

Continuities Between Motivation Research and Whole Language Philosophy of Instruction

David A. Bergin
Cheryl LaFave
UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

The purpose of this article is to show that motivation research is generally compatible with and supportive of the whole language philosophy of instruction and to provide explicit motivational reasons why whole language practices might be effective. Both motivation research and whole language instruction emphasize the following: providing choice in order to foster perceptions of autonomy, emphasizing the mastery goal of learning in order to improve personal competence rather than the ego goal of doing better than other people, using assessment that encourages a deep personal construction of meaning and learning for understanding, providing students with experiences that will increase their belief that they can succeed, modeling appropriate literacy activities, responding to students' social goals, providing an emotionally supportive atmosphere, and making learning interesting. Whole language classrooms provide settings where motivation researchers can investigate the success of motivation principles, and whole language classrooms might benefit from the motivation technique of goal setting. It would be useful for practitioners if whole language and motivation researchers investigated appropriate levels of teacher control more precisely.

THE WHOLE LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY of fostering literacy development has become so influential in recent years, particularly for elementary school instruction, that it has been featured on the front page of the *New York Times* (Richardson, 1994), in *Atlantic* magazine (Levine, 1994), and in *Newsweek* (Hancock & Wingert, 1996). Motivational effects are one of the major claims of whole language proponents, though the claims are largely implicit. That is, although seldom using the word “motivation,” whole language proponents assert that given choice and meaningful tasks in an appropriate environment, students will be motivated to read and write. For example, K. Goodman (1986) wrote that whole language programs are “more pleasant and more fun for both pupils and teachers” (p. 8). In the following passage, Edelsky, Draper, and Smith (1991) described a whole language classroom and mentioned such indicators of motivation as attendance, engagement, choosing to pursue literacy tasks outside of school, and spontaneous discussions of literature:

Absentee rates were low in her room. Visitors frequently commented that students were almost always engaged in appropriate tasks. Parents reported a sudden and dramatic turn to book reading and story writing as at-home activities. Students whose September journals had entries such as “I don’t got nuthin’ to write” were writing full pages by October. Previous “non-readers” read award-winning children’s literature and revised and edited multiple drafts of long, involved stories. By spring, children spontaneously discussed the literary merits of their own writing and of books they read, commenting on style, point of view, plot structure, and other literary elements. (p. 114)

Although this passage does not explicitly mention motivation, it is clearly about motivated behavior.

Motivation is important not only because “motivated” children are more likely to be engaged in meaningful learning in the classroom, but also because motivation is an important outcome of instruction. Maehr (1976) wrote that effective instruction should result in learners who are interested in a task and who are inclined to return to a learning task even if they do not have to; he called this “continuing motivation.” If classrooms foster students who score highly on achievement tests but who hate learning, the classrooms are failing.

The first purpose of this article is to show that motivation research is generally compatible with and supportive of a whole language approach; thus, we do not provide a comprehensive review of motivation or whole language research – such a review would be book length. Rather, we describe whole language philosophy and research and then discuss how specific strands of motivation research are congruent with whole language. Researchers and practitioners should take notice when two literatures converge in their guidelines for effective classroom practice. The convergence lends validity to each approach, making the assertions of each more powerful. For example, very different strands of motivation research have independently generated principles with different names but that all claim that a fundamental aspect of human motivation is “an individual’s subjective evaluation of whether he or she is capable of producing

some set of desired environmental effects” (Ford, 1985, p. 5; see also Pintrich & Schunk, 1996, chapter 3). Labels for this principle include expectancy for success, self-efficacy, perceived competence, perceived control, learned helplessness, and others. This convergence supports the validity of a robust principle. A point of this article is to show similar convergence of principles in whole language and motivation research. Although whole language philosophy can be used with students of any age, this review focuses on elementary students, because that is the age group for whom whole language was initially developed.

One might wonder why, if motivation research and whole language theory and practice are so congruent, whole language proponents have not used motivation research to support their practices. One reason might be that whole language proponents have largely rejected what they view as reductionist, positivist, quantitative research (Edelsky, 1990), and they may perceive motivation research as part of that genre. K. Goodman (1989), for example, wrote, “Research will be most applicable to whole-language classrooms if it draws on the same theoretical base as the whole-language practice and if it is conducted in the real world rather than in laboratories” (p. 211).

Because participating in “paradigm wars” (Stanovich, 1990) is not a purpose of this article, we refer interested readers to those who have discussed the clash of methodologies and epistemologies (e.g., Almasi, Palmer, Gambrell, & Pressley, 1994; Cambourne, 1994; Edelsky, 1990; K. Goodman, 1994; McKenna, Robinson, & Miller, 1990a, 1990b; McKenna, Stahl, & Reinking, 1994; Moorman, Blanton, & McLaughlin, 1994a, 1994b; Willinsky, 1994). Although this article does not delve into the rhetoric of whole language, the paradigm wars, or the phonics versus whole language debate, it is important to recognize that this article is presented during a time of considerable controversy regarding how to teach reading and writing. Although for some years, the whole language movement gained considerable grassroots support and credence among educators, it is currently under attack. For example, California was among the first states to support whole language curriculum, but in 1996, the state rejected whole language because, it was claimed, whole language had reduced literacy competencies in children (J. Steinberg, 1997). Former California superintendent of public instruction Bill Honig went so far as to say that whole language was a mistake and that “Children need phonics” (Goodale, 1997, p. 11), as though teaching phonics and using literature to teach for meaning are mutually incompatible. Another example of the rancorous nature of the debate is suggested by the following incident. The International Reading Association took a stand that “The teaching of phonics is an important aspect of beginning reading instruction” (“IRA Takes Stand on Phonics,” 1997), which elicited a response from Y. Goodman (1997) that asserted that “the heart of the phonics movement is an attack on public education” (note that she also supported some components of the IRA position).

Besides showing compatibility between whole language philosophy and motivation research, a second purpose of this article is to make explicit the motivational reasons why whole language practices might be effective. Whole language

could be characterized as a set of theoretical principles that describe learning and the application of those principles. To the degree that teachers understand the principles that underlie effective practice (and do not just memorize techniques), they are better prepared to make effective curriculum decisions. Many motivational principles are implicit in whole language; teachers would be better prepared to make classroom decisions if the motivation principles were explicit.

In this article, we begin by defining whole language and then briefly describing motivation research. We then use Motivational Systems Theory (Ford, 1992) as a framework for comparing whole language and motivation research. Next, we review studies that have compared whole language instruction with traditional or skills-based instruction. Finally, we provide conclusions and suggestions for research.

Defining Whole Language

Whole language is a term that describes a philosophy of learning and instruction. That is, whole language is not just a set of classroom practices, but rather includes a theoretical framework that underlies the practices (Edelsky, 1991b). This philosophy is evolving in a sometimes contested terrain of theorists and practitioners who do not always agree. Although there are areas of controversy, such as the role of phonics and whether literacy is learned in the same “natural” way as speech is learned, there are also fundamental areas of agreement among most whole language proponents. The goals of whole language include skill development, but go beyond skill development. They include fostering a literate lifestyle that views reading and writing as valuable, promoting enjoyable skills, and creating a political environment that empowers students and teachers.

Altwerger, Edelsky, and Flores (1987) provided the following description of whole language:

Whole language is based on the following ideas: (a) language is for making meanings, for accomplishing purposes; (b) written language is language – thus what is true for language in general is true for written language; (c) the cueing systems of language (phonology in oral, orthography in written language, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics) are always simultaneously present and interacting in any instance of language in use; (d) language use always occurs in a situation; (e) situations are critical to meaning-making. (p. 145)

After reviewing 64 articles pertaining to whole language instruction, Bergeron (1990) concluded:

Whole language is a concept that embodies both a philosophy of language development as well as the instructional approaches embedded within, and

supportive of, that philosophy. This concept includes the use of real literature and writing in the context of meaningful, functional, and cooperative experiences in order to develop in students motivation and interest in the process of learning. (p. 319)

Edelsky (1991b), while describing whole language philosophy, asserted that “babies acquire a language through actually using it, not through practicing its separate parts or practicing with only one or two systems until some later date when the parts are assembled or the system is reintegrated and the totality is finally used” (p. 97) and that language acquisition is naturally learned as part of functioning in a community. This means that “First, if language is acquired through use, and if written language is language, then written language too is learned through use, not through practice exercises. And second, if language is a tool for making sense of something else, then the ‘something elses’ must have prominence in the curriculum” (Edelsky, 1991b, p. 98). This view of learning to read and write provides a useful analogy for literacy development, that is, novice learners should be surrounded with written language in use just as infants, who are novice speakers, are surrounded with spoken language in use.

The theory behind whole language draws heavily from Vygotsky (Edelsky, 1991a; K. Goodman, 1989, 1992; Y. Goodman, 1989b). Whole language assumes that learning is a social process and that social interaction and collaboration should occur in the classroom.

The authentic texts and instruction used in whole language classrooms support reading as a meaning-related activity for everyone (Fagan, 1989; Tunnell, 1989). In whole language classrooms, reading is viewed as an interaction between the text and the reader with meaning being the primary goal. According to one review (Steve Graham & Harris, 1994), this results in students in whole language classrooms holding meaning-based views of writing, whereas students in traditional classrooms tend to hold a skills-based view of writing.

Whole language philosophy is also explicitly political. Edelsky (1992) stated that “Whole language stands *for* justice, democracy, and empowerment and *against* injustice and a stratified society” (p. 325). Whole language seeks to empower both the teacher and the student. Whole language philosophy recognizes that theoretical positions have political implications; for example, Edelsky (1992) stated that “Advocating the abandonment of basal readers attacks the control that publishers have over both the tests and the curriculum” (p. 326). Of course, whoever influences tests and curriculum decisions also wields power that influences huge amounts of time, money, and other resources.

Although defining whole language is difficult, and there are disagreements and ambiguities about what constitutes whole language instruction, definitions are sufficiently clear that whole language and skills-based classrooms can be distinguished. Researchers have documented that instruction in whole language classrooms indeed differs from instruction in skills-based classrooms (Deford, 1984; McIntyre, 1992; Morrow, 1992; Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1991).

Motivation

Motivation research is a field that is complex, sprawling, and difficult to organize. For example, major approaches to human motivation include goal orientations (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1989), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985), goal setting (Locke & Latham, 1990), expectancy-value (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992), extrinsic rewards (Cameron & Pierce, 1994), social constructivist (Oldfather & Dahl, 1994), and attributions (Weiner, 1985). Some approaches overlap in principles and constructs, which means that the field is not as complex as it might appear at first glance. Therefore, it is useful to use an organizing framework to show how some theories share concepts and categories. For example, Pintrich, Marx, and Boyle (1993) organized motivational beliefs around two factors: expectancy and value. Brophy (1998) also used expectancy and value.

We have chosen to use Ford's (1992) Motivational Systems Theory (MST) as our organizational framework, because it explicitly highlights goals as a key component of motivation, because it explicitly treats emotions as part of motivation, and because its systems-theory roots make it particularly effective at analyzing human behavior as embedded within a sociocultural context. A strength of using a simplifying organizational framework is that it provides the reader with an organizing mental structure that aids memory and understanding; a weakness is that it tends to oversimplify, and that not all theories fit into categories equally neatly.

According to Ford (1992), motivation consists of three interacting components: goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs. "Each component is necessary, but none are sufficient for the activation of strong motivational patterns" (p. 80). For example, a child who believes in her capacity as a reader but holds no reading goals will not be motivated to read; mere positive beliefs are not sufficient to motivate behavior in the absence of goals. Motivational Systems Theory is useful as an integrative tool, because it shows how most principles that are labeled motivational can be analyzed as aspects of goals, emotions, or personal agency beliefs.

In MST, *goals* refer to the consequences that the person wishes to achieve (or avoid). Goals guide people's attention, interest, and behavior. Motivation is generally greater when a person holds multiple goals simultaneously and uses effective goal-setting processes. Goals are generally perceived by people as part of the social and cultural environment and are adopted in a personal, sometimes idiosyncratic, way or even rejected. The adoption or rejection of goals occurs as part of the individual's adoption or rejection of other societal goals. For example, a youngster whose peers reject achievement and striving in school (D. Bergin & Cooks, 1995; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986) is faced with adopting the school's literacy goals and rejecting peer goals, or maintaining peer goals while rejecting school goals, or finding some way to build a reconciliation between the conflicting goals of peers and school.

Emotions are closely linked with goals such that goal attainment (or progress toward a goal) can lead to positive emotions (e.g., pride, happiness) and goal failure (or lack of progress) can lead to negative emotions (e.g., shame, guilt). Emotions that we discuss in later sections include interest and test anxiety. Emotions are powerful and often unresponsive to rational analysis; thus, a child who has experienced repeated failure when reading and who comes to associate reading with shame, fear, and distress is unlikely to hold any goals for reading other than avoidance, even if the teacher attempts to convince the child that he or she is capable. Emotions may have biological roots, but the emotions that people feel are largely based on the meanings they attribute to events; and those meanings are constructed from their experience within a particular sociocultural context. Thus, a child who lacks trendy clothing at one school may think nothing of it, whereas a similar child in another school may feel excruciatingly embarrassed and may also feel anger at his or her parents for not being better providers.

Personal agency beliefs are of two types: *Capability beliefs* are evaluations of whether one has the personal skill and competence needed for a task. Therefore, capability beliefs overlap with Bandura's (1986) notion of self-efficacy and with Patrick, Skinner, and Connell's (1993) capacity beliefs. *Context beliefs* are evaluations of whether the environment is sufficiently responsive to allow task attainment and are similar to Bandura's (1986) notion of outcome expectation (p. 391; see also Bandura, 1995). Context beliefs refer to whether the person believes that success is possible if one possesses sufficient skill; thus, children who are competent readers for their age may not even attempt to find books to read if they believe that all the books in the classroom library are too challenging, and they may choose not to write for a school contest if they believe that the criteria for success are too stringent.

Personal agency beliefs are closely linked with goals, emotions, and culture; for example, a person who has low perceptions of ability in a domain that is not valued by the culture is unlikely to hold goals in that area and is unlikely to care about low ability. If the domain is valued by the culture, however, negative emotions are much more likely. Personal agency beliefs are largely constructed from personal experience in the social environment. Social comparison initially plays a relatively small role in this construction, because young children do not realize that "when achievement is equal, lower effort implies higher ability" (Nicholls, 1989, p. 46), but as they grow older, lack of ability to do what others can do creates feelings of incompetence and leads to withdrawal from such activities. Nicholls (1989) stated that it is a good thing this sense of ability does not usually develop until students are already schooled in basic literacy.

Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs are linked and influence one another. No one of them is sufficient for motivated behavior to occur. Thus, a child may adopt a goal of reading a challenging book because she saw her brother do it, but only if she is confident that she can be successful or is confident that she can develop strategies to be successful, and if her emotions are

sufficiently positive. On the other hand, if she has had experiences that created strong negative emotions toward reading, she might observe her brother's reading, but would be unlikely to adopt reading goals herself.

Although goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs are internal processes, MST recognizes that motivational processes result from the interaction among persons and context; a core concept of MST is that "one *always* deals with a whole person-in-context" (Ford, 1992, p. 220). Context is critical for understanding and predicting motivation and is a focus of this review. Context, including teacher behavior, strongly affects the goals students hold, the emotions they feel, and the personal agency beliefs they experience. Motivation depends on the way a person perceives and interprets a context or situation, not on some "objective" reading of the situation (Bandura, 1986; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986; Weiner, 1985). In addition, MST recognizes that goals spring neither from the mind of the person nor from the culture of the society, but rather are co-constructed in an interaction among the individual, the culture, and persons in the culture. Thus, a researcher guided by MST might examine the goals that children hold across different life domains (e.g., school, family, sports) and analyze those goals both as idiosyncratic constructions of the person and as normative social constructions that fit a particular phase of life or type of activity. A researcher guided by MST would be likely to observe or measure multiple aspects of experience – personal goals, social influences on goals, emotions and previous experience that created them, personal agency beliefs regarding one's capability and the way that society facilitates or undermines those beliefs, and so forth.

In the following sections, we use the MST framework of goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs to discuss how motivation research is congruent with whole language instruction.

Goals

Goals generally refer to desired outcomes and have been conceptualized from several different perspectives (D. Bergin, 1992). In the following sections, we discuss the following goal-related issues: goal orientation, continuing impulse to learn, social goals, importance of multiple goals, influence of assessment on goals, and influence of classroom tasks on goals.

Goal Orientation

Student goal orientation has become an important topic of motivation research. Two major goal orientations that describe what students seek in achievement situations have been studied by researchers. Although researchers differ somewhat in their formulations and definitions of these goals, we follow precedent

(e.g., Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988) in focusing on similarities in definition rather than distinguishing features. The two goals are mastery goals, also called learning or task goals, and ego goals, also called performance or competitive goals (Ames & Archer, 1988; Covington & Omelich, 1984; Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). Students who hold mastery goals seek challenge, mastery, and skill development. Students who hold ego goals seek to perform better than others, to compete successfully. These goals can reflect trait-like tendencies or characteristics of situations. That is, some people have a trait of being more ego-goal oriented than others, and some situations tend to make most people more ego-goal oriented than they might otherwise be.

Even though American society and many classrooms tend to emphasize ego and competition goals, there is considerable evidence that mastery orientations foster better learning strategies, motivation, and achievement outcomes. Research shows that mastery situations are correlated with increased use of effective learning strategies. Ames and Archer (1988) found that students reported greater use of learning strategies in classrooms they perceived as mastery oriented. Nolen (1988; Nolen & Haladyna, 1990), analyzing individual differences rather than situational differences, found that students who were mastery oriented reported greater valuing and use of learning strategies that required deep processing. Deep processing refers to encoding that deals with the meaning of verbal material, whereas shallow processing deals with surface features. Thus, for a baseball fan, remembering through rote rehearsal that World War II began in 1941 for the United States would be shallow processing, whereas remembering that it was the same year that Ted Williams batted over .400 and that Joe Dimaggio hit safely in 56 consecutive games would be deep processing. In an experimental study, Sandra Graham and Golan (1991) found that when the task of recalling single words required shallow processing, children in both mastery and ego situations were equally poor at recall, but when the task required deep processing, the ego-involved children showed poorer recall. Meece et al. (1988) showed that fifth and sixth graders who held mastery goals were more likely to report active cognitive engagement in learning activities, whereas students who were concerned about their ability or about evaluation, both of which are likely in competitive situations, were more likely to use ineffective learning strategies like copying answers or guessing.

Mastery-oriented situations are more likely to lead to intrinsic motivation, enjoyment, and continuing motivation for a topic (Maehr, 1976). For example, Maehr and Stallings (1972) found that external evaluation of an ego-oriented nature undermined continuing motivation. Ames and Archer (1988) reported that students who held mastery goals in a particular classroom also tended to have a positive attitude toward the class. Butler (1987) found that a mastery situation was related to continued interest in doing additional experimental tasks. Others have found similar patterns (Benware & Deci, 1984; D. Bergin, 1995; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Meece et al., 1988).

Optimal whole language settings are designed in a way that avoids ego goals and fosters mastery goals. Ames and Archer (1988) listed the following as

characteristics of a mastery-oriented setting: focusing on improvement, valuing effort, viewing errors as a natural part of learning, and evaluating students in terms of their own progress and improved competence. Classroom characteristics that can foster ego goals include social comparison, normative grading, and competition, all of which are activities that most whole language proponents oppose. Instead, many whole language teachers avoid fostering ego orientations by emphasizing individual improvement rather than normative improvement, avoiding worksheets (a recurring occasion for competition is to pass out the same worksheet to the whole class at the same time), and encouraging diverse modes of demonstrating competence rather than requiring all students to do the same things.

Continuing Impulse to Learn

Oldfather has generated the term “continuing impulse to learn” to label a redefinition of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning (Oldfather & Dahl, 1994; Oldfather & McLaughlin, 1993). She defined it as “An ongoing engagement in learning that is propelled and focused by thought and feeling emerging from the learners’ processes of *constructing meaning*. Continuing impulse to learn is characterized by intense involvement, curiosity, and a search for understanding as learners experience learning as a deeply personal and continuing agenda” (Oldfather & Dahl, 1994, p. 142). We categorize continuing impulse to learn as a goal concept, though it is much more, because it has an intentional, purposive quality; however, it is important to recognize that continuing impulse to learn does not fit as neatly into the MST framework as most other motivation constructs, because it incorporates epistemology, affective processes, and construction of meaning processes simultaneously.

Continuing impulse to learn reflects a social-constructivist approach that shares roots with whole language philosophy in drawing on the writings of Piaget and Vygotsky. The approach is also influenced by constructivists like von Glasersfeld (1984). Because the roots of whole language and the social-constructivist approach are so similar, it is no surprise that social-constructivist research is very congruent with whole language philosophy and practice. Oldfather and Dahl (1994) described a fifth grader who experienced continuing impulse to learn in a whole language classroom; the student’s focus was on whether the goal was learning versus getting correct answers: “One of the things I love in school is that we’re trying to learn – not just get the right answer. That’s really good. You want to get the right answer, but you still learn. *You do better because learning is more important than getting the right answer*” (p. 147).

Social Goals

Social goals, sometimes referred to as integrative or belongingness goals, are also

important for understanding behavior (Urduan & Maehr, 1995). Several researchers have observed that social goals are very important for adolescents during school and other learning situations. For example, when Csikszentmihalyi and Larson (1984) asked adolescents, "What are the things in your life you enjoy doing most?" one of the largest groups of activities was interpersonal interaction. Rury (1991), in his historical study of why girls in the United States went to school in the 19th century, concluded that a major reason was to be with their friends. J. D. Allen (1986) observed classrooms and interviewed students and reported that a major classroom goal was to socialize. D. Bergin (1989) found that teenagers often named belongingness as a reason for pursuing out-of-school learning activities. Wentzel (1991) reported that adolescents' social interaction goals were the most frequently pursued goals. Although there is little research on whether younger children hold such explicit social goals, research has clearly demonstrated negative effects of social isolation and lack of belongingness for young children (e.g., Evans & Eder, 1993; Parker & Asher, 1987).

Oldfather (1993) and her colleagues have emphasized the collaborative, social nature of effective learning. For example, Oldfather and Dahl (1994) asserted that part of the process of generating meaning comes from the process of sharing meaning with others. Research has documented positive effects of cooperative and collaborative learning approaches, which include extensive social interaction, for young children (E. Cohen, 1986, 1994a, 1994b; Slavin, 1990; West & Oldfather, 1993). However, teachers should be warned of potential pitfalls of cooperative learning, such as one child doing all the work or exclusion of low-status children from the work (E. Cohen, 1986, 1994a, 1994b; Slavin, 1990; West & Oldfather, 1993).

Whole language philosophy emphasizes the importance of social interaction for well-being and for learning; it emphasizes peer interaction and belongingness more than traditional instruction. Whole language is predicated on a social model of learning that includes extensive interaction between teacher and students as well as among students. "Students in whole-language classrooms socialize with each other in ways similar to human socialization outside the classroom: learners talk with each other about what they are writing, the books they are reading, the problems they are solving or not solving, and the experiments they are conducting" (Watson, 1989, p. 135). When West (1994) asked children in a whole language classroom about fun aspects of literacy learning, they frequently named social issues like wanting "an audience for their accomplishments – an audience sensitive to their needs and interested in what they were doing" (p. 12).

Multiple Goals

Some goal theorizing has emphasized the importance of multiple goals for motivation (D. Bergin, 1989; Ford, 1992; Lee & Anderson, 1993; Wentzel, 1989, 1991). That is, motivation is likely to be stronger when a person has multiple goals for

pursuing an activity or an appropriate pattern of goals, as long as the goals do not conflict. For example, Lee and Anderson (1993) found that sixth graders who held a pattern of understanding and ego-social goals simultaneously were more likely to be intrinsically motivated to learn science than students who held only ego-social goals, or who held ego-social goals with task-avoidance goals.

Whole language philosophy supports an environment that engages multiple goals and appropriate patterns of goals. For example, writing a paper in a whole language classroom may address entertainment goals as children choose topics they are interested in, social goals as they discuss their topics with classmates, understanding goals as they discover new knowledge while writing, intellectual creativity goals as they grapple with original ideas, and positive self-evaluation goals as they create and sustain feelings of competence and self-worth (see Ford, 1992, or Ford and Nichols, 1987, for a taxonomy of human goals). Although children may pursue similar patterns of goals in traditional classrooms, it seems less likely, because the tasks are less likely to be selected by the child and because writing is more likely to be presented as a solitary, individualistic task.

Assessment

Classroom assessment has a profound effect on children's goals for learning, partly by fostering or avoiding ego goals. Ames (1992) pointed out that evaluation that highlights social comparison has negative effects on motivation and learning: "The range of examples in which social comparison is imposed and made public in the classroom is extensive, including announcements of highest and lowest scores; public charts of students' papers, scores, and progress; ability grouping; and displays of selected papers and achievements. The impact of social comparison on children when they compare unfavorably can be seen in their evaluations of their ability, avoidance of risk taking, use of less effective or superficial learning strategies, and negative affect directed toward the self" (p. 264). (Note that whole language philosophy supports publication and public display of student work, but not in a way that encourages students to compare who is best.) Covington and Beery (1976) suggested that schools may train children to focus on tests, not learning, and they may come to believe that what is not tested is not worth learning. Paris, Lawton, Turner, and Roth (1991) provided data suggesting that as students grow older, some become disillusioned with standardized achievement tests and care less about doing well on the tests; the authors called for more collaborative and authentic assessment that would promote learning as well as long-term motivation.

All of these observations by motivation researchers are compatible with whole language perspectives. Whole language philosophy recommends avoidance of ranking aspects of social comparison and suggests the use of portfolio assessment. Portfolios include written items and may also include pictures, an-

ecdotes, tapes, and written comments (Bergeron, 1990; Watson, 1989). Report cards may report no grades but rather may contain a narrative of the child's accomplishments (Oldfather, 1993, p. 673). Assessment in the whole language classroom may involve kid watching (Y. Goodman, 1978/1989a). Assessment focuses on successes and competencies rather than on failures and incompetencies; this is presumed to help students "develop the self-confidence and motivation to want to engage or invest themselves in learning" (Weaver, 1990, p. 214). Teachers may use miscue analysis (Y. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987) to determine how students are constructing meaning from text.

Tasks

Turner (1995) found that the goal of classroom tasks was closely related to motivated behavior. She defined two types of tasks, open and closed. Open tasks did not specify the goal of the task and left many choices in the hands of the student. Examples of such choices included deciding what information was relevant to the problem and how to use the information to solve a problem; thus, composition and trade-book reading were open tasks. Closed tasks specified what students were to do and what sort of procedure they were to follow; thus, worksheet exercises with one correct answer were closed tasks. Turner observed traditional basal classrooms and whole language classrooms and found that 77% of the tasks observed in basal classrooms were classified as closed, whereas the percentage was reversed in whole language classrooms – 73% of the tasks were open. In both types of classrooms, more complex, open-ended, authentic tasks were related to motivated behaviors that led to greater engagement in literacy. When the goal of the task was to find the one correct answer, motivated behaviors (reading strategy use, learning strategy use, help seeking, persistence, and volitional control) were less likely than when the goal of the task was more oriented to solving problems, satisfying curiosity, or generating creative responses. Turner pointed out that open tasks facilitated motivation even in basal classrooms, where most tasks were closed.

Miller, Adkins, and Hooper's (1993) study of elementary teachers' and students' experiences with literacy instruction was not in a whole language classroom, but it illustrates the link between goal orientation and tasks and how the complexity of whole language tasks might engage students. After interviewing students about their liking of and interest in specific assignments, the authors categorized the responses according to the goal each child seemed to hold. Students gave different reasons for liking simple versus complex assignments. Ego and work-avoidance responses tended to occur after simple literacy assignments, whereas task-mastery responses tended to occur after complex literacy assignments. For example, after completing two simple assignments, Mark, a third grader, gave ego-oriented reasons. In contrast, after completing a complex literacy assignment that required writing multiple sentences, he gave mastery-

oriented reasons: "It was kind of fun and it took a real long time. When I write my sentences I could include some of my family and when I finish them I could read them and it's fun to read them" (p. 83). Although the complex tasks these teachers assigned were not as open and student-based as typical whole language assignments, the pattern of responses does support the argument that more complex, open, student-chosen tasks, like those in whole language classrooms, lead to more adaptive motivational goals. Whole language philosophy clearly emphasizes open tasks over closed tasks. This emphasis can be seen in the forms of assessment discussed above, as well as in the emphasis on authentic reading and writing.

In summary, the goals that students hold profoundly affect their approach to learning. When students focus on the ego goal of doing better than others, they tend to study more superficially and to focus on the coming assessment rather than on the learning. Whole language philosophy emphasizes collaboration and social construction of meaning, learning patterns of goals over competitive goals, and an environment that values meaning-making as a crucial goal in order to foster continuing impulse to learn. The type of assessment influences student goals – well-implemented portfolio and other authentic assessments elicit a different sort of learning goal than do tests that measure only subskills or whose scores will be publicly posted.

Emotions

Emotions constitute an important aspect of motivation that has been less studied than cognitive aspects. In fact, Ford (1992) noted that for many theories of motivation, personal agency beliefs are the primary process of motivation and emotions are merely side effects. He pointed out that "emotions are not simply motivational 'add-ons' or 'afterthoughts' – they are major influences in the initiation and shaping of goals and personal agency belief patterns" (p. 147). Thus, the emotions that a person associates with experiences influence the person's goals and personal agency beliefs. In the following sections, we discuss the emotions of interest and anxiety, and also the influence of attributions on emotions. Although other emotions such as anger, fear, shame, excitement, and pride could be discussed, we have chosen interest, anxiety, and attributional influences on emotions because of their relevance to literacy instruction and because they have been studied extensively.

Interest

An emotional state that has recently received increased research attention is interest (Renninger, Hidi, & Krapp, 1992; Schiefele, 1991). Izard (1994), Ekman

(1994), and Ellsworth (1994) all included interest in their lists of fundamental emotions. For education researchers, interest refers to a content-specific preference for a topic or activity; interest may be enduring or short lived, general or specific, but it is not a personality trait (Schiefele, 1991). Eccles et al.'s (1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992) expectancy-value theory highlights the intrinsic value of a task, which includes interest, as part of the "value" side of the motivation equation. The theory also asserts that tasks may have utility value, which means that children will pursue even uninteresting tasks if they are important to achieving valued goals.

Research suggests that when students are interested in what they read, they engage in deeper processing, experience improved recall, and have better comprehension (Schiefele, 1991). According to Hidi and Anderson (1992), people "who are interested in a topic or an activity pay more attention, persist for longer periods of time, and acquire more knowledge than subjects without such interest" (p. 217). Lepper and Cordova (1992) and their colleagues have demonstrated that motivational embellishments that add interest and fun to a task can also increase learning. Thus, classroom situations that create interest or allow children to choose activities that interest them would be expected to enhance learning.

However, when Hidi and Anderson (1992) reviewed the few studies that have investigated the influence of interesting topics on quality of writing, they found that interesting topics did not necessarily lead to better writing for elementary school students. They suggested that one possible reason for this finding is that writing competence is heavily influenced by knowledge of the topic, and interesting topics are not necessarily topics that children know a lot about, at least initially (e.g., sharks, space travel, dinosaurs, and other exotic or adventurous topics). Of course, after interests have developed for a time, children are likely to accrue increased knowledge.

Whole language philosophy also asserts that interest in the learning task is crucial to learning. For example, Watson (1989) wrote, "In whole language classes, students are at the heart of curriculum planning; nothing is set into classroom motion until it is validated by learners' interests and motivated by their needs" (p. 133). One way to respond to students' interests is by allowing choice; whole language proponents call for providing learners with opportunities for choice that enhance their perceptions of autonomy and also allow them to engage their personal interests. Providing interesting activities is a crucial complement to providing choice, because choice between boring options can lead to classroom chaos. Nofziger (Freeman & Nofziger, 1991), a whole language teacher, noted that when he changed his classroom structure and began to give children increased choice, the classroom initially showed no improvement; however, he went on to state:

I knew that it was important for the children to make choices, and I did not want to give up on the idea. By watching the children, I could see which activities were not interesting to them. I thought about activities that had engaged them in the past and replaced some of the choices with those. By

following the lead of the children and their interests, I was able to create a classroom where students really had choice and accepted responsibility. (p. 72)

Whole language philosophy does not advocate ceding control of the classroom to children, but rather providing choices that are both interesting and educationally relevant. However, some whole language advocates are concerned that whole language is inappropriately viewed as warm, fuzzy, soft, accepting, and undemanding (Church, 1994; Field & Jardine, 1994).

Test Anxiety

Another emotion that has received considerable research attention is test anxiety (e.g., Covington & Omelich, 1987; Neveh-Benjamin, 1991). Although controversy continues about precisely what causes anxious students to experience lower achievement, it appears clear that anxiety is a negative emotion and should be avoided where possible. Some anxiety may motivate preparation, but excessive anxiety has negative effects during learning and testing. Whole language philosophy largely circumvents anxiety during testing by suggesting the use of assessment techniques other than formal tests. Because whole language philosophy is not concerned with comparing or ranking levels of competence, whole language teachers do not need to use assessment in which all students respond to identical prompts or items. Some of their approaches to assessment include journals, in which children discuss what they have learned; concept maps, in which students graphically represent the meanings they have constructed from what they have learned; and portfolios. Teachers may use kid watching, in which they ask "(1) What evidence is there that language development is taking place? and (2) When a child produces something unexpected, what does it tell the teacher about the child's knowledge of language?" (Y. Goodman, 1978/1989a, p. 119).

Attributions

According to Weiner's (1985) attribution theory, immediately following an outcome, people feel a generalized positive or negative emotion; then they seek a reason for the success or failure. They feel different emotions depending on the specific attribution and whether it is internal or external, controllable or uncontrollable, and stable or unstable. For example, if children do well on a writing assignment, they may make an internal causal attribution and feel the emotion of pride. If they fail and attribute the cause to the teacher, they are likely to feel anger. If they fail and feel it is their own fault and was controllable, guilt is likely to follow. If they fail and feel it is because they lack ability, and they perceive this lack of ability as stable and uncontrollable by them, they are likely to feel shame

and hopelessness. This analysis suggests that teachers should emphasize effort, which is controllable, over ability, which most older children and adults consider to be stable and uncontrollable.

The emphasis on effort over innate ability is compatible with whole language. Whole language philosophy assumes that effective reading and writing are primarily the results of instruction and effort, not immutable ability. Whole language philosophy exhorts provision of a supportive environment for risk taking, and within that context placing responsibility for learning on the students. For example, J. B. Allen, Michalove, Shockley, and West (1991) wrote that “Being a part of a whole language classroom means taking responsibility for your own learning” (p. 465); they also pointed out that this is particularly important for “children who view themselves as failures” (p. 460), which is congruent with attribution theory.

In summary, motivation and whole language research agree that when students experience positive emotions like interest, they are more likely to persist, learn at a deep level, and desire to return to a learning task. When they experience negative emotions like anxiety, they are more likely to avoid the task and to learn at a superficial level. The attributions that students and teachers make affect students’ emotions.

Personal Agency Beliefs

In Ford’s (1992) conceptualization, the third component of motivation is personal agency beliefs, which are of two types. Capability beliefs refer to the perception that one has the necessary skills to perform specific actions; context beliefs refer to one’s beliefs about whether the environment will respond to skillful attempts to achieve goals.

Capability Beliefs

Capability beliefs are central to nearly all cognitive theories of motivation. In expectancy-value theory, expectancy for success is a prominent determinant of motivation and affects performance, persistence, and task choice (Atkinson, 1978; Eccles et al., 1983). In attribution theory, which has roots in expectancy-value theory, expectancy for success is largely guided by beliefs about the stability of a cause (Weiner, 1985). In self-worth theory (Covington, 1992), “the protection of a sense of ability is the student’s highest priority – higher sometimes even than good grades – so that students may handicap themselves by not studying because to try hard and fail anyway reflects poorly on their ability” (p. 17). Following, we discuss in more detail two approaches to capability beliefs – self-efficacy and attributions.

Self-efficacy. In self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986, 1993, 1997), judgments of capability affect goals, persistence, and effort. Bandura points out that people may be physically or cognitively capable of some action (like picking up a spider or writing a paper), but still be unsuccessful, because they do not believe they are capable. Self-efficacy thus refers to “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). Self-efficacy is a good predictor of performance and achievement (Bandura, 1997; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991).

A key goal of whole language philosophy is to foster efficacy beliefs. According to whole language philosophy, the teacher should treat students as readers and writers. K. Goodman (1986) stated that whole language teachers “exude their belief in children. In their words and body language, in their programs and classroom ambiance, they say, ‘I know you can do it.’ ‘Go ahead and try.’ ‘Take your time.’ ‘I’m here to help you.’” (p. 79). Self-efficacy is fostered not only by believing in students, but also by creating skill development. Strong efficacy beliefs will prove to be maladaptive if they are empty, erroneous beliefs. Students need real skills as well as belief in their skills. Whole language philosophy emphasizes such skill development in the context of tasks that have meaning for students.

Watson (1989) vividly exemplified the concept of self-efficacy (without using that term) when she described Patty, who in a whole language kindergarten flourished as a writer, but in a skills-based first grade came to believe that she could not write because she could not spell. In the first grade, Patty came to believe that she was an incompetent writer and quit writing; even though she presumably still had the same capacities that she had in kindergarten, her negative beliefs undermined her writing. In a whole language second grade, Patty returned to being a writer.

Dahl (1993) provided a case study of Ellen, who began kindergarten as a gregarious “higher achieving” inner-city student. During kindergarten, she experienced a traditional reading readiness program, which used workbooks and worksheets, ability groups for workbook sessions, and sight-word recognition training. The curriculum also included a free-choice period in which Ellen experimented with writing. The first-grade curriculum used a basal reader, ability grouping, and worksheets. Ellen became less and less of a learner; for one assignment, Ellen had copied some sentences, and Dahl asked what they said. “She looked at me incredulously as if to say ‘we’re not supposed to READ them,’ and walked up to the teacher’s desk to have her paper graded” (p. 97). It appears that Ellen’s difficulty with learning to read was partly a function of undermining her efficacy that she could be successful (“Her demeanor indicated that she was doubtful that she could do well or that she could be accurate,” p. 96) and partly a function of her not constructing an understanding of how to read or why to read. She seemed to guess and to avoid risks when she could. Although it is true that other students in the same classroom successfully constructed an understanding of literacy, for Ellen, it appears that the basal-oriented curriculum undermined her confidence and her competence.

Bandura (1986) and Schunk (1991) pointed out that self-efficacy is affected through vicarious experience and is particularly interesting because level of performance can be changed just by changing self-efficacy – through observing a successful peer, for example – without actual practice of the behavior (Bandura, 1982). That is, when we observe someone else's success or failure, we infer our own competence at the same behavior, which affects our actual competence. When children are in a traditional classroom in which the only models are professional writers in an anthology, they may believe that they have nothing in common with an adult professional and low efficacy may be maintained. When they are in a classroom in which everyone writes, including the teacher, and the writing is displayed publicly, they are faced with many model writers who are similar to themselves (Schunk, 1987). It may not even occur to them to believe that they cannot write. Of course they can write, everyone does!

Social cognitive theory asserts that modeling is one of the most powerful ways of learning new behavior (Bandura, 1986), which is congruent with whole language philosophy. Bandura's theory and Vygotsky's theory are not so far apart as some might suggest (Tudge & Winterhoff, 1993; Zimmerman, 1993). One basic tenet of whole language philosophy is the notion of a teacher who pursues the same activities as the students. The teacher is a learner, not only an arbiter of knowledge, and continues to learn from and with the students. The teacher not only requests that the students write but also writes as well. As Brown and Mathie (1990) stated, "It is our experience that children like to model themselves on someone they admire; someone who has assumed significance in their lives. The teacher is, or should be, such a person. If we as teachers are seen in class to enjoy books and to write, and if we talk about the satisfaction that these experiences give us, then we are providing a positive model for our students" (p. 5). Freppon and Dahl (1991) quoted a teacher who said, "Children need to see me thinking through the process. I model my thinking, and I see them learning to think about letters and sounds.... I saw a big change in the children when I started this kind of modeling" (p. 194). Whole language philosophy emphasizes that teachers serve as models by reading to their students or telling them stories. Teachers demonstrate the importance of reading daily by reading narratives, poetry, songs, riddles, information text, and so forth. Books, student-authored works, and peers also serve as models.

Attributions and personal agency beliefs. Attribution-theory researchers have investigated the relationship between attributions and expectancies for success, which are a component of personal agency beliefs. The attributions people make regarding their competence and the responsiveness of the environment affect their expectancies for success and the probability they will attempt a task. Most research suggests that attributions to effort, which is controllable and potentially unstable, lead to better outcomes than attributions to ability, which most people perceive as stable and uncontrollable. If people experience failure and attribute it to lack of ability, they are unlikely to expect success, or even attempt success, in the future. This is a symptom of learned helplessness (Diener &

Dweck, 1978; Seligman, 1975). Attribution retraining represents an attempt to induce attributions to effort, particularly after failure (Forsterling, 1985). However, because attributions to effort can mean lack of ability (“Why do I have to try so hard? ‘Cause I’m not as smart/able/clever as other people”), it is important that attribution retraining occur in a mastery-oriented rather than ego-oriented or competitive environment (Covington & Omelich, 1979).

Whole language philosophy supports provision of these conditions – mastery goals in a setting that emphasizes effort and personal responsibility for learning rather than competitive situations that allow the teacher (and students) to rank the students according to ability.

Context Beliefs

The second type of personal agency beliefs are context beliefs, which refer to one’s beliefs about whether the environment will respond to bids to achieve goals. A responsive environment is essential for optimal motivation, because it affects all three aspects of motivation – goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs. For example, if children believe that no matter how hard they try, the teacher will harshly criticize their writing, they are experiencing an unresponsive environment that will tend to move their goals away from writing, cause negative emotions when they have to write, and undermine their belief that they can be competent writers.

The social-constructivist approach to motivation states that a responsive environment is a prerequisite for continuing impulse to learn. To describe this facilitative condition, Oldfather and Dahl (1994) invoked the concept of honored voice, “a condition of deep responsiveness in the classroom environment to students’ oral, written, and artistic self expression. Through honored voice the community of learners invites, listens, responds to, and acts upon students’ thoughts, feelings, interests, and needs” (p. 143). Thus, the teacher is deeply and genuinely responsive, giving careful attention to each student’s responses; and students too honor each other’s contributions.

Ford (1992) described four elements of a responsive environment that would foster positive context beliefs: congruence with the individual’s personal goals, congruence with the individual’s capabilities (optimal level of challenge), provision of resources (material and information) needed to facilitate goal attainment, and a supportive emotional climate. Whole language philosophy supports providing each of these elements; we discuss each in turn.

Congruence with children’s personal goals. The first aspect of the responsive environment is congruence with an individual’s personal goals. For example, a number of motivation researchers (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ford & Nichols, 1987; Oldfather & Dahl, 1994) have identified self-determination as a central goal or need in people’s lives. According to Deci and Ryan’s (1985, 1987) self-determina-

tion theory, self-determined behavior is initiated autonomously and is characterized by choice, flexibility, and absence of pressure. Events that are controlling tend to undermine intrinsic motivation and may include rewards, threats, deadlines, evaluation, and surveillance (see also Condry, 1977; Lepper & Greene, 1978; Morgan, 1984). However, these types of events only undermine intrinsic motivation if they are perceived as controlling. Events can also be perceived as informational, that is, providing information regarding one's competence. Information suggesting that one is competent fosters intrinsic motivation, whereas information suggesting that one is incompetent reduces intrinsic motivation. One should also keep in mind that when there is zero intrinsic motivation, extrinsic rewards can help by providing incentives for development of competence, which may result in intrinsic motivation. Note that motivation researchers are not unanimous in condemning extrinsic rewards where interest already exists (Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996).

Patrick et al. (1993) investigated the joint effects of perceived control and autonomy on children's behavior and emotion. In their self-report study of 264 third, fourth, and fifth graders, they found that positive emotions were related to intrinsic reasons for pursuing schoolwork, whereas negative emotions like anger, distress, and boredom were related to more extrinsic reasons. They concluded that "optimal motivation, then, characterized by active behavioral involvement, interest, enthusiasm, and happiness, is the result of both perceived control centered on the effectiveness of effort and reasons for engagement that are autonomous" (p. 789). They pointed out that in order to support autonomy, a classroom must provide "choice, lack of coercion, respect for children's own agendas, and learning activities relevant to children's own goals" (p. 789). This respect for children's goals provides a responsive environment that fosters motivation to learn.

According to whole language philosophy, teachers and students should share goal setting, and students' goals should evolve from active participation so that there is congruence between the children's goals and the environment the teacher provides. A goal of the whole language approach is learner empowerment through personal ownership, choice, and control (Fagan, 1989; McCarty, 1991; Pace, 1991). Children are challenged to set goals for themselves, which acknowledges their need for self-determination. The children's purposes and intentions drive learning (Edelsky, 1991a). The teacher and the students talk and mutually construct the goals and activities. In response to the children, the teacher provides authentic texts and opportunities for writing that engage the children's goals. This does not mean that children control the classroom; for example, the teacher may choose ocean life as an area of study and allow student choices within that domain. Students may decide to write journals about their responses to learning about sea creatures, or books that report what they have learned, or letters to organizations asking for information about ocean life – or they may decide to make a mobile, a wall chart, or an art project. The teacher

might offer a field trip to the zoo or aquarium. This sort of classroom sends the student the message that he or she helps set significant classroom goals, and the classroom environment responds in a supportive fashion.

Like most motivation research, whole language philosophy recommends the avoidance of systems of extrinsic rewards or monitoring systems whose aim is to control students. Students should feel that tasks belong to them and that they have choice regarding the tasks they pursue. Whole language proponents discourage adding spurious goals for the learner:

Now, if the sole purpose for the learning is extrinsic to the endeavor (e.g., pleasing the teacher by buying into her purpose, getting a good grade, staying eligible for band, etc.), then what is learned doesn't really matter. One thing could just as well be learned as something else as long as the teacher pleasing, good grade, or band eligibility is achieved. Not only might what is learned lose its value but the extrinsic purpose might also, so that more and more "motivators" would be needed to prod what becomes an increasingly empty exercise. (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991, p. 25)

Congruence with children's capabilities. A second aspect of a responsive classroom environment is congruence between the individual's capabilities and the tasks he or she is asked to do. Teachers need to provide tasks that are challenging enough to avoid being boring but not so challenging that students give up. This tends to provide an optimal level of challenge, which facilitates motivation and engagement (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Malone & Lepper, 1987). Whole language philosophy suggests the use of scaffolding; that is, in order to maintain an optimal level of challenge, teachers gradually eliminate or reduce support as the child's need lessens. Whole language teachers may feel the need for more specific skill or strategy work with a few children, and so may arrange for small-group instruction in temporary, flexible groups. The whole language approach of assigning open tasks that can be approached from different levels of competence also facilitates an optimal level of challenge (Turner, 1995). The tasks can be approached from each child's own level of skill.

Provision of resources. A third aspect of the responsive environment is provision of resources necessary for accomplishing goals. Whole language philosophy advocates provision of resources through a classroom rich in literacy resources (such as trade books, catalogs, student-authored works, reference books, and so forth) as well as authentic opportunities to practice literacy. Teachers may provide opportunities to practice literacy through reading aloud and publishing. Publishing means that the students' work is read by a wider readership than the typical "teacher-as-examiner" audience (Applebee, 1981; Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Rosen, 1975). Published work may be printed in a classroom newsletter, placed on school bulletin boards, or distributed to parents and the local library. The materials and learning situations supported by whole language philosophy are authentic, functional, and relevant. The tools of learning are real books, real writing, and real production of literature.

Supportive emotional climate. A fourth aspect of responsive environment is the perception of emotional supportiveness. One way the whole language approach attempts to provide emotional supportiveness is through teacher warmth. We use “warmth” as a catchall term to include various variables including empathy, supportiveness, responsiveness, and expression of affection. Although Brophy and Good (1986) found in their review that teacher warmth was not closely related to achievement, they did find that student attitudes were related to measures of teacher warmth and support. Behaviors measured included “praise, use of student ideas, willingness to listen to students and respect their contributions, and socializing with students in addition to instructing them” (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 369). Evidence of the importance of warmth for optimal development has also emerged from various fields outside of education. For example, there is evidence that parental warmth, particularly when combined with appropriate levels of control, is related to positive child outcomes such as prosocial behavior, social competence, self-esteem (C. Bergin, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), and academic achievement (L. Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991).

Although we have found few explicit recommendations in the whole language literature that teachers be warm, the entire literature is infused with an attitude of warmth and supportiveness. For example, D. Goodman (1991) commented on letters that she received from former students – “Amy also knows that I care about her. She cares about me, too” (p. 139), and “Amanda wrote her letter because she knows that her social acceptance and personal well-being are important to me” (p. 155). Oldfather (1993) wrote that the keys to student enthusiasm lie in “a deep responsiveness to students’ self-expression – to their ideas, opinions, feelings, needs, interests, hopes, and dreams” (p. 674). Whole language proponents have commented on the need to provide an environment that makes risk taking safe (J. B. Allen et al., 1991; Watson, 1989). For example, K. Goodman, Smith, Meredith, and Goodman (1987) wrote: “Young people who feel that they won’t be embarrassed or punished for the risks they take in writing are less likely to be uptight about their writing as adults. There’s no place in the classroom for sarcastic, caustic, or punitive responses to pupils’ writing, no matter how tentative or ineffective their efforts are” (p. 278).

A second way that the whole language approach attempts to provide emotional supportiveness is by avoiding threatening assessment. Whole language philosophy suggests that assessment should not be a threatening experience. Such threats can undermine the positive emotions toward literacy that teachers hope to foster. Whereas effective whole language instruction includes assessment and diagnosis, both formal and informal, whole language philosophy frowns on the teacher being thrust into the role of summative examiner; teachers, of course, should assess, but without the violation of trust that typical grading can create (Noddings, 1984).

It is important to note that neither whole language philosophy nor motivation research suggests that students should be able to do anything that they

want, or that all student work is equally good (then why revise?), or that teachers should be undemanding.

In summary, motivation and whole language research agree that when children believe they are capable because they have evidence of their competence, and when the environment is responsive to their bids for competence, they are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation, interest, confidence, and positive emotions. When they make attributions to effort in a mastery-oriented situation, they are more likely to view the causes of their failures as effort and to try hard in the future.

Comparative Studies of Motivation

Thus far, we have discussed the theoretical issue of whether motivation research would predict that effectively implemented whole language classrooms should foster appropriate motivation for literacy. In this section, we review research that actually compares whole language classrooms with traditional or skills-based classrooms.

Research generally supports the assertion that whole language instruction fosters motivation for learning. Researchers who have used observational research methods, both qualitative and quantitative, have generally found differences in motivated behaviors between whole language and traditional settings favoring whole language. Dahl and Freppon (1995) observed greater persistence, more effective coping strategies, and greater engagement in independent reading for inner-city kindergarten and first-grade whole language learners than skills-based learners. Freppon (1995) followed up the Dahl and Freppon (1995) study and closely observed eight students who had experienced whole language classrooms in kindergarten and first grade; in second grade, four students received whole language instruction (Continuing Group), while the other four received skills-based instruction (Transition Group). Freppon documented that during her second-grade observations, the Transition Group declined in interest, engagement, and self-initiated literacy behavior; however, when the curriculum was revised (because of a new principal) to include collaborative work, trade-book reading, and increased writing, their motivation for literacy behaviors improved. In contrast, the Continuing Group did not decline in motivation. Purcell-Gates, McIntyre, and Freppon (1995) found that children in whole language classrooms, as compared to children in skills-based classrooms, showed significantly greater growth in their knowledge of written language.

Turner (1995) found that learning strategy use was more common in whole language classrooms, and open tasks, which are more common in whole language classrooms, were positively related to reading strategy use, volitional control, and persistence. Morrow (1992) found more positive attitudes toward literature-based classroom instruction than toward a basal approach, which stu-

dents described as boring. West (1994) observed a second-grade classroom as the teacher implemented her second year of whole language philosophy and the students' first exposure to whole language. She documented how the students categorized whole language learning as fun and traditional literacy learning as work. They seemed to define fun not as entertainment or goofing off, but rather in motivational terms: "(1) having positive, constructive relationships with others; (2) having some control over the task; (3) feeling comfortable and confident; and (4) being engaged in learning" (p. 7).

One the other hand, quantitative attitude surveys have tended to find no difference between whole language and traditional students (McKenna, Stratton, Grindler, & Jenkins, 1995; Stahl, McKenna, & Pagnucco, 1994; Stahl & Miller, 1989). In contrast to the studies just described, which used observations of actual behavior, written artifacts, and interviews, attitude survey studies ask students to rate how they feel about literacy behaviors.

In one of the studies, McKenna et al. (1995) contrasted traditional elementary schools with whole language schools on attitude scales. They measured both recreational attitude (e.g., How do you feel about reading for fun at home?) and academic attitude (e.g., How do you feel about reading your school books?). They found no significant difference in attitude between whole language and traditional instruction. They also observed the two whole language teachers whose students reported the highest and lowest attitude means and found that both were eclectic in their implementation of whole language; both used systematic phonics instruction, but the teacher with higher recreational reading attitude scores devoted more time to writing, provided more print in the classroom, and contextualized her phonics instruction rather than following a rigid sequence of skills, which suggests that she was "more" whole language than the other teacher. This provides evidence for a possible reason why the attitude surveys generally found no differences – the whole language teachers may not have been effectively implementing a whole language philosophy. A second possible reason is that observational methods may be more sensitive to subtle differences than global attitude surveys.

Conclusion

In this article, we have argued that research on motivation for learning is congruent with whole language precepts. We have described specific areas where the two perspectives tend to converge. Convergence of principles from different research programs or philosophies suggests the principles are powerful and robust.

Regarding goals, both whole language and motivation research emphasize preferring goals of self-improvement and task mastery while avoiding ego goals of doing better than others, structuring the classroom to foster social interaction and feelings of belongingness, encouraging multiple goals for doing a task, and

using assessment that encourages students to focus on the learning not the grades.

Regarding emotions, both motivation research and whole language emphasize learning tasks that engage personal interest, and experiences and assessment that avoid provoking anxiety. We suggest that motivation researchers begin to pay additional attention to emotional aspects of motivation. For example, students' previous experience may leave emotional traces such as a love or hatred for a subject that defy rational analysis. It seems that the less rational aspects of motivation as manifest in emotions are the least understood, yet may be among the most important.

Regarding personal agency beliefs, both motivation research and whole language emphasize providing students with experiences that will increase their belief that they are capable (self-efficacy), modeling appropriate literacy activities by teachers and by peers, providing a responsive environment that is congruent with the children's goals and congruent with their capabilities (optimal level of challenge), providing materials that facilitate goal attainment, fostering a supportive emotional climate, emphasizing effort over ability attributions (particularly for failure), and supporting self-determination and autonomy by providing choice and flexibility.

A benefit of this article for whole language proponents is that we have made explicit the motivational principles that could be said to underlie whole language philosophy. Whole language theorists have pointed out that teachers benefit more from understanding theory underlying effective practices than from memorizing specific techniques, because theory is more likely to be useful for responding to situations that require flexible problem solving. It would be useful if whole language proponents emphasized motivational foundations of the approach in addition to the psycholinguistic, constructivist, sociocognitive, and sociocultural principles that are typically discussed. For example, familiarity with attributional principles of achievement and motivation might sensitize teachers to respond to student failure with attributions that are unstable and controllable, like effort; such familiarity could provide teachers with specific language for responding to student success and failure. That is, a teacher might respond to student success by saying, "I see your hard study paid off" instead of "It's nice to have such smart students in this class."

Whole language researchers have done little to describe the specific conditions and reactions that foster different emotions and have not specified what sort of feedback teachers should use to respond to failure. Sandra Graham (1991) pointed out that in their quest to provide a supportive emotional environment, teachers can subtly communicate to students that the students lack ability. For example, showing pity instead of anger or disappointment after failure, not blaming students for failure, and providing unsolicited help can all communicate to students that the teacher regards them as lacking ability. This does not suggest that teachers should be crabby or blaming toward failing students (that

would conflict with the principle of emotional supportiveness), but it does suggest that teachers need to be careful how they react to failure and how they offer help so as to avoid communicating to students that they lack ability.

A benefit of this article for motivation researchers is that we have pointed to whole language as a domain where principles espoused by motivation researchers have been put into practice. This provides evidence that these principles can be implemented on a large scale with considerable success. It also suggests that whole language classrooms can provide settings where motivation researchers could investigate motivation principles. One should keep in mind, however, that it is very difficult for teachers to use appropriate motivational and whole language strategies if school leaders support conflicting practices like emphasis on competitive goals, tracking, and ranking students (Maehr, Midgley, & Urdan, 1992). Motivation researchers who want to implement effective motivation principles in the schools should be interested in how whole language began largely as a grassroots movement and in a few years has strongly influenced classrooms throughout the United States and other countries. Most educational innovations have dismal records of nonimplementation (Cuban, 1984); why has whole language been so widely implemented? The current attacks on whole language, however, should also be a caution.

One potential area for collaborative research is goal setting, which is an area where motivation research and whole language research could converge, but have not. Research has provided strong evidence that the technique of goal setting causes improved performance and motivation in adults (Locke & Latham, 1984, 1990; Morgan, 1985, 1987), but has provided little evidence for young children. One of the studies done with young children (Bandura & Schunk, 1981) showed strong effects for 7 to 10 year olds, but it used individualized instruction that was a far cry from a whole language approach. Steve Graham, MacArthur, and Schwartz (1995) showed positive effects of goal setting on revising behavior of learning disabled fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. Whole language writers frequently refer to the importance of encouraging children to set goals, but they provide little specific advice concerning how to use goal setting. They describe highly developed methods for analyzing miscues (Y. Goodman et al., 1987), they adopt specific techniques for holding writing conferences (Graves, 1983), but they are vague about how to implement goal setting with children. Motivation researchers have a highly developed method and rationale for using goal setting, but little research with young children. Investigating goal setting with young children in whole language classrooms is an area that merits research, especially because having children participate in setting goals can facilitate implementing forms of alternative assessment.

A second area for collaborative research is the issue of motivational effects of whole language on low-achieving, at-risk, and minority students. A concern of several commentators has been that such students may not fare well in whole language and other less directive approaches to instruction (Delpit, 1988;

Pressley & Rankin, 1994; Stahl et al., 1994; Stahl & Miller, 1989) despite whole language claims that it is precisely those students for whom the approach works particularly well (e.g., Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991; Scala, 1993). Purcell-Gates (1995) pointed out that low-achieving students often do not share the culture of the school and are at a disadvantage when expected to infer the cultural rules; she stated that they need explicit instruction, though not the type that "moves all children through a preset scope and sequence of isolated skill work regardless of the conceptual development of individual children" (p. 222). Although some research has shown positive results of whole language with at-risk students (e.g., Dahl & Freppon, 1995; Freppon, 1995), the issue is not yet resolved. Practitioners would benefit from further research on how students who differ in achievement level, ethnicity, gender, social class, and so forth respond to different approaches to whole language in terms of their motivation and achievement.

A third issue that should concern both motivation and whole language researchers and that could benefit from collaborative research is that of control and choice. Both groups claim that perceptions of control and choice are critical for optimal development, yet there is strong evidence that external control is important for optimal development of children (Maccoby & Martin, 1983), and whole language classrooms are, in fact, highly structured in some dimensions. The question of whether skilled whole language teachers are as nondirective as they are often portrayed is open to research. The issue of what constitutes a proper amount of control comes up frequently in discussions of whole language (Church, 1994; Field & Jardine, 1994; K. Goodman, 1992; Shannon, 1989). Investigation by whole language and motivation researchers of appropriate levels and types of control would be helpful for practitioners and also for theory.

It is important to recognize that we have described whole language approaches as described by its proponents and theoreticians. The theory of whole language appears congruent with what research has shown to be effective for fostering motivation. Although we would not claim that motivation research necessarily implies a whole language philosophy, it can clearly be interpreted to support a whole language philosophy. We recognize that neither whole language proponents nor motivation researchers (of course, the two groups are not mutually exclusive) compose monolithic viewpoints, and not all will agree with our emphases.

Some might wonder whether motivation research could be used to support different, even contradictory or incompatible, approaches to instruction. Motivation research could clearly be used to support different forms of instruction, but those forms would be unlikely to be contradictory. That is, instruction may vary in terms of granting autonomy or emphasizing mastery goals or emphasizing positive emotions, but an approach that did not grant autonomy or emphasized ego-oriented goals or emphasized negative emotions would clearly be contradicted by motivation research. In principle, it seems that skills-based

classrooms could be directed in a way congruent with motivational principles developed in this article, but the studies cited in the comparative research section suggest that it is unlikely. In contrast, the very philosophy of whole language is congruent with motivation principles; a teacher would have to ignore the philosophy underlying the instruction in order to contradict motivation principles. The traditional, skills-based teacher would cross no philosophical boundaries in order to contradict some motivation principles; for example, providing little choice in the classroom or using competition to “motivate” would be congruent with most skills-based approaches but incompatible with most motivation research.

Some classrooms that claim to use whole language may not provide the sort of environment that we have described and would not create the benefits (Neuman & Fischer, 1995). As is said, “Many’s the slip twixt the cup and the lip”; that is, many educational innovations exist only on paper or in the minds of the creators, not in the experience of the intended recipients (see, for example, D. Cohen, 1990). We hope that this review might spark cross-disciplinary collaboration as well as recognition of whole language classrooms as potential settings for coming to understand student motivation.

Author Note

Versions of this article were presented at the meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association in Chicago, October 1993, and at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, April 1994. We thank Christi Bergin, Julie Turner, Ellen McIntyre, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

References

- Allen, J. B., Michalove, B., Shockley, B., & West, M. (1991). “I’m really worried about Joseph”: Reducing the risks of literacy learning. *The Reading Teacher*, *44*, 458–472.
- Allen, J. D. (1986). Classroom management: Students’ perspectives, goals, and strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, *23*, 437–459.
- Almasi, J. F., Palmer, B. M., Gambrell, L. B., Pressley, M. (1994). Toward disciplined inquiry: A methodological analysis of whole language research. *Educational Psychologist*, *29*, 193–202.
- Altwerger, B., Edelsky, C., & Flores, B. M. (1987). Whole language: What’s new? *The Reading Teacher*, *41*, 144–154.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *84*, 261–271.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students’ learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*, 260–267.
- Applebee, A. N. (1981). *Writing in the secondary school*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Atkinson, J. W. (1978). The mainsprings of achievement-oriented activity. In J. W. Atkinson & J. O. Raynor (Eds.), *Personality, motivation, and achievement* (pp. 11–39). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, *37*, 122–147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*, 117–148.
- Bandura, A. (1995). On rectifying conceptual ecumenism. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 347–375). New York: Plenum.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 586–598.
- Benware, C. A., & Deci, E. L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational set. *American Educational Research Journal*, *21*, 755–765.
- Bergeron, B. S. (1990). What does the term whole language mean? Construction of a definition from the literature. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *22*, 301–328.
- Bergin, C. A. C. (1987). Prosocial development in toddlers: The patterning of mother-infant interactions. In M. E. Ford & D. H. Ford (Eds.), *Humans as self-constructing living systems: Putting the framework to work* (pp. 121–143). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bergin, D. A. (1989). Student goals for out-of-school learning activities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *4*, 92–109.
- Bergin, D. A. (1992, April). *Goal-oriented perspectives in studies of motivation for learning*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Bergin, D. A. (1995). Effects of a mastery versus competitive motivation situation on learning. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *63*, 303–314.
- Bergin, D. A., & Cooks, H. C. (1995, April). “Acting white”: *Views of high school students in a scholarship incentive program*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Brophy, J. (1998). *Motivating students to learn*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328–375). New York: Macmillan.
- Brown, H., & Mathie, V. (1990). *Inside whole language: A classroom view*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Butler, R. (1987). Task-involving and ego-involving properties of evaluation: Effects of different feedback conditions on motivational perceptions, interest, and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *79*, 474–482.
- Cambourne, B. (1994). The rhetoric of “The rhetoric of whole language.” *Reading Research Quarterly*, *29*, 330–332.
- Cameron, J., & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *64*, 363–423.
- Church, S. M. (1994). Is whole language really warm and fuzzy? *The Reading Teacher*, *47*, 362–370.
- Cohen, D. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *12*, 311–329.

- Cohen, E. G. (1986). *Designing groupwork*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994a). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 1–35.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994b). *Status treatments for the classroom* [Video]. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Condry, J. (1977). Enemies of exploration: Self-initiated versus other-initiated learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 459–477.
- Covington, M. V. (1992). *Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press.
- Covington, M. V., & Beery, R. G. (1976). *Self-worth and school learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Covington, M. V., & Omelich, C. L. (1979). Effort: The double-edged sword in school achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 169–182.
- Covington, M. V., & Omelich, C. L. (1984). Task-oriented versus competitive learning structures: Motivational and performance consequences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 1038–1050.
- Covington, M. V., & Omelich, C. L. (1987). “I knew it cold before the exam”: A test of the anxiety-blockage hypothesis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 393–400.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1984). *Being adolescent*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890–1980*. New York: Longman.
- Dahl, K. L. (1993). Ellen, a deferring learner. In R. Donmoyer & R. Kos (Eds.), *At-risk students: Portraits, policies, programs, and practices* (pp. 89–101). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dahl, K. L., & Freppon, P. A. (1995). A comparison of inner-city children’s interpretations of reading and writing instruction in the early grades in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 50–74.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1024–1037.
- Deford, D. E. (1984). Classroom contexts for literacy learning. In T. E. Raphael (Ed.), *The contexts of school-based literacy* (pp. 163–180). New York: Random House.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people’s children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280–298.
- Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 451–462.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040–1048.
- Eccles (Parsons), J., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 78–146). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Edelsky, C. (1990). Whose agenda is this anyway? A response to McKenna, Robinson, and Miller. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (8), 7–11.
- Edelsky, C. (1991a). *Whole language: What’s the difference?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Edelsky, C. (1991b). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Edelsky, C. (1992). A talk with Carole Edelsky about politics and literacy. *Language Arts*, 69, 324–329.

- Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1991). *Whole language: What's the difference?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Edelsky, C., Draper, K., & Smith, K. (1991). Hookin' em at the start of school in a whole language classroom. In C. Edelsky (Ed.), *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (pp. 112–126). New York: Falmer Press.
- Eisenberger, R., & Cameron, J. (1996). Detrimental effects of reward: Reality or myth? *American Psychologist*, 51, 1153–1166.
- Ekman, P. (1994). All emotions are basic. In P. Ekman & R. J. Davidson (Eds.), *The nature of emotion* (pp. 15–19). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellsworth, P. C. (1994). Some reasons to expect universal antecedents of emotion. In P. Ekman & R. J. Davidson (Eds.), *The nature of emotion* (pp. 150–154). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, C., & Eder, D. (1993). "No exit": Processes of social isolation in the middle school. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22, 139–170.
- Fagan, W. T. (1989). Empowered students; empowered teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 42, 572–578.
- Field, J. C., & Jardine, D. W. (1994). "Bad examples" as interpretive opportunities: On the need for whole language to own its shadow. *Language Arts*, 71, 258–263.
- Ford, M. E. (1985). The concept of competence: Themes and variations. In H. A. Marlowe & R. B. Weinberg (Eds.), *Competence development* (pp. 3–49). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans: Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ford, M. E., & Nichols, C. (1987). A taxonomy of human goals and some possible applications. In M. E. Ford & D. H. Ford (Eds.), *Humans as self-constructing living systems: Putting the framework to work* (pp. 289–311). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "Burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review*, 18, 176–206.
- Forsterling, F. (1985). Attributional retraining: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 495–512.
- Freeman, Y. S., & Nofziger, S. D., Jr. (1991). WalkM to RnM 33: Vien Vinidos al cualTo 33. In Y. M. Goodman, W. J. Hood, & K. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Organizing for whole language* (pp. 65–83). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freppon, P. A. (1995). Low-income children's literacy interpretations in a skills-based and a whole language classroom. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 505–533.
- Freppon, P. A., & Dahl, K. L. (1991). Learning about phonics in a whole language classroom. *Language Arts*, 68, 190–197.
- Goodale, G. (1997, January 7). Word wars. *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 10–11.
- Goodman, D. (1991). Organizing a classroom as a community. In Y. M. Goodman, W. J. Hood, & K. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Organizing for whole language* (pp. 138–162). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Goodman, K. (1986). *What's whole in whole language?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Goodman, K. S. (1989). Whole-language research: Foundations and development. *The Elementary School Journal*, 90, 207–221.
- Goodman, K. S. (1992). Why whole language is today's agenda in education. *Language Arts*, 69, 354–363.
- Goodman, K. S. (1994). Deconstructing the rhetoric of Moorman, Blanton, and McLaughlin: A response. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 340–346.
- Goodman, K. S., Smith, E. B., Meredith, R., & Goodman, Y. M. (1987). *Language and thinking in school: A whole-language curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Richard C. Owen.
- Goodman, Y. M. (1989a). Kid watching: An alternative to testing. In G. Manning & M. Manning (Eds.), *Whole language: Beliefs and practices*, κ–8. Washington, DC: National

- Educational Association. (Reprinted from *National Elementary Principal*, 1978, 57, 41–45)
- Goodman, Y. M. (1989b). Roots of the whole-language movement. *Elementary School Journal*, 90, 113–127.
- Goodman, Y. M. (1997, June/July). Why I voted “no” on the position statement on phonics [Letter to the editor]. *Reading Today*, p. 32.
- Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (1987). *Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures*. New York: Richard C. Owen.
- Graham, Sandra. (1991). A review of attribution theory in achievement contexts. *Educational Psychology Review*, 3, 5–39.
- Graham, Sandra, & Golan, S. (1991). Motivational influences on cognition: Task involvement, ego involvement, and depth of information processing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 187–194.
- Graham, Steve, & Harris, K. (1994). The effects of whole language on children’s writing: A review of literature. *Educational Psychologist*, 29, 187–192.
- Graham, Steve, MacArthur, C., & Schwartz, S. (1995). Effects of goal setting and procedural facilitation on the revising behavior and writing performance of students with writing and learning problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 230–240.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers & children at work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children’s learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 890–898.
- Hancock, L. N., & Wingert, P. (1996, May 13). If you can read this *Newsweek*, 127, 75.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1992). Situational interest and its impact on reading and expository writing. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 215–238). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- IRA takes stand on phonics. (1997, April/May). *Reading Today*, pp. 1, 4.
- Izard, C. E. (1994). Innate and universal facial expressions: Evidence from developmental and cross-cultural research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 288–299.
- Lee, O., & Anderson, C. W. (1993). Task engagement and conceptual change in middle school science classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 585–610.
- Lepper, M. R., & Cordova, D. I. (1992). A desire to be taught: Instructional consequences of intrinsic motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 16, 187–208.
- Lepper, M. R., & Greene, D. (1978). *The hidden costs of reward*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Levine, A. (1994, December). The great debate revisited. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 38–44.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works!* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*, 1, 240–246.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- Maehr, M. L. (1976). Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 443–462.
- Maehr, M. L., & Braskamp, L. A. (1986). *The motivation factor: A theory of personal investment*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Maehr, M. L., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. (1992). School leader as motivator. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 410–429.
- Maehr, M. L., & Stallings, W. M. (1972). Freedom from external evaluation. *Child Development*, 43, 177–185.
- Malone, T. W., & Lepper, M. R. (1987). Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic

- motivations for learning. In R. E. Snow & M. J. Farr (Eds.), *Aptitude, learning, and instruction: Vol. 3. Conative and affective process analyses* (pp. 223–253). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McCarty, B. J. (1991). Whole language: From philosophy to practice. *The Clearing House*, 65, 73–76.
- McIntyre, E. (1992). Young children's reading behaviors in various classroom contexts. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 24, 339–371.
- McKenna, M. C., Robinson, R. D., & Miller, J. W. (1990a). Whole language: A research agenda for the nineties. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (8), 3–6.
- McKenna, M. C., Robinson, R. D., & Miller, J. W. (1990b). Whole language and the need for open inquiry: A rejoinder to Edelsky. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (8), 12–13.
- McKenna, M. C., Stahl, S. A., & Reinking, D. (1994). A critical commentary on research, politics, and whole language. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26, 211–233.
- McKenna, M. C., Stratton, B. D., Grindler, M. C., & Jenkins, S. J. (1995). Differential effects of whole language and traditional instruction on reading attitudes. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 19–44.
- Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 514–523.
- Miller, S. D., Adkins, T., & Hooper, M. L. (1993). Why teachers select specific literacy assignments and students' reactions to them. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 25, 69–95.
- Moorman, G. B., Blanton, W. E., & McLaughlin, T. (1994a). The rhetoric of whole language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 309–329.
- Moorman, G. B., Blanton, W. E., & McLaughlin, T. (1994b). Rhetoric and community in whole language: A response to Cambourne, Willinsky, and Goodman. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 348–351.
- Morgan, M. (1984). Reward-induced decrements and increments in intrinsic motivation. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 5–30.
- Morgan, M. (1985). Self-monitoring of attained subgoals in private study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 623–630.
- Morgan, M. (1987). Self-monitoring and goal setting in private study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 12, 1–6.
- Morrow, L. M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 27, 250–275.
- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 30–38.
- Neuman, S. B., & Fischer, R. (1995). Task and participation structures in kindergartens using a holistic literacy teaching perspective. *The Elementary School Journal*, 95, 325–337.
- Neveh-Benjamin, M. (1991). A comparison of training programs intended for different types of test-anxious students: Further support for an information-processing model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 134–139.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328–346.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nolen, S. B. (1988). Reasons for studying: Motivational orientations and study strategies. *Cognition and Instruction*, 5, 269–287.
- Nolen, S. B., & Haladyna, T. M. (1990). Motivation and studying in high school science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 27, 115–126.

- Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 46, 672–681.
- Oldfather, P., & Dahl, K. (1994). Toward a social constructivist reconceptualization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26, 139–158.
- Oldfather, P., & McLaughlin, H. J. (1993). Gaining and losing voice: A longitudinal study of students' continuing impulse to learn across elementary and middle level contexts. *Research in Middle Level Education*, 11, 1–25.
- Pace, G. (1991). When teachers use literature for literacy instruction: Ways that constrain, ways that free. *Language Arts*, 68, 12–25.
- Paris, S. G., Lawton, T. A., Turner, J. C., & Roth, J. L. (1991). A developmental perspective on standardized achievement testing. *Educational Researcher*, 20 (5), 12–20, 40.
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 357–389.
- Patrick, B. C., Skinner, E. A., & Connell, J. P. (1993). What motivates children's behavior and emotion? Joint effects of perceived control and autonomy in the academic domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 781–791.
- Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 167–199.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Pressley, M., & Rankin, J. (1994). More about whole language methods of reading instruction for students at-risk for early reading failure. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 9, 156–167.
- Purcell-Gates, V. (1995). *Other people's words: The cycle of low literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Purcell-Gates, V., & Dahl, K. (1991). Low-SES children's success and failure at early literacy learning in skills-based classrooms. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23, 1–34.
- Purcell-Gates, V., McIntyre, E., & Freppon, P. A. (1995). Learning written storybook language in school: A comparison of low-SES children in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 659–685.
- Renninger, K. A., Hidi, S., & Krapp, A. (1992). *The role of interest in learning and development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Richardson, L. (1994, January 31). More schools are trying to write textbooks out of the curriculum. *The New York Times*, pp. 1, 12.
- Rury, J. (1991). *Education and women's work: Female schooling and the division of labor in urban America, 1870–1930*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Scala, M. A. (1993). What whole language in the mainstream means for children with learning disabilities. *The Reading Teacher*, 47, 222–229.
- Schiefele, U. (1991). Interest, learning, and motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 299–323.
- Schunk, D. H. (1987). Peer models and children's behavioral change. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 149–174.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 207–231.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Shannon, P. (1989). The struggle for control of literacy lessons. *Language Arts*, 66, 625–634.
- Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Stahl, S. A., McKenna, M. C., & Pagnucco, J. R. (1994). The effects of whole-language instruction: An update and a reappraisal. *Educational Psychologist*, 29, 175–185.
- Stahl, S. A., & Miller, P. D. (1989). Whole language and language experience approaches for beginning reading: A quantitative research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 87–116.

- Stanovich, K. E. (1990). A call for an end to the paradigm wars in reading research. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 22, 221–231.
- Steinberg, J. (1997, May 11). Teaching children to read: Politics colors debate over methods. *The New York Times*, p. 24.
- Steinberg, L., Mounts, N. S., Lamborn, S. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across varied ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 1, 19–36.
- Tudge, J. R. H., & Winterhoff, P. A. (1993). Vygotsky, Piaget, and Bandura: Perspectives on the relations between the social world and cognitive development. *Human Development*, 36, 61–81.
- Tunnell, M. O. (1989). Using “real” books: Research findings on literature based reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 42, 470–477.
- Turner, J. C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children’s motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 410–441.
- Urduan, T. C., & Maehr, M. L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement: A case for social goals. *Review of Educational Research*, 65, 213–243.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1984). An introduction to radical constructivism. In P. Watzlawick (Ed.), *The invented reality* (pp. 17–40). New York: Norton.
- Watson, D. J. (1989). Defining and describing whole language. *Elementary School Journal*, 90, 129–141.
- Weaver, C. (1990). *Understanding whole language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548–573.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1989). Adolescent classroom goals, standards for performance, and academic achievement: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 131–142.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Social and academic goals at school: Motivation and achievement in context. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 7, pp. 185–212). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- West, J. (1994). *Children’s perceptions of fun and work in literacy learning* (Perspectives in Reading Research No. 7). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.
- West, J., & Oldfather, P. (1993). On working together: An imaginary dialogue among real children. *Language Arts*, 70, 33–44.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, 12, 265–310.
- Willinsky, J. (1994). Theory and meaning in whole language: Engaging Moorman, Blanton, and McLaughlin. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 334–339.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1993). Commentary. *Human Development*, 36, 82–86.

Manuscript received: January 7, 1996

First revision requested: April 2, 1996

Final revision received: September 5, 1997

Accepted for publication: September 15, 1997

J L R

Journal of Literacy Research
Copyright © 1998 National Reading Conference Inc.
All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

N R C