feelings and capacity for compassion and become empowered through affirmation of their ability to be co-creators of their world” (p. 18). Wyann made that connection come true in her dance class.

There was also a human factor. Wyann was highly motivated and enthusiastic throughout the inquiry. She possessed a curiosity that transferred to her students. It was of great importance to her to establish a nurturing and productive environment. She had the desire to learn about student voice. Her work has influenced the students’ work and taken the entire dance program to new heights. Wyann took a hard, deep look at student voice at a time when she was struggling with it and decided to approach improvement through thoughtful planned instructional strategies, authenticating the students’ lives and taking advantage of small class sizes. This would give the students an opportunity for voice and begin them on their journey of controlling their learning and their destiny. How ironic that those student voices became the foundation for Wyann’s instruction.

Sara was another enthusiastic volunteer during that initial faculty meeting. She initially defined student voice as “students expressing their feelings” (MT/S-2). While this is a very broad
definition, Sara was able to narrow her exploration of student voice to the instructional strategy of technology for several reasons: She had just finished taking a technology course and was excited to try some new software, and she had asked for and received a new PowerMac computer. Strong evidence suggested that students become empowered and invested in the activities they carry out while using computers, especially if there is student input into shaping the learner task (Tapscott, 1999).

With her new software and computer, Sara could let students create and choose their own music and background. Different abilities of students could be addressed by having them play scripted music or create their own composition. Students could pick a background that suited them, whether it be an urban sound, oriental, country or hip-hop. The choice belonged to the students. Whatever their cultural background or day to day interests, the technology and teacher were there to facilitate the students’ musical compositions. Technology facilitated the students voices to be one that is truly reflective of them. Sara had students keep journals which served as critiques of their performances and/or classroom sessions.

Sara’s definition of student voice evolved from a general, “students expressing themselves” to a highly specific one. First and foremost, she felt, “that technology, especially music technology, is a great strategy for promoting student voice. Students can be successful using this vehicle for self-expression and voicing their feelings” (R/S-1). Sara also felt differentiated instruction allowed students to progress at their own pace and gave them developmentally appropriate choices. This emphasized the developmental nature of children and reminded her that “not all children develop, learn, or achieve at the same pace” (R/S-1).

Sara was also emphatic, “that there are certain parameters that the teacher needs to give to the students—some guidelines, not exactly a model to follow, but some clear direction with
boundaries clearly staked out at the beginning” (R/S-1). Sara felt these boundaries were necessary because “otherwise, some students tend to run in the wrong direction whatsoever. And some students have so much voice at home, that they are used to doing whatever they want without a clear focus or clear direction” (R/S-1).

Although Sara spent a year promoting student voice, she felt, “the teacher still needs to have control over the situation and the activities at hand. These students are still developing children who are still learning, and I feel that they do not need to be given too much freedom or too many choices” (R/S-1). Along with the instructional strategies utilized, Sara felt size played a key role in her inquiry. “Due to the small class size, I was able to give ample one-on-one instruction when needed” (R/S-1).

Sara strongly felt that she wanted to continue her inquiry with music and technology. The more she learned about technology and software, the more she was able to address students’ “personalities, abilities, needs and musical interests” (R/S-1). This enabled her to give the students “more choices to create, record and orchestrate their interests and ultimately their learning” (R/S-1).

The third volunteer to participate in this action research was Betty. She initially felt student voice was “the opportunity for students to state how he feels in a public way”(MT/B-10). Betty chose storytelling as a way to promote student voice in her classroom. Betty believed that, “Storytelling will develop an appreciation for their (the students) own voice for social as well as cultural histories”(AP/B-3). She also had planned a unit on storytelling, which would culminate in a storytelling festival and bulletin boards which would constantly keep the school community abreast of the happenings.
At first glance this seemed feasible; however, the stories were to be based on a grant and according to Betty, the criteria were not developmentally appropriate for this age student. There were also time constraints with the grant curriculum and the schedule of her magnet drama classes. What began as a school-wide project with bulletin boards and a storytelling festival, soon was asked to be dropped by Betty. It was only through the dialogue journal and coaching that she redirected the students into telling the stories of “Aesop’s Fables.”

Student voice became more difficult to manage for Betty with the upper grades. In the play *The Elephant’s Child*, the fifth grade drama students wanted to participate by creating a dance which would mark the point in the baby elephant’s life which precipitated his “satiable curiosity” (Kipling, ____). “However, the group of students became infected with a social disease called emerging adolescence. They would not cooperate with each other, they were cruel to each other and when ideas were being developed, they became critical, then defensive, then apathetic toward their goal” (PS/B-2). With their animosity toward each other becoming less than educational, Betty decided to cut their scene from *The Elephant’s Child*, and opted for them to perform a small play for a small audience.

Throughout all of this hard work, however, some of the fourth and fifth graders were accepting no responsibility for their commitment to perform the play for an audience. “I kept the constructivist theory alive and while I continued to encourage them to do their homework and worked hard with them during classes, I also allowed them to fail” (PS/B-1).

Betty’s definition of student voice evolved into disappointment for her. It was surprising with Betty’s belief in constructivism and student voice that the word failure was used by her. There was some redirecting and canceling of performances. This was one of the two times I really felt my role as the “boss” came into play. Betty was ready to quit the grant and the inquiry
into student voice. The support offered Betty may have been ineffective if I was her peer. I felt uneasy at this time with my dual role. This “gentle urging” (J/B-17) mentioned in Betty’s dialogue journal revealed that Betty took the hint and continued with her storytelling festival, although the majority of students recited established fables versus their own stories. I felt my voice became the motivator in this inquiry.

The last volunteer participant was Rosa. From the beginning Rosa had reservations about student voice. Initially, she was concerned with the impact of student voice and its’ limitations and “felt at the elementary level there should be guidelines and boundaries as well as a background of information, skills and practice before allowing a high percentage of student voice in the curriculum” (J/R-3). Rosa was very succinct in her purpose for studying student voice, to promote, ‘independence, faith and responsibility’” (J/R-3). Fostering of student voice must be done hand in hand with teaching students the responsibility of their voice.

Rosa was a curious but reluctant participant in this inquiry. She had a structured framework in the state SOL’s, which she utilized to promote student voice. Student work was important to Rosa. The students’ art work was evident throughout the year; in the halls at Southside, at the art exhibit, at the state capitol and downtown in the central office. All of these were tangible proofs of student voice in the classroom. With art each stroke of the brush and choice of mediums and colors affirms that child’s voice and how they put their voice into their work. The painting, sculpture or end product of each lesson is what is unique about that student. Student voices came through the framework with Rosa’s implementation of specific instructional strategies such as grouping, choice, discussions and evaluative feedback from the students. Teaching students background and knowledge of a subject matter also set the stage for their participation and allowed them to make choices that reflected their voice.
The organizational culture of the building, the students and the teacher were critical in this inquiry. Rosa felt boundaries were necessary when dealing with student voice. Rosa’s concerns about boundaries and classroom management and most important her fear of “letting go” made the choice of following local pacing charts and adhering to state standards a logical one. These goals provided a lens for Rosa to view student voice in her classroom. Her cross-analysis of state standards was detailed and demonstrated many areas where student voice could be fostered.

Time was an issue for Rosa. Time in her schedule for collaborative planning, time to implement the Virginia State Standards of Learning, time for the students to interact and complete projects were all daily reminders of a critical issue—time. The organizational structure of the building became a factor in promoting student voice in the curriculum. Forty minute sessions weren’t long enough at times for discussion, although seeing the fourth and fifth grade art magnet students three times a week helped facilitate goals.

For Rosa, student voice, was to become more engaged in the curricula and increase learning while teaching responsibility and discussing issues. Utilizing the SOL’s, Rosa promoted student voice. from SOL 5.1, producing works of art which express personal emotions and ideas to SOL 4.1, generating creative ideas through experimentation. From this perspective it became clearer that the Virginia SOL’s had the possibility of promoting student voice in the curriculum depending on the organizational structure and culture of the building and teacher.

Student voice could only be linked to student performance for Rosa. The framework for student performance were the Virginia Standards of Learning. Rosa never wavered from her initial concepts of student voice. Student voice would and could be promoted; however, only as far as the standards promoted voice. What was surprising is that there was room in the SOL’s for
student voice to be promoted and Rosa found those niches. Rosa’s exploration and definition of student voice expanded, “to help magnet students take more responsibility and to think more independently and have faith in their own ideas to follow through to the end product” (J/R-3).

Student voice was explored to some degree by Rosa; however, it was with tight control of management and instruction. “Perhaps it reflects the general feeling that students are too inexperienced to know what’s best for them” (R/J-3).

Rosa seemed to have more difficulty than the other fine arts teachers. Part of that difficulty was due to scheduling conflicts and part was due to Rosa. She came to Southside to take advantage of our art room and schedule. Meanwhile the schedule had changed. Although trying to keep her focused on the inquiry, I certainly couldn’t and wouldn’t ignore the fact that Rosa was in emotional distress. As a supportive peer (Kram, 1985), I listened to her concerns and with her made some changes for the following year. However, as her principal, I found the depth of her unhappiness and the lack of bonding with the other fine arts teachers unsettling. In retrospect, she was always focused on promoting student voice through the Standards of Learning and I think the students’ art work reflected she was successful in that endeavor.

Rosa’s class contained twice as many students as the other participants. This had a huge impact on Rosa’s participation. No other participants had targeted more than ten to twelve students with some having six to eight in their classrooms for this inquiry. It is understandable that the climate in her room manifested a tension between teacher and the sharing of power with students. The beliefs that shaped Rosa’s culture was more of establishing her authority rather than giving it away. This is a critical point for teachers interested in this work on student voice. Rosa was very succinct in her purpose for studying student voice, to promote, “independence,
faith and responsibility” (J/R-3). Fostering of student voice must be done hand in hand with teaching students the responsibility of their voice and Rosa stuck to the SOL plan.

**Exploring the Guiding Questions Across the Cases**

In cross analyzing all four of the case studies in this inquiry, three empirical bins existed in all four: *instructional strategies, organizational structure, and organizational culture*. All three are necessary in varying degrees with a variety of combinations to promote student voice in the curriculum. The following is an explanation of each concept and the conditions that surround it in the inquiry.

**Instructional Strategies**

*What instructional strategies implemented in the classroom by the four participants promoted student voice?*

Creativity and choice were stressed by all four participants during their study. Creativity in some cases meant giving the students a choice in the curriculum. In other cases, it meant the student creating the final product. For Sara that meant students creating their own compositions in music and selecting the background that the student wanted. For Wyann’s students’ creativity meant recalling one of their first body movements and setting it to choreographed steps. Betty found that her students did not have enough time or background knowledge to create the stories necessary for the grant. She found creativity and knowledge were linked. When her students were given a choice of “Aesop’s Fables” to review, they didn’t have any difficulty with that. So choice can be different from creativity, although in Rosa’s case choice was a stepping stone for creativity. Once Rosa’s students chose what medium or subject they wanted to draw or paint, then creativity ensued with every stroke of the brush or pen.
The differences in creativity and choice among the students reflected the different levels of promotion of student voice among the participants. Sara and Wyann were more willing to let the student create the entire project with guidance and facilitation, while Betty and Rosa set the choices within a constructed set of criteria. All students had choice; however, Wyann and Sara’s choices allowed a greater degree of creativity. For educators who wish to promote student voice, both strategies, choice and creativity, can do that. In “Father Knows Best” Rode(1995) would say that we are still controlling the students by having a set curriculum and allowing them to make choices within that curricula. He purports that the students should be setting the curriculum itself and having choices within that curriculum.

Two other instructional strategies used by half of the participants were journal writing and questioning strategies. Two participants, Sara and Wyann, were considered the highest promoters of student voice because of their use of student journals in their inquiry. Their case studies were the most interesting and the best validation that student’s voice were being listened to by teachers. When Wyann’s students wrote of their early childhood memories, this was integrated into the curricula. When they told what dance meant to them and how it helped them through school, it affirmed what Wyann has known all her life as a dancer. When Sara’s students wrote of the changes they would like in their performances and recitals, Sara found it not only enlightening but it improved the quality of future performances. These student voices had an impact. The student journals raised the quality of Sara and Wyann’s inquiry. The other two studies just didn’t come up to the authenticity of these two and it was partly due to the students’ writing.

The three next most frequently utilized strategies that promoted student voice were learning styles, summarization and discussions. Even though Rosa did not emphasize
discussions, it was part of the mandated SOL’s and it was done on a continuous basis in her classroom. Therefore, discussions were present in all of the participants’ inquiries. Most of what was written about or observed were discussions about the subject matter. For example, Sara’s class may discuss why they picked the background they did for their music, Betty’s class discussed what it felt like to be a slave during the Civil War, Rosa’s art students discussed Eisner and his perspective on art, while Wyann’s class discussed their first movements. These were discussions based on the lessons.

However, there were other kinds of discussion. Wyann’s class discussed a topic not in the lesson plan for the day, gender equity, because it was important to the teacher and to the students. There were also other times that discussion and dialogue promoted student voice outside of the lesson. When topics are important to students, it is important to recognize that and let the students talk. A death of a classmate or teacher, a school or neighborhood shooting or an illness that is affecting the class are all examples of discussions that aren’t instructionally oriented but human oriented and necessary.

Wyann felt that sharing her concerns about gender equity in the class would bring the students’ awareness level up and help her address the classroom management issues. At this point, she was sharing power with students. Some girls, now that they knew about equity, refused to let the boys dominate the class by calling them down.

Research was an instructional strategy utilized by three of the participants. Having research knowledge of learning styles, multiple intelligences and gender equity, were considered necessary by three in promoting student voices in their inquiries. Sara, Wyann and Betty felt it was necessary to have a working knowledge of all learning styles, while Betty was meticulous about Gardner’s (1993) multiple intelligences in every lesson. A child’s voice is more likely to
be fostered if we are addressing that child’s educational needs in the correct learning style or intelligence. “ How does school knowledge enable those who have been generally excluded from schools to speak and act with dignity?” (Giroux, 1996, p.16)

Wyann did extensive research in gender equity. It was through the research on these two initiatives that active engagement could be planned for and implemented daily. All four of the participants stressed active engagement in their lessons. Their students were actively engaged in discussions, technology, art, drama and dance.

The design of the lesson became an important instructional strategy used to promote student voice for the participants. Three of the participants, Sara, Wyann and Betty, felt that summarization of a lesson was critical in learning and promoting student voice. All three used critiques as evaluations of lessons, recitals and performances. Continuously, they asked the students to review their performances and discuss and/or write what they did or didn’t like, what they would do different and how they could make the performance better. Many good ideas came from these critiques that changed the appearance and quality of performances. Ideas gathered from students’ voices, and facilitated by teachers. However, Sara and Wyann presented documentation of student journals to support their inquiry.

Sara and Wyann also felt the strategy of checking for understanding promoted student voice by allowing individuals to express their concern, knowledge and/or lack of knowledge and setting up the dialogue between teacher and student for clarification.

Sara and Wyann felt that the performances themselves were indicative of student voice. Betty was struggling with students’ mastering the content and projecting their voices. After all, Betty and her drama students were the only fine arts discipline that depended on the students’ actual voices for their performance. Students couldn’t depend on their body movements or the
entire choir backing you up or even what works you painted. Betty’s students performed together, but they spoke their lines alone.

Ensuring the relevance of instruction can also be an instructional strategy to foster student voice. It is what helped Wyann facilitate her dance troupe with the early movement piece. What could be more relevant than what your parents or grandparents had to say about you when you were little? One of the keys to Sara’s inquiry was the relevance technology brought to the project. The students were enthralled with the technology, the software and their final product. Sara tapped into the students’ interest in the power of technology and through the creative use of the computer to promote student engagement and voice in the curriculum.

Organizational Structure

What conditions in the organizational structure of the classroom and/or the school promoted student voice in the classroom for the four participants?

Two conditions in organizational structure that promoted student voice in all four participants’ inquiries were time and size. Time was needed to pursue some of the previously mentioned instructional strategies. Discussions, journals and kinesthetic activities all need time to be successfully implemented. Time was needed to check for understanding and to solicit individual responses. Think time was needed for students to reflect upon questions, while more class time was needed for discussion if you want full participation.

Size had two sides in this inquiry. Three out of the four participants, Sara, Wyann and Betty, had small (six to ten) students in their classes. This made a tremendous difference for Sara and Wyann in being able to work individually with the students on their choreography thus time resulted in a more authentic performance. The small class size of six students in keyboarding motivated and allowed Sara time to work with individual students as they created and
experimented with their choices. It also allowed students more time on the computers. Instead of
waiting for twenty students to select their background, six students was much more manageable.
Size promoted ownership with both the students and teachers. There simply were small enough
numbers with Wyann and Sara to promote each individual’s voice and to keep the teacher
motivated.

Although Betty had the condition of class size as a positive factor, she felt that time
worked against her and her goals. There wasn’t enough time in the forty minute slots three times
a week for the students to meet their goals. Also Betty felt, the content of the project was deemed
too difficult for the students to master in forty minute time slots.

Rosa’s concern with her schedule was really concern over the issues of time and size. Her
classes were not small. Many times they ran twenty to twenty-five students. This affected her
motivation along with the instructional strategies she was willing to try. She had the students for
the same length of time, but there were three to four times the number of students. It would be
quite challenging to hold a circle time discussion as Wyann did, on a regular basis. Size and time
were critical conditions in promoting student voice. How much time you have and how many
students you have to facilitate played a role in Rosa and Betty’s inquiry.

One of the ways Rosa did facilitate students expressing themselves was in cooperative
groups. Even with the size of her classes, cooperative groups facilitated students expressing their
feelings about works of art (SOL-K.2 & 2.3). Another form of cooperative groups formed when
Sara’s students expressed an interest through their journal writing to collaborate with the other
magnet disciplines. Why couldn’t vocal music and drama get together and practice? After all
they met at the same time in the schedule three times a week and the size of the classes were
small. Again, a suggestion from a student changed the way rehearsals were done at Southside.
Two participants, Wyann and Betty, mentioned staff development. Betty felt a workshop on constructivism would help “us discern if there are opportunities for voice” (J/B-2). Wyann felt all staff development should be meaningful and pertinent to teachers. Staff development has implications for all conditions that promote student voice and all factors promoting student voice have implications for staff development.

Another area that needed to be highlighted was the organizational structure of the school day. Of critical importance were two processes: the block scheduling of the school and the selection process of fourth and fifth graders into their choice of magnet discipline. All participants targeted students that had by their choice selected that particular fine art. The relevance factor increased if the student got their choice. However, there were students who did not get their first choice due to overcrowding. Usually the dance program had to turn away many students.

The block schedule allowed all fourth and fifth graders to be in different magnet classes at the same time. For example, if drama and music wanted to rehearse together, it would be possible on this block schedule. All grade levels were in the fine arts classes at the same time on a daily basis. Southside’s block schedule was created and implemented during the course of this inquiry. This had been an intense structural change for the school and we are still working on it.

Wyann also felt the sting of a teacher’s voice when she sought support on a discipline problem from his room. “I won’t bring problems to him anymore. I just won’t handle it that way again” (MT/W-5a). Wyann has availed herself numerous times of the structure we have in place at Southside to handle discipline problems. Wyann also was supportive of the existing report card for reporting citizenship for students. She expanded her magnet report card to include areas that she thought was necessary.
Wyann had utilized and changed more organizational structural conditions than any other participant. After her year long inquiry into student voice, she was able to establish two all female dance classes. She has been “amazed at the uninterrupted instruction time” (J(R)/W-1). Real changes to the structure of your building and/or classroom can have a significant impact on promoting student voice.

**Organizational Culture**

*What conditions in organizational culture promoted student voice in the classrooms of the four participants?*

“Organizational learning, development, and planned change cannot be understood without considering culture as a primary source of resistance to change” (Schein, 1992, xiv).

Culture played a tremendous role in promoting student voice. Two teachers can implement the same exact instructional strategy with different results. One teacher’s belief system may feel it is necessary to give more think time to students or ask more probing, redirecting questions. The other teacher may be allowing discussions, but their belief system is more concerned with staying on topic and staying on time. While not making a judgment call on who is right or wrong, this example may demonstrate the importance of a teacher’s values and beliefs in carrying out the day to day struggles of a classroom teacher. The heart and soul of that teacher is what can be the cultural condition that promoted student voice. While instructional strategies were critical for promotion of student voice, culture sustained the changes.

Whether a teacher is nurturing or empowering has so much to do with the emotional stability of the teacher. Sara and Wyann recognized that this is a condition necessary to promote student voice. The teachers’ ability to do their job with confidence and satisfaction plays an important part in wanting to recognize student voice. If a teacher is unhappy, experience tells me
that the classroom is not going to be a positive place where students’ voices are affirmed and encouraged. That is not to say that there aren’t periods where all humans experience unhappiness, but to be dissatisfied with your job as a teacher will reflect upon your performance and on students’ motivation. “Teachers as cultural workers strive to minimize the oppression which afflicts the lives of their students and fellow teachers.” (Giroux, 1996, p. 2)

Wyann stressed that educators also need to work with different ethnic groups and cultures. When teachers work in a diverse setting, it is important to recognize student voices to promote motivation and increase the learning taking place. We need to be aware of the different cultures in our building and open ourselves to their stories. Educators must guard against stereotypes of students and parents and remember that students may have been socialized differently with different beliefs and attitudes. "The curriculum must analyze and deconstruct popular knowledges produced through television and culture industries" (Giroux, 1993, p. 26)

The culture of the classroom was another condition that promoted student voice. Wyann felt it was critical to establish a democratic classroom that nurtured students while setting boundaries for their behavior. Participation in decision-making promoted more ownership when students were invited for their input. Although the instructional strategies facilitated this atmosphere. Wyann, particularly, felt it was important to plan for this in daily lesson plans.

Two participants, Wyann and Rosa, demonstrated the importance legislation has on the school culture. Wyann stressed the importance of the Title IX Act which made sex discrimination illegal and the WEEA (Women’s Equality in Education Act) which was passed to promote policies that promote equitable outcomes for women. Rosa made full use of the legislative passed Virginia Standards of Learning to promote student voice.
While many of the described cultural conditions may be present alone or in combination with each other, each educator must answer the question if students’ voices are important. Student voice exists, regardless of what we do or don’t do with it. Why not use it to help motivate students to learn? Why not use it to help establish a more nurturing democratic atmosphere? Why not use it to help establish rapport and respect among educators and students? As we are sadly learning, schools can be places of violence, we must listen to students’ voices to help us maintain a safe environment and promote maximum learning. While this inquiry does not provide you a prescription to follow, the hope is it will help the reader understand the concept of student voice, its importance and illuminate strategies that promote voice in your classroom or school.

**Lessons Learned About Student Voice**

I learned that students have a voice regardless of our preconceived perceptions about them. How and if we recognize their voice depends on instructional strategies and organizational structure and culture. Strategically, acceptance is a primary key. Realizing as an educator that students’ “storied lives” (Dahl, 1995) can help us motivate students to work for relevant goals. Acceptance is a trait upon which instructional strategies can be built.

Student voice has many layers. It is an evolving definition. Initially, there were many reactions to the concept of student voice. Some educators reacted vehemently that students have too much voice. Why would anyone worry about their voice? Then there were educators who were positive about student voice and created student councils, elections, etc. as vehicles to promote voice. Many of the participants and other educators utilized instructional strategies that promoted voice, such as discussion and writing.
However, the deepest layer experienced was Wyann’s dance curricula originating from the childhood movements of her students. She still taught all of her vocabulary, space size and movements; however, the students’ stories became their curricula. The authentication of the students’ lives created enthusiasm, ownership and motivation for her students. Educators need to deal with motivation with today’s postmodern child. Students are no longer going to do exactly as we say, no matter how much we complain. We can use their lives in many ways, Wyann showed me one.

Key to this inquiry was narrowing the concept of student voice to student voice in the curriculum. It made the inquiry more meaningful and focused it on learning. This eliminated some of the disbelief with my topic.

This study revealed that there are instructional practices that can promote student voice and can serve as recommendations for practice for educators. Writing and discussions are springboards for hearing authentic, student voices. Specifying further, journal writing about a topic may help the teacher plan her instruction. Educators can use writing as a doorway to get to know their students and authenticate their experiences. Discussions led by focus questions aids the teacher in ascertaining a student’s background knowledge of a subject and allowing a student to express their voice on a variety of topics.

Other strategies that fostered student voice in this inquiry were choice, creativity and technology. Through choice, creativity flourished in every subject area. The more choices the teachers gave students, the more ownership they demonstrated in this inquiry. Technology can also be used as a tool to provide choice for students, be it a different curriculum, assessment or instructional level.
Student critiques were instrumental in two of four case studies and were used to make substantial changes in the programs. These assessments were valuable and assisted the teacher greatly in planning her lessons, her recitals and major performances. Each teachers’ values along with their choice of instructional strategies and their governance of organizational factors positioned student voice in their classrooms.

The organizational structure of a building or classroom is important in promoting student voice. In particular, time and size played a role in a positive and negative way in all of the participants’ inquiries. Critical to this study is the fact that three of the four participants had small classes and met with them twice a week for forty-five minutes. However, small class size does not necessarily promote student voice as was revealed in Betty’s study with the difficulty she had with her storytelling festival.

Most of the participants found the twice a week meeting time with their targeted students, conducive, if not critical, to promoting student voice. However, one participant found that more time was needed to teach about the Civil War. It didn’t allow enough time for the teacher to build the scaffolding for their learning. Then again, this particular teacher was not coming from their students’ ancestral Civil War experiences, but from a prescriptive curricula mailed to her and existed as the objectives of that grant.

The culture of the organization and of the classroom is critical to promote student voice. While writing is a good instructional strategy, it isn’t going to promote students’ voices if no one ever reads it. The same can be said of critiques; they are valuable if they are used to promote learning and/or improve the classroom and/or performances. The organization and individual’s desire to recognize and promote student voice was critical in this endeavor. Without considering culture, we as educators are only promoting voice cosmetically. Awareness workshops and
ethnicity/gender training sessions may assist in building the kind of culture conducive to student voice. Whether or not the teacher recognizes and celebrates the diversity in her classroom is a part of that individuals’ belief system and their openness to the concept of student voice. Wyann demonstrated the power of accepting students lives while using that to produce curriculum in her dance classes. Giroux (1996) purports that “school knowledge enables those who have been generally excluded from schools to speak and act with dignity” (p.16).

Lessons Learned From the Action Research Approach

According to Calhoun (1994), “Action research is a fancy way of saying, let’s study what’s happening at our school and decide how to make it a better place” (p. 20). What an appropriate method of research in today’s postmodern world and in particular with this topic of inquiry, student voice. While the government and taxpayers are clamoring for schools to change, educators are the ones that can make it happen. Action research helps bridge the gap between theory and practice. “The school is where renewal happens and it begins with education” (p. 4). Educators have authentic experiences being on the front line. Education today demands practicality and educators’ voices need to be heard for substantive changes to be made. Educational research has moved to a more self-reflective phase that encourages participation from practitioners (Smulyan, 1989, vii). Action research allows educators’ voices to be heard.

Action research promotes continuous education and fosters teachers’ creed of life-long learning. It focuses on real issues for your classroom or building that are important to the individual or to the school. This inquiry had a broad umbrella of collaborative action research. All four participants studied the promotion of student voice in the curriculum. However, each participant did an individual action research project on the topic, student voice. Teacher as
researcher allowed each participant in this study to approach the topic in a different way and utilize different methods of promoting student voice.

The action in action research is the practicality needed for educator’s today. Theory alone will not entice the majority of educators, Entwine theory with action that transforms the school room and the school. Many of the changes wrought in this study had an immediate effect, but some also had cumulative effects on practices at Southside.

Sara and her students’ work with technology changed her instruction, her classroom and her performances at Southside. These changes happened not only as the study was taking place, but has influenced the vocal music department to the present day. Students utilized technology to compose and create their music, while performances changed to include more choreography and costumes.

Wyann elevated her dance troupe to new heights by recognizing the authentic voices of her dancers. Not only did she recognize them, but she utilized their culture to create curriculum and motivate the students. The study focused her on student voice and had immediate effects in her classroom, such as the “birth” dances and the discussions on gender equity. The cumulative effect has been a deep commitment from Wyann to value her students’ histories and cultures and translate that value into practice. The parents have reacted favorably to the dancers’ performances.

The research part of action research fosters learning the theory behind what we do. The why of what we do is critical to know and to be able to articulate. Calhoun (1994) believes, “To benefit from the collective wisdom of other educators and institutions, school-wide action research includes a study of the available professional literature” (p. 2).
Researching topics like differentiation, technology, ADHD, constructivism, feminist pedagogy, postmodernism and culture during this inquiry built the framework for us to fully benefit from the study. A strong research foundation provided the rationale of what we do. Research provided solid framework, relevance, wisdom, and high standards for action researchers.

Teachers in this inquiry took ownership of their topics of study. Rather than a top-down mandated slate of objectives and goals, these researchers selected their own topic and geared it toward the interest of their classrooms. The teachers, like their students, responded to this freedom of choice.

In addition, the inquiry fit appropriately in the systems’ evaluation form. This streamlined this inquiry for the participation and this can’t be emphasized enough. Time was a critical factor for all of these participants.

My role as the principal, when working with teachers on action research, became one of a coach/facilitator. One of the greatest challenges in making school changes revolves around the changes in role relationships (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977). Providing emotional and research support was necessary for all of us to complete this journey. There were times that being a principal interfered. It became necessary to remove myself as the teachers’ evaluator to ensure fairness. Having an assistant principal helped the process tremendously. This was a first time experience for the participants, and I felt it necessary to create the most bias-free environment for the study that was possible.

Some of the relationships deepened and some became adversarial. It became easy to slip back in the role of principal when a participant wanted to give up. One participant became my teacher as she led me to a clearer definition of student voice and its’ influence in the curriculum.
and ability to motivate. That’s a role that took years in its formation. While this was a year-long inquiry, the effects of this inquiry have been evolving. Roles taken by team members during this inquiry were not fixed, but changed during the inquiry reflecting the researchers’ tasks and teachers changing perceptions about themselves as researchers (Smulyan, 1989, ix).

Action research provided a structure for us to understand student voice in four classrooms at Southside. By its very nature, action research propelled us to change practices in our classrooms and initiate strategies that promoted student voice. It helped teachers make real changes in practice to guide their students in ways that they believed would enhance learning. Action research was the framework in studying the position that student voice took in the classroom in the postmodern era at this school site.
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### Appendix A

**Analysis of Unitized Data from Sara’s Dialogue Journal: Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Choice—costumes,</td>
<td>• Size—small class size of</td>
<td>• Empowerment—teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background music, props,</td>
<td>six students in keyboarding</td>
<td>provided this through the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student input helped.</td>
<td>motivated and allowed the</td>
<td>resources she established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiated instruction—met needs of each student</td>
<td>teacher time to work with</td>
<td>which allowed ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met needs of each student</td>
<td>individual students as</td>
<td>of this project. Sara also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by providing instruction</td>
<td>they created and</td>
<td>taught students how to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and choices at appropriate level.</td>
<td>experimented with their</td>
<td>have a discussion and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision-making.</td>
<td>choices.</td>
<td>modeled how to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentations/recitals—</td>
<td>• Time—size allowed</td>
<td>answers beyond the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic assessments.</td>
<td>more time for</td>
<td>yes/no mentality. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussions—forum for</td>
<td>teacher/student</td>
<td>engages the reluctant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students to express</td>
<td>interaction. It also</td>
<td>learner that is hesitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves and to go a step</td>
<td>allowed students more</td>
<td>about making decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further than their written</td>
<td>time on the computer.</td>
<td>If you are going to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critiques.</td>
<td></td>
<td>perform, you must select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student journals—forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>your work. Sara’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for students to express</td>
<td></td>
<td>willingness to establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td>certain instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questioning strategies—</td>
<td></td>
<td>strategies demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful, more in-depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>her beliefs in the role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions, higher order</td>
<td></td>
<td>of students in the learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions, probing, clarifying</td>
<td></td>
<td>process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critiques—forum for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students to assess theirs and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others performances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology—opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for students to engage with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative interactive software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gave students a chance for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students to select songs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create choreography and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have instruction at the appropriate level while being actively engaged in the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gifted musician as well as the beginner were addressed. Independent and dependent levels were available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Unitized Data from Student Journals (Sara): Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of dance choreography.</td>
<td>• Students want to reorganize schedule so two disciplines can work together (music and dance).</td>
<td>• Students also are aware and wrote about students stepping over the boundary of acceptable behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection of favorite song with reason, extends thinking of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journal writing—students expressed themselves in writing on various topics including their own performances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Meeting Transcripts (Sara): Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Strategies students wanted to see in the future  
  * Suggestion box  
  * Computer lab | | • Acceptance of student voice in today’s world.  
• Initial definition of student voice. |
Analysis of Unitized Data from Sara’s Action Research Plan: Themes

**Instructional Strategies**

The software along with the teacher’s planning and initiative would foster creativity in students and allow them to make decisions about song selection, arrangement and level of instruction. Students also created their own melody or rhythms. It gave students an opportunity to express themselves and to voice their feelings through music and music technology. It also allowed them choice as to what orchestration would serve as their background for their creations. Would it be the Ice Palace or Tingling Butterflies?

**Resources**

Resources included the technology and software which were needed to fulfill her music objective. These particular pieces of software called MusicShop and Finale allowed students to compose, arrange and print existing songs as well as to create their own songs.
Analysis of Unitized Data from Sara’s Lesson Plans: Themes

Instructional Strategies

- Improvisation—acting out lyrics, movements, words.
- Discussion—allowing students to speak their thoughts.
- Choice—students selecting the songs and the order of the program (recitals). They also selected the background orchestration from the software MusicShop.
- Critiques—student analysis of their performance and others.
- Create—students created costumes for recitals and stage decorations. They also composed simple pentatonic melodies.
- Journals—students voiced their opinions in writing on a variety of teacher and student initiated topics.
- Performances—students final demonstration of their learning and their voice.
Analysis of Unitized Data from Sara’s Observations: Themes

### Instructional Strategies
- Discussions
- Student summarizations
- Learning styles—ex. visual—able to see musical notes, auditory—imitating notes, kinesthetic—students plucked low and high sounds on guitar
- Active participation
- Performance assessments
- Critiques—students evaluating performances
- Checking for understanding—each individual
- Questioning—set stage for students to express themselves

### Organizational Structure
- Size—small class promoted utilization of listed instructional strategies

### Organizational Culture
- Positive classroom management—teacher handled disruptive behavior in professional, positive manner
## Analysis of Unitized Data from Sara’s Final Reflections: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Cultute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology—is an instructional tool, it levels the learning field between teacher as student and student as teacher, it promotes student voice and expression, empowers students with choices, different ability levels and different programs, it also facilitates meeting local and state goals.</td>
<td>Size—affects individual help and promotion of student voice.</td>
<td>Boundaries—teacher must limit freedom and number of choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Analysis of Unitized Data from Wyann’s Dialogue Journal: Themes

Instructional Strategies

• Listening—“I might see the emotional expression of a sad or quiet child. I really enjoy listening to what students have to say” (J/W-2).
• Dancing—“I think students express their voice powerfully through their movement. I often see the creative potential of a behavior problem labeled child. I might see the emotional expression of a sad or quiet child” (J/W-2).
• Discussion/verbal expressive skills—encouraging students to talk and discuss—“I do not think I hear voices too much. I think students need more opportunities to express themselves. It’s an important part of their language development and their ability to express themselves in writing” (J/W-3). Starting discussions with such questions as, “Have you ever been treated differently just because you are a girl or a boy?” (J/W-15).
• Questioning—utilizing open-ended questions that promote voice and critical thinking—“I try to ask a lot of
• Checking for understanding—making sure that students understand the concept you are trying to teach. “Once they began to understand the topic they were eager for input. I began

Organizational Structure

• Time for strategies to be implemented? Is there time to solicit student responses?
• Size—Can be a factor in implementing instructional strategies, interacting with students and individualized instruction.
• Staff development—all strategies utilized by Wyann have implications for staff development with particular emphasis on ADHD students (coaching), gender equity and learning styles.
• Schedule

Organizational Culture

• Participation in decision making—promotes more ownership when students are invited to give their input. It also sets the stage for a democratic atmosphere.
• Boundaries—the structure of a classroom will take care of the students that try to monopolize the environment. A democratic atmosphere will not tolerate a child that is continuously disruptive or disrespectful. Many times girls and in this case, white girls, will use passivity to cope. This study showed that boys dominated the conversations in her class by interrupting, ignoring, leaving and engaging in physical activity when girls were speaking.
• Beliefs—It helps them develop their ability to think critically and creatively. I think kids want to be taken seriously today. I think they are more and more mature and they would like to be more acknowledged” (J/W-3).
• Limits to student voice—“Yes, in terms of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| by telling them I needed their input for some research I am doing. This is a great way to introduce a lesson—take a topic and tell them their opinions will be the goal of the lesson rather than imposing the lesson on them. Their opinions will be the goal of the lesson (J/W-10). | disrupting a class. No, in terms of inviting input” (J/W-9). “Yes, kids can go over the line and will go over the line, but they are kids—it is our job to give them the skills they need to be more successful. | • Schedule—is it arranged to maximize learning.  
• Time—is there time for instructional strategies?  
• Gender equity—“students overwhelmingly stated that boys and girls are not treated equally, but each gender posed convincing arguments for inequity” (J/W-10 & 11).  
  * Girls said boys are called on more often, boys said the opposite.  
  * Male teachers favor boys and female teachers favor girls.  
  * “It is better to be a boy” (J/W-11).  
  * Several students felt teachers talk a lot—stories, etc., but doesn’t give time for input” (J/W-11).  
  * “Girls have more work to do (be moms, work), boys make girls clean up messes, boys think girls are their slaves””(J/W-11).  
  * “No girls have ever run for president. Teachers pets are boys. Boys always get to do attendance. Girls raise |

- **Design of lesson**—“In terms of assuring that all students get to voice their opinion—I start in a circle and go around and ask everyone to voice their opinion. The quiet kids (usually females, usually white) take longer but after practicing this format they become more involved” (J/W-16).
- **Active engagement in curriculum**—active vs. passive engagement promotes student questions—especially questions that don’t have right or wrong answers” (J/W-2).
- **Writing**—allowing students to choose topics or to respond to any issue in writing thus allowing a safe and alternative method of expressing voice—“I try and give watching discussions in my education class and even with an overwhelming majority of women, the men speak at least half of the time. And often, a certain impatience can be felt when a women is speaking. Men receive full attention whether or not what they are saying is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interesting” (J/W-15).</td>
<td></td>
<td>their hands, but don’t get called on. The teacher looks at me, but calls on someone else. Teachers always calls on girls. Girls get to go to the bathroom more. Girls get more attention. Boys get in trouble more”(J/W-11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journal writing—I find this is a very effective way of finding out what kids are thinking. And it’s a complete surprise to me” (J/W-9). “…he felt the journal was a safe place to express his real thoughts and ideas” (J/W-10).</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Boys overwhelmingly dominated, interrupted, and raised their voices. They had difficulty waiting for others to finish what they were saying. They also (several, not all) actually got up—left the circle and engaged in disruptive physical activity—mostly when the girls were speaking” (J/W-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice—students select which magnet discipline in which they will enroll— “Most students said they don’t get enough opportunities to say what they think about the subject matter being taught” (J/W-10).</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Black females showed far more assertiveness than white. This sounds crazy but the lighter the skin, whether black or white, the less assertive. … white females being the least likely to voice their opinions and the most likely to be trampled on when they did” (J/W-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogue—among student to student and student to teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Black children come from the most matriarchal of any American culture (J/W-15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance—making the curricula relevant and interesting to students journal writing, physical involvement in task—“I think we all see this in ADHD students—lack of self control. I agree that they have a good capacity for attention” (J/W-8).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Influences—how much does their influence set the curriculum (gov’t).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning styles—“I see ADHD students (They) are definitely the most active and disruptive students but they can stay focused for 40 minute periods if the material is interesting and meaningful to them” (J/W-8 &amp; 9).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenging tasks—do they require more than lower level thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State/national—I to get a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| high ratio of ADHD kids. I find that they are often visual and kinesthetic learners” (J/W-2).  
  - Active engagement in the curricula—active vs. passive engagement promotes student voice by forcing the student to attempt understanding of the topic through cooperative groups, utilizing manipulatives, journal writing and physical involvement in task.  
  - Challenging tasks—do tasks require more than lower level responses and are they challenging to the learner. | | |
### Analysis of Unitized Data from Student Journals (Wyann): Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinesthetic activity—dance is that kind of activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereotyping—young children do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing—students wrote critiques, as well as expressing themselves on a myriad of topics including their qualifications for holding down a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes—students realize they have negative ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of Meeting Transcripts (Wyann): Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Writing—“I told them to write down what you think and we’ll look at it and talk about what you can actually send” (to the news writer) (MT/W-5).</td>
<td>• Report cards—have a space for marking the following criteria: pays attention, listens and follows instruction.</td>
<td>• Postmodern child—many will try to monopolize the discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion—teacher noted discussions in her student classes and in her masters classes at Hollins—“When a boy was talking, everyone would pay attention. But if a female started talking …” (MT/W-2).</td>
<td>• Handling discipline problems—“I just won’t do it again. I won’t handle things that way again. I won’t bring behavior problems to him (male teacher), but I guess that’s the best way to handle it” (MT/W-5a).</td>
<td>• Boundaries—of teachers’ and students’ voices, who decides what is acceptable and what isn’t … “Men are doing all the talking in my education class even though there are four times as many women, and women are listening” (MT/W-3). One male teacher said, “If the three of you (boys) can’t take your little twinkle toes and …”, “I was really unhappy about that. I just think at an art school, for a teacher to stand up and call three boys twinkle toes and to put that kind of connation with dancing was really insulting to the whole program and every child that performs here” (MT/W-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice—of magnet discipline and choice in creativity of dance movements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Confidence/experience of teacher may affect their choice of instructional strategies—“You have to have confidence that you know what you’re doing and you are good at what you do” (to invite student input) (MT/W-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Looking at equity differently—“It’s really not fair that they finish this sentence!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Beliefs—(teacher’s) “I would never say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
something about another teacher to a teacher. It upsets me that this was the perception of 4 or 5 of our kids (that boys are twinkle toes if they dance)” (MT/W-5).

• Perceptions—“Well probably what I’ll say is (to the other teacher), “I don’t know what you said, I don’t know what your intentions were, but what the kids brought back to me was …” (not positive) (MT/W-6).
## Analysis of Action Research Plan—Wyann: Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Assessments—to provide diagnostics about instruction and students being served.</td>
<td>- How can it be arranged to maximize learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observation—to see when student voice is or is not present and to what degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research—teacher as learner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Unitized Data from Research Paper (Wyann): Themes

**Instructional Strategies**
- Discussions—with students
- Observations—what does teacher and students see

**Organizational Structure**
Legislative—Title IX made sex discrimination illegal, also 1974 WEEA (Women’s Equality in Education Act) passed to promote policies that promote equitable outcomes for women.

**Organizational Culture**
- History of education being dominated by males.
- Stereotypes—television, ads and people still reinforce.
- Belief system—how does the staff feel about gender issues, what are their values.
- Bias of test scores—do they hold children down.
## Analysis of Unitized Data from Wyann’s Final Reflections: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice (of dance partners)—promotes diversity</td>
<td>Female classes—the schedule just happen to work out that Wyann had two all female classes this year</td>
<td>Teacher’s beliefs—plays a major role in promoting student voice and if it is important to teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity—ultimate expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>Socialization—plays a role with males and the way they have been brought up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion—of such topics as gender equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>New students’ beliefs—overcoming the hurdle that dance is for girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of Unitized Data from Wyann’s Observations: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summarization—having students summarize what they learned</td>
<td>Size—classes observed had 6 to 10 students</td>
<td>Positive environment—promotes confidence level in expressing your voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles—all three styles were included in lessons to promote participation and maximize learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create—own choreography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing—students keep journals for self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing—appropriate pacing engages students more in lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning strategies—keeps students focused and forces students to extend their thinking and formulate their thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C
Analysis of Unitized Data from Betty’s Dialogue Journal: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Questioning — strategy that promotes student voice, utilization of probing, clarifying questions that promote thinking.</td>
<td>• Staff development—a visual to tell one’s leaning toward constructivism, to discern if there are opportunities for voice (J/B-6).</td>
<td>• Autonomy—teachers learning to give up power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discipline — allowing voices to be heard.</td>
<td>• Time</td>
<td>• Boundaries — of student voice, what are they? Betty’s rules of discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking — discussing the traits of characters, explaining, encouraging dialogue/discussion among students on various topics, helps shy students.</td>
<td>* Think time</td>
<td>• Appropriate and inappropriate ways to hear student voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning styles — more creative approach, acting out vocabulary words and concepts, engaging student in formulating and articulating one’s own learning, seeing learning as a process, rapping with new knowledge.</td>
<td>* Time to teach in a way that fosters student voice</td>
<td>• Level of satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Readiness levels of students and teachers for student voice, the effects of poverty and neglect and unpreparedness.</td>
<td>* How to improve the time you have</td>
<td>• Introspective development — serves as a bridge to student voice (Betty’s rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recitals — vehicles of self expression.</td>
<td>* Pacing</td>
<td>* good citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critiques</td>
<td>* Rate of teacher discourse</td>
<td>* fore thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discerning students’ cognition</td>
<td>* Increase talk time</td>
<td>* reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of new learning with old (relevance)</td>
<td>• Choice in magnet discipline</td>
<td>* questioning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging the disengaged child</td>
<td>• Size of classes-size does assist in promoting student voice</td>
<td>* thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metacognition</td>
<td>• Scheduling</td>
<td>* encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructivism</td>
<td></td>
<td>* expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Empowerment issues — responsibility and ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead by example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Affective climate — the use of rewards, using positive reinforcement, considering student feelings and thoughts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of Unitized Data from Betty’s Action Research Plan: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critiques—of student’s own performances and the performances of others, as an on-going process.</td>
<td>Size—targeted students were in groups of 6 to 10.</td>
<td>Voice through storytelling—storytelling will develop an appreciation for students’ own voice for social as well as cultural histories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active engagement—through storytelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and relevance—students made up original stories, wrote, illustrated and recorded them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of Unitized Data from Betty’s Lesson Plans: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson plans—should reflect</td>
<td>• Size of classes</td>
<td>• Sharing class with home—“Tell someone at home about our work” (L/B-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice in curriculum, costumes</td>
<td>• Time—length of classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Point-of-view—teaching to look from another’s perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher order thinking skills—“Which mythology story will be the most interesting and culturally informative?” (L/B-4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple intelligences (Gardner, ____).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critiques—self assessment—students watch videotapes and assess their performance and compare/contrast their assessment to the video of the live performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Unitized Data from Betty’s Observations: Theme

Instructional Strategies
- Active engagement—students were pretending they were at the zoo. They utilized their bodies and their imaginations. They chose their activities. At the kindergarten level they were using their bodies as well as their voices to project.
- Student summarization—forces voice.
- Pacing—allows time for expression.
- Questioning

Organizational Structure
- Size—small classes

Organizational Culture
- Positive environment—sets the stage for expression.
### Analysis of Unitized Data from Betty’s Final Reflections: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performances—recitals, plays demonstrate understanding, authentic assessments.</td>
<td>Adolescence—age of student and student voice—any relationship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity—in selections.</td>
<td>Responsibility—along with voice students must exhibit responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal expressive skills—the power of language</td>
<td>Elimination—remove disruptive voices from performances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination—individual student voice</td>
<td>Encouragement—to complete assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure—students need to learn whose fault failure is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D
Analysis of Unitized Data from Virginia SOL-Art (Rosa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K.1</strong> Discover that the senses are avenues to self expression through art</td>
<td><strong>K.3</strong> Share personal artwork</td>
<td><strong>K.2</strong> Express personal experiences, thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Express self creatively in drawing/painting the human figure</td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong> Work cooperatively in art group activities</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Recognize that personal creative work and the work of others has value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Repeat original designs to create a pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.15</strong> Create art from real and imaginary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Create original works of art which correlate with spoken and/or written language</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong> Express feelings about specific works of art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Produce art work that is inventive</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> Generate creative ideas through experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Describe differences among works of art</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5.1</strong> Produce works of art which express personal emotions and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Create the effect of texture on a two-dimensional surface</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5.3</strong> Demonstrate concern for self and others in the safe use of tools and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Create an alternating pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Create texture in three-dimensional artwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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