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At the Northeast Regional Conference this summer, U.S. National Teacher of the Year for 2014 Sean McComb electrified attendees with his vision of the way to advance education—a vision that captures the thrust of this issue of the Bulletin: Educating the Whole Child. McComb offered four “shifts” that must occur to advance education: sparking hope by building each student’s belief in a bright future and the ability to make it happen; teaching “kids before content”; building a collaborative culture in the classroom and the school; and addressing the needs of the whole child. One might consider the fourth shift somewhat redundant, for the first three clearly speak to the importance of developing a laser-like focus on each child in all his or her dimensions—emotional, social, and academic. Movingly, McComb reminded DKG members of the importance that a teacher can make in the life of a student—and particularly a troubled or economically disadvantaged student. For him, making such a difference by seeing and believing in the whole child is nothing less than working to bend the “arc of moral justice.”

In her article based on an interview with Dr. Nancy Gibson, past president of ASCD and an advocate for teaching the whole child, editorial board member Trybus provides a thorough definition and explanation of the concept, thereby setting the stage for the entire issue. Williams urges educators to remember the importance of classroom, school, and professional culture in teaching the whole child. With a different perspective on culture as related to the child’s background and familial history, Malone warns of the potential for culture clash between educators and parents regarding the meaning of parental involvement.

The next three authors in this issue focus on specific ways to address the varied needs of the whole child. Adair reports on an extensive class project designed to educate her students emotionally, intellectually, and morally to cope with the challenges of a culture of violence. Osborne advocates a more student-centered approach to teaching mathematics, while McKee-Waddell urges educators to “meet students where they are” in the digital age. Although her focus is on teaching composition and she provides an extensive list of digital tools in that discipline, her message is appropriate for all educators.

Inspired by the theme and seeing its alignment with her “soap-box issues” relative to the social, emotional, and civic development of young people, Szabo weaves a consideration of negative trends in education with suggested theory and practice to “do what is right for children.” Through a case study of four teachers, Morris reminds educators that, in order to do the right thing in addressing the needs of the whole child, one must exercise care for herself, colleagues, and students. In a similar vein, Wiedmer urges consideration of generational differences as drivers of the unique needs of each individual and offers ways to meet those needs in the classroom and workplace.

It is not surprising that McComb spoke to the hearts of those in attendance at the regional conference. As the authors in this issue demonstrate, DKG members clearly understand the importance of advancing education by identifying and meeting the needs of the whole child—and the whole individual!

Judith R. Merz, EdD
Editor
Interview

Advocating for the Whole Child: An Interview with Dr. Nancy Gibson
By Margaret Trybus

This interview continues a series initiated by members of the Bulletin's Editorial Board. The goal of the series is to feature interviews conducted with Delta Kappa Gamma members or other educational leaders on a topic related to the theme of the issue. Here, Dr. Margaret Trybus presents the results of an interview with ASCD past president, educational whole-child advocate, and university professor Dr. Nancy Gibson regarding the whole-child movement.

An Introduction to Dr. Gibson

Nancy Gibson, PhD, has been a member of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Board of Directors for 5 years and is currently serving as past president of that board. She has long been an advocate at both the state and the federal level promoting the passage of resolutions supporting the education of “the whole child.” Dr. Gibson has also been a member of the ASCD Legislative Committee, a small group of members who annually develop ASCD’s legislative lobbying agenda.

She has been a superintendent of schools, assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, principal, and special education teacher. She has observed teaching and learning in Argentina, Thailand, Cambodia, China, South and North Vietnam, Egypt, and Quatar with an eye toward international perspectives on the whole child.

Introduction to the Interview

ASCD convened the first Commission on the Whole Child in 2006 and launched the Whole Child Initiative. Dr. Gene Carter, the ASCD Executive Director, who convened the Commission, wrote that it set out to “redefine the definition of a successful learner from one whose achievement is measured solely by academic tests to one who is knowledgeable, emotionally and physically healthy, civically inspired, engaged in the arts, prepared for work and economic self-sufficiency, and ready for the world beyond formal schooling.” The Commission acted in response to the debate over standards-based education that permeated conversations among educators, policymakers, parents, and community leaders who were reforming schools and instructional programs.

The Whole Child Commission was made up of leading thinkers, researchers, and practitioners from a wide variety of sectors. Some individuals who served on this 20-member commission were John Goodlad, James Comer, Stephanie Pace Marshall, Nel Noddings, Elliot Eisner, and Pedro Noguera. The outcome of the first Commission on the Whole Child was a report from ASCD entitled “The Learning Compact Redefined: A Call to Action,” published in 2007.
Having a leadership role in ASCD has brought Nancy Gibson to the forefront of educating the whole child and applying the tenets of this movement throughout the international educational community. The following summarizes an interview with this educational leader.

**How did the Commission define a “whole child,” and why is it important to educate children with that concept in mind?**

The report stated that it is important to recognize that, in order to compete and survive in our global economy, we must educate our children so that they can be prepared to “live and contribute to a worldwide community of shrinking size and growing complexity.” It is important for students to reach their full potential and have a well-rounded education: emotionally, physically, artistically, musically, and academically. That was the impetus for ASCD forming the first Commission on the Whole Child, and their work is still relevant today.

The Commission defined a whole child as one who is “intellectually active; physically, verbally, socially, and academically competent; empathetic, kind, caring and fair; creative and curious; disciplined, self-directed and goal oriented; free; a critical thinker; confident; cared for and valued.”

**How did the whole-child movement develop and gain momentum?**

The Commission, made up of premier researchers, determined that the demands of the twenty-first century require a comprehensive approach to learning not limited to just basic reading and mathematics. In fact, ASCD partners with more than 51 other organizations that all support the idea of the whole child. ASCD has an education advocacy department composed of full-time, professional lobbyists who have presented the whole-child tenets to legislators. In fact, the new *No Child Left Behind* legislation is being addressed to include multiple measures for accountability, rather than a limited scope of standardized tests—a move that supports the whole-child movement.

Gibson is very involved in advocacy and, under her leadership, a Whole Child Resolution was passed in the Illinois Senate in March 2012, making the tenets of the whole child widespread throughout the state. She was also part of an advocacy team that found co-sponsors for a federal resolution on the whole child. In fact, many states now have...
legislative resolutions that support the whole child, and international affiliates through ASCD are agreeing with the need to adopt. For example, Argentina is very much interested in the whole child and, according to Gibson, “I have seen problem-based learning that is impressive where students are engaged in learning... Also, in a small village in Thailand, I saw 72 students in one standard-sized classroom with no desks and sharing books, who wouldn't have the resources to support the whole child, yet so needed.”

**What are the tenets of the whole child and how should they be used?**

Five tenets make up the whole-child approach to education. These include **healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged**. If stakeholders want to improve schools and include families and communities to help children succeed, they need to address all of these tenets.

To this end, ASCD has created indicators of the Whole Child Tenets. For example, to meet the tenet of **safe** schools, educators need to review school climate and culture to insure that physical, emotional, academic, and social aspects of the school are “safe, friendly, and student-centered” ([http://www.wholechildeducation.org/assets/content/mx-resources/wholechildindicators-all.pdf](http://www.wholechildeducation.org/assets/content/mx-resources/wholechildindicators-all.pdf)). The **healthy** tenet works toward reinforcing the “health and well-being of each student, through physical education, curriculum, and instructional support...by addressing life-time fitness knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, and skills.” According to Gibson, some of the tenets are more difficult to follow in certain neighborhoods where children may not be safe, which is a basic need. **Healthy** may be more important to consider in poor, urban, or rural towns where health care may not be available. “Children in rural towns in China are probably not getting the health care they need.” In the same way, “Emotionally and socially are dependent on where you live and what kind of family you come from...it could be good or not so good.”

By taking an inventory of each tenet, school personnel and community members can assess the extent to which they are addressing the needs of the whole child. To do so requires a whole-community response. Examples of such response might be health-care providers working with schools: having health clinics inside the school, providing healthy meals that might be the only nutritional meal children have, and having the conversation as partners working in collaboration. According to Gibson, “That is what the Commission found; they wanted to have the conversation about the whole child and the tenets of the whole child with community leaders from each walk of life.” The five tenets are a way to focus conversations within the school and within the whole community.

**Are there ways schools are being recognized for adopting the tenets and putting the whole-child approach into action?**

The ASCD website ([http://www.Wholechildeducation.org/](http://www.Wholechildeducation.org/)) has highlighted examples of schools and communities that are recognized for implementing whole-child approaches. At the site, an individual can see many models and search on a variety of initiatives from global education to parent and family engagement to find ideas that can help one get started in the whole-child movement. Gibson shared there is a formal program for submitting applications to be evaluated for recognition as a whole-child school.
Are there any assessments schools are using to address the needs of the whole child beyond state and national tests?

Many conversations on assessment related to the whole child have focused on lobbying efforts at the federal level on this topic. Gibson firmly states, “…multiple measures of student success—notice I didn’t say student achievement—are important. So there would be different ways, for example, to determine if a child was healthy and socially and emotionally fit, as opposed to a paper-and-pencil test or an electronic test. We feel really strong about multiple measures of student success.” Gibson and the lobbyist have met with legal aides of senators who are working on revisions to No Child Left Behind, expressing the importance of multiple measures. Advocacy and influence with legislators is important for changes in assessment to be understood and aligned with the needs of the whole child.

How are you seeing the tenets of the whole child develop into community partnerships?

Gibson shared her own personal experiences, discussing her work as the school superintendent in a small city of about 30,000 people. She joined the Rotary and Chamber of Commerce, served on both boards, and worked with the mayor, who was the first person she went to see in the community. They shared ideas for an early childhood center, an onsite health clinic, and adult-education lessons for parents. With the Rotary, she got involved in projects that might be helpful with children’s social and emotional issues. What is key, according to Gibson, is building that network. “This needs to happen in communities, with everybody working together as partners and collaboratively talking about what is best for our kids. And what is best for our kids is a well-developed educational system and support system that helps them be all that they can be.”

How important is it to sustain the whole-child movement in this day and age?

Sustaining the movement is absolutely important. If one looks at the global perspective, what is happening in the global economy, and now what is happening with violence and other big issues and challenges facing everyone, it is clear we have big problems to solve as a global society. Gibson is adamant that “we need every child across the continent, every child in every country, to be educated to their fullest potential and be contributing, because we need them.” The whole-child framework is a way to develop and prepare students fully to reach this ideal.
A Critical Conversation: Remembering Culture in the Teaching of the Whole Child
By Ereka R. Williams

The author addresses the relationship between culture, schooling, and education of the whole child. She uses historical scholarship from the field of anthropology to unpack the significance of having those involved with the day-to-day operations of schools and classrooms critically examine their culture, the culture of the organization in which they work, and the institutional culture of the profession in the education of the whole child in the twenty-first century.

“Culture, then, consists of standards for deciding what is, standards for deciding what can be, standards for deciding how one feels about it and standards for deciding how to go about doing it.”
(Goodenough, 1981)

To address educating the whole child, it is essential to discuss the role that culture plays in that process. The culture of the child is where some would start; however, the culture of the systems children inherit and are asked to learn within matter as much, if not more. To attempt this discussion otherwise would be akin to talking about an egg yolk in the absence of talking about the egg itself: it is simply incomplete. A review of historical scholarship from the fields of anthropology and education offers a clear and guiding light into why those responsible for leading classrooms and schools must come back to culture and examine the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of beliefs and practices if the goal is truly to reach the whole child.

What is Culture?

Nearly 35 years ago, in the now classic book, Culture, Language and Society (1981), anthropologist Ward Goodenough explored the systems that facilitate each. From his perspective, culture is fluid and is a product of one’s experiences. Culture is not something that rests outside of a person—an “out there” phenomenon—but rather is internal. It operates at the core of “recipes, routines, values, and beliefs” (Goodenough, p. 90) of an individual. According to the Goodenough model of culture, all objects, practices, persons, and events in an individual’s conceptual framework have some kind of symbolic meaning. Individuals do not arbitrarily assign positive or negative feelings to objects or occurrences; such feelings are learned. As such, culture is a product of human learning.

When one explores the intersection of culture and schools from the Goodenough (1981) model, some questions naturally evolve:

- What are the “recipes, routines, values, and beliefs” of schools?
• What symbolic meanings have been attached to the practices and persons of schools?

• Are the beliefs that are printed in the school’s vision or mission statement on the wall of the reception area alive and breathing daily in the hallways, classrooms, and cafeteria of the school?

• Do the daily interactions between leaders, learners, families, teachers, custodians, and so forth mirror those stated beliefs?

These questions are intentionally thought-provoking and the answers that surface in a school speak volumes about whether the whole child is at the center of the beliefs and practices of a school’s personnel.

Beliefs in Action

Actions are the manifestation of beliefs. To understand the practices of an individual or a group of individuals is to understand first what it is he, she, or they believe. The curricula (written and unwritten) and the activities designed to support the curricula all speak to the belief systems of administrators, faculty, and staff. For example, teachers who pride one philosophical orientation to learning and teach primarily toward that orientation (regardless of various learning preferences of the students) put forth the belief that there is a “right” way of learning. From the Goodenough (1981) model, the standards for what is, what can be, and how it should be done (or culture) of this school have clearly been established. However, is it a culture for supporting the whole child?

Values and symbols are transmitted in schools daily through practices and protocols. School practices that limit physical education, out-of-class experiences, or recess in the effort to increase seated academic-learning time communicate a set of values. Classrooms that display little if any student work products also communicate a set of values or beliefs. Likewise, school personnel who continue to hold parent conferences and ceremonies primarily during the work day as opposed to nontraditional times that are a better fit for the work schedules of families are clearly communicating a definitive culture for schooling. These practices articulate a loud and clear cultural message that emphasize habitual procedures that, in too many cases, are antithetical to what educators know is sound for human growth and development. They are practices that all too often are also not conducive to building collaborative, reciprocal relationships between the families of the twenty-first century and school personnel. So, what happens when schooling culture and community culture do not align? What happens when families struggle to fit into the culture of the school that their children must attend? Who ultimately holds the responsibility for deciding what is and what will be best for the child?

Ereka R. Williams, PhD, is a professor and Chairperson for the Interim in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University in Greensboro, North Carolina. Her scholarship of teaching and engagement centers on issues of equity, family/community voice, teacher preparation, and leadership. She has presented her research internationally and nationally in her area of expertise and has several articles, monographs, and book chapters to her credit. Williams is a native North Carolinian and member of Beta Gamma Chapter of Eta State Organization (NC). ewilliam@ncat.edu.
The Responsibility to Change

School leaders have such a moral obligation to assist in the growth and development of children and adults that an increased awareness of self is extremely important...[They] must foster a genuine feeling of identification with others...[and] recognize that healthy school environments promote collaboration, cooperation, and interdependence. (Combs et al., 1999, p. 115).

Individuals working for cultural change in schools must keep students—and specifically the whole child—at the forefront of all their interactions in the learning environment. Although saying this would seem to be unnecessary, the opposite is true. In the present and ever-increasingly dominant school-accountability phase of American education, educators face mandates that have, unfortunately, reduced students to state test proficiency levels, numbers on a scale, proficient versus nonproficient, and exceptional versus average. All too often, educators do not discuss students using growth and travel metaphors but instead use machine metaphors and raw materials analogies. Rather than facilitating conversations about teaching that address the engaging, dynamic, interactional enterprise that it truly is or could be at its best, educators often discuss teaching in terms of efficiency and bottom-lines, seemingly preferring to address product over process. For example, facilitating dialogue on a curricular planning day among a group of middle-school literacy teachers about ways to interject student voice and choice into the literacy objectives and requirements for the next quarter and highlighting best practices from the latest issue of a reputable practitioner journal with some modeling by a fellow teacher-leader creates a focus on student culture, engagement, and interaction in the classroom. However, to spend that planning day looking at quarterly benchmark data in isolation, reconstituting remedial groups based on testing-day data alone, and focusing on how these data sets will factor into teacher evaluation at the end of the year is to limit the nature of the learning environment. Such a narrow focus reduces the experience to boxes on a checklist void of connection to learners, their culture, and the wide range of possibilities in the learning environment.

To affect school culture in a way that is toward the ultimate benefit of the whole child, educators must examine their language as well as their practices. If consonance between whole-child practices, school culture, families, faculty, and leaders is possible, it will only come after leaders and other standard- or culture-bearers address issues related to their self-perceptions as leaders of and participants in the current environment. Once these dispositions are identified and addressed, the work toward promoting an atmosphere of collegiality for and among themselves, students, and the community can begin in earnest. Leaders and other participants in the school environment must be clear about the dispositions before they can begin to align to whole-child-oriented practices. Therefore, it is essential that leaders in the school environment and classroom consistently assess the following questions:

- What do my body language and facial expressions communicate to colleagues, families, and learners?
• Does my tone indicate concern? Sincerity?
• As a leader, am I modeling respect for all who engage in this environment?
• Do my communication practices (e-mail, letters home to families, updates on operations) operate from a place of “we” and “us,” or do they convey a dictatorial approach?
• Are the stakeholders invited to build the environment or am I informing stakeholders of what has been predetermined?
• How do I demonstrate my commitment to each child’s growth and his or her right to an education?

As culture bearers in the learning environment, educators must remember to conduct these self-checks intermittently to move away earnestly from tendencies toward authoritarian, isolated, disconnected roles in the learning community.

The classic scholarship of the authors referenced here raises significant issues related to what those who are concerned about the whole child should consider. Goodenough’s classic model (1981) simply serves as a reminder or indicator as to how complex and daunting a task it is to address culture. Nevertheless, no matter how complex or deeply embedded a given culture may appear, the exercise of critical reflection, examination, and dialogue must occur in these spaces in which children are expected to learn and grow. This examination is a task worth the effort if building schools and environments that promote and sustain the whole child is the objective. Ignoring the culture of schools and schooling is akin to ignoring the very foundation most essential as professionals and global citizens, wholly committed to children and their futures.

References

Culture: A Potential Challenge for Parental Involvement in Schools

By Debra Malone

Parental involvement is an important area of research because of its seemingly positive influence on academic achievement (Hill & Craft, 2003; Jasso, 2007). The author argues that cultural influences can create poor understanding and limited congruency between parents’ and educators’ perceptions of appropriate parental involvement practices.

The significance of parental involvement (PI) in a child’s academic success began to be considered in the 20th century (Tekin, 2011). In fact, PI first occurred in nursery schools in the United States from 1920 to 1960. Mothers worked as teachers’ assistants in the classrooms and provided other support for the staff. Middle-class families were the first to become involved in these efforts.

More than 50 years later, scholars have continued to show an interest in the topic of PI because researchers have consistently established a direct association of PI with positive student academic outcomes (Ryan, Kelly-Vance, Ryallas, & Nero, 2010). Even though legislators have implemented No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Goals 2000, and other federal initiatives to increase PI in America’s public education system, the reality is that many educators are dismayed about the rate of PI in schools. The assumption is, in fact, that some educators find it difficult to foster an environment that is conducive to PI. However, because PI is beneficial to students at all levels, limitations on PI at any grade level can have a negative bearing on student academic outcomes (Epstein, 2010).

Clearly, poor understanding and limited congruency exist between parents’ and educators’ views of PI practices (Robles, 2011; Shute, Hansen, Underwood, & Razzaouk, 2011; Wright, 2009). Because there is no consensus as to what PI actually includes, the variety of views available can create conflict, especially when cultural differences are brought into play (Pomerantz, Moorman, & Litwack, 2007). Lerach (1995) asserted, “Culture is the shared knowledge and schemes created by a set of people for perceiving, interpreting, expressing, and responding to the social realities around them” (p. 9). Culture determines what values and traditions individuals embrace, their mindsets, and their mannerisms (Johnson, 2012). I contend that culture is a potential challenge to educators in fostering of environments conducive to PI.

Culture as a Challenge to Parental Involvement

In 2000, racial and ethnic minorities made up approximately 28% of the United States population. A decade later, “according to the 2010 U.S. Census, approximately 36.3 % of the population belonged to a racial or ethnic minority group” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014, para. 1). Clearly, the populations of U.S. public schools have become
more culturally diverse, and this change challenges both educators and parents in regards to PI (Johnson, 2007). The diversity in schools reflects the cultural diversity in society, which in itself can be a challenge for educators (Larocque, Kleiman, & Darling, 2011). While the U.S. public schools have become more culturally diverse with students immigrating to the United States, in many instances the educational field has remained homogeneous (Seidl & Friend, 2002; U.S. Department of Education, 2004, 2013). Although some officials have endeavored to prepare their teachers and administrators to work effectively with diverse populations via educator preparatory programs and in-service staff and faculty development programs, some educators have reported not feeling comfortable or adequately trained to do so (Sleeter, 2001).

Without effective training, educators may not be able to recognize and encourage forms of PI that have a strong cultural basis or influence. For instance, PI includes communication with educators, volunteering at schools, fostering learning at home, engaging in the decision-making process at the campus or district level, and participating in school and community partnerships (Epstein, 2002). Because culture determines an individual’s attitudes, beliefs, and actions, some families may find it challenging to participate in their children’s schooling because of cultural influence.

Indeed, Larocque et al. (2011) conducted a study and found that, although minority students did not directly present a challenge to educators, oftentimes cultural issues arose because of poor understanding between educators and families of different cultures. Cultural issues in schools ranged from the concept of personal space to the perception of authority figures (Larocque, et al., 2011). Sometimes, such cultural issues intensified when educators and families from different cultural backgrounds interacted, and, in turn, the interactions influenced how educators perceived the families’ willingness to be involved in school.

Traditionally, minority ethnic subgroups have views of PI that differ from those of their Anglo-American counterparts. Such differences should not be assumed to be negative, however, as parents from various ethnicities have clearly supported their children’s academic achievement (Chang, Park, Singh, & Sung, 2009). Nevertheless, cultural practices or beliefs influence the types of PI and vary from one ethnicity to another (Hill & Taylor, 2004; Pena, 2000). For example, Eccles and Harold (1996) found that Anglo-American families were more actively engaged in volunteering at school, while other ethnicities participated at home. Generally, minority families assisted their children with homework and inspired them to perform well in school so that they would have greater opportunities for successful futures (Patel & Stevens, 2010).

Some Specific Examples

Poorly understood views of PI presented a need for an in-depth analysis of these differences (Chang et al., 2009; Howard & Reynold, 2008; Spera et al., 2009; Wong & Hughes, 2006). Such an in-depth look by various researchers showed that cultural challenges...
hindered the PI of some families, regardless of their education levels and socioeconomic status (SES). For instance, Isk-Ercan (2010) investigated the perspectives of well-educated, affluent Turkish-American parents regarding their children’s early elementary education in the United States. Specifically, Isk-Ercan explored these parents’ engagement with or disengagement from the school culture and found that their sociocultural comprehension of education influenced their support at home and their relationships with school personnel. Some Turkish families used their cultural backgrounds to inform their teaching methods at home. For example, they only reinforced teaching practices they believed were academically rigorous and ignored or shunned all others. The parents only promoted practices they had encountered in their own schooling. Because these parents did not fully understand the curriculum and school culture, they attempted to find ways to insert themselves and be accepted into the American public school culture. Isk-Ercan’s (2010) findings suggested a pressing need for a strong partnership between school and home, and the responsibility falls to educators to provide communication and training on the curriculum (Epstein, 2002).

Another example of cultural challenge revealed in Isk-Ercan’s (2010) study related to relationships between teachers and parents. For example, as is standard in much of Turkish culture, parents viewed the teacher as part of the family (Isk-Ercan, 2010). As a result, teachers had the potential to build personal relationships because of the traditional Turkish cultural view of the profession, but the teachers’ lack of awareness of Turkish culture precluded the kind of personal contact that would have been welcomed. Ultimately, even though the parents were from high SES, were educated, and were English proficient, they experienced a minimalized connection to the educational system because of cultural challenges and their perception of the curriculum’s rigor and lack of deep personal connections with the teachers. The implications from this research are significant in the American school system because it is imperative information for educators of immigrant children.

In another study (Galindo & Medina, 2009), although families engaged in PI in various ways, many families embraced their culture when they desired to participate in their children’s school experiences. Some Latino parents expressed PI in schools in a culturally fulfilling manner. For example, when some Mexican immigrant mothers in the case study school felt excluded from the traditional view of PI, they chose to present a folkloric ballet performance that allowed them to introduce themselves in the manner in which they wanted to be viewed and understood. Much like the Turkish families, when the traditional route of PI was not open to them, the mothers turned to that with which they were familiar as a way to gain access to the school culture. Although presentation of a folkloric ballet is not a commonly accepted form of PI in many public schools, these families viewed it as such (Galindo & Medina, 2009). Because of this, parents believed they were engaged in PI, even if the educators did not share that perception.

Culture can also impede PI when families perceive that educators lack the proper awareness and knowledge regarding their students’ cultural background (Ramirez, 2009). Some scholars found that if educators did not properly address students’ cultural

“Without effective training, educators may not be able to recognize and encourage forms of parental involvement that have a strong cultural basis or influence.”
Educating the Whole Child

backgrounds, students were not academically successful (Gibson, 2008). Traditionally, many students performed better in learning environments in which they believed educators welcomed and valued them for their respective cultures.

In sum, culture often plays a part in students’ lives and can present a challenge to PI. Educators must find ways to overcome this challenge. Epstein (2002) recommended that educators collaborate with the community to find ways to alleviate obstacles that have the potential to lessen PI. However, when collaboratively involving the community, educators must in turn understand how cultural patterns influence family and parental involvement.

Conclusion

The literature provides sufficient evidence to support the viewpoint that culture has the potential to be a stumbling block to PI in schools. However, when administrators and educators are willing to address cultural challenges, parents will engage in school activities. Three potential strategies for removing cultural challenges include creating a welcoming climate, promoting effective communication, and raising cultural awareness. A climate that is inviting should begin in the front office and extend throughout the school, involving something as simple as greeting a guest, making eye contact, and smiling. Effective communication—verbal and nonverbal—is equally important. Opening doors for parents, pulling out chairs, greeting them, and smiling are all important gestures that demonstrate positive nonverbal communication. Finally, including all cultures in school-related events, celebrating different cultures, and displaying culturally diverse student work throughout the school are helpful forms of celebrating culture. Ultimately, training all school personnel to interact positively with parents from diverse cultures may result in increased PI and increased student achievement.
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Ending the Culture of Violence, Hearing the Youth Perspective: A Class Project

By Debbie Soro Adair

The author describes the inspiration for and implementation of a multifaceted class project to extend high school students’ learning beyond academics. Reading an article on rape at the college level in a popular magazine caused her to wonder whether she had helped to educate her students emotionally, intellectually, and morally to cope with challenges suggested by the article. The classroom project regarding a culture of violence in the United States extended to the community and was supported by a local DKG chapter.

The Inspiration

May 26, 2014, just around the time that Enochs High School in Modesto, California was having the graduation ceremony for the Class of 2014, TIME magazine published its latest edition. On the front cover was a red college pennant with the word “RAPE” written on it. I was shocked and intrigued. As I opened the magazine and began to read about the culture of rape on college campuses, I was sickened—sickened by the article’s statistics that one in five female students will be the victim of an attempted or actual sexual assault on college campuses. The author of the article concluded that the problem is much broader than the big name universities who get all the bad publicity:

The truth is, for young women, particularly those who are eighteen and nineteen years old and just beginning their college experience, America’s campuses are hazardous places. Recent research shows that one in five women is the victim of an attempted or completed sexual assault during college. (Gray, p. 22)

Additionally, in an article titled “Male Victims of Sexual Assault Speak Out,” Kassie (2015) noted, “One in six males will be the victim of an attempted or actual sexual assault on college campuses.” However, they are far more likely not to report the assault because of a great sense of shame and for fear that their sexuality and masculinity will come into question.

As I was preparing to say goodbye, good luck, and congratulations to the 180 graduating senior students who had been enrolled in my classes (out of a class of more than 500 graduating seniors), I was struck by the fact that I was sending them out into a world of unknown evils, lurking in the form of a college education, without having prepared them for what they could potentially be facing. I wanted to stop the ceremony and bring the...
entire graduating class back into my classroom and have them read the TIME magazine cover to cover. Then at least they would have an idea of what they were up against, and I would have some comfort in knowing that I had tried to educate them for a life outside of our pristine high school walls. That is what I was supposed to do, right? Educate students in such a way that they would be successful in and beyond high school?

I had been teaching for 22 years at that point, with most of those years spent teaching seniors, and I had to wonder how many of my former students had been placed in such a precarious position, unarmed and ignorant to the dangers that many of them would face? Could I really find comfort in knowing that they could write decent compositions, discuss themes and motifs of literature, and recognize the differences in the Romantic period versus the Renaissance period? Had I really done my job in educating them? My answer was a resounding "NO!" I had not.

I walked down the hallway, with the TIME Magazine in hand, to one of my colleagues who also teaches seniors. I showed her the cover and said, “We have to do something about this.”

Preparing

I spent that summer researching and collecting scholarly and not-so-scholarly articles about the culture of rape on college campuses. In that research, I discovered how deeply intertwined the sexual-assault crisis is with concepts of masculinity, femininity, and privilege. It was a lot to absorb. I wanted to create a unit addressing all of the issues so that my students would see how integrated the issues were and how dysfunctional the culture of the United States has become. But more importantly, I did not want to discuss only the “evils of society.” That would be easy. I wanted to lead them to a place where they would not only be informed but also feel empowered to make the changes that need to be made.

As fall of 2014 approached and as the new school year was about to begin, I put my compilations on hold. I knew from experience that I could not start the school year with such a deep, complex, controversial, and jarring unit. That would have sent students running to their counselors with requests to get out of my class. I had to demonstrate to my students that I was credible, trustworthy, respectful, and fully versed in the issues before we tackled the difficult topics of rape culture and a culture of violence together. By the end of first semester, I felt that they were ready to trust me, trust each other, and trust in the sanctity of my classroom environment.

Implementing

I began the topic with a quick reference back to the first unit we had done in August—a college research project. I used that platform to launch a discussion about what else they needed to know about college life. We had a very frank discussion in which I described the next unit into which we would be venturing together. Students shared their concerns and their trepidations about exploring this unsettling and scary topic. I listened. I reassured. I asked them to let me know if and when they were feeling uncomfortable, so that, together, we could navigate that as well.

What happened next was even more shocking than all of the statistics and personal stories I had read over the summer. I had nine students come to me and express concerns about the unit because they had already been the victims of sexual assault—and no, they were not all females. Although I was taken aback, having these students come forward was a validation that I really needed to teach this unit.
For 2 months, we read 75 pages of articles about the crisis of rape culture on college campuses and the culture of violence in society. The students annotated every article, discussed every article as a class, and wrote about what each article meant and how each article impacted them as individuals. They asked questions, and I answered them. I asked questions, and they responded with articulate, well thought out answers.

I then assigned a research project. I wanted my students to research any aspect of the culture of rape and violence that resonated with them. I also wanted them to have a voice in what they chose to research, because part of the assignment included creating an awareness campaign about what they deemed was a contributing factor to the culture of rape and violence. The topics varied, ranging from sexual exploitation of women in the media, human trafficking, rape on high school and college campuses, adulation of athletes, LGBTQ sexual harassment and assaults, degradation of women in music, and many, many more.

The awareness campaigns were phenomenal (some can be viewed on youtube.com on the Enochs Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum channel [ERWC]; ERWC is a program developed by the California State University system to help high school seniors increase their skills in analysis, comprehension, research, writing, and critical thinking prior to their entrance into a college or university). But two really important events occurred in the aftermath. The first was the creation of a class video. During a class discussion, one of my students said, “Hey, Ms. Soro, we should make our own awareness video.” I had an outline of a script written the next day and presented it to my students. After getting their input and making many revisions, we had what we believed was a solid educational and informative video about the world in which they live. Another student filmed and edited the video—in less than a week! It was truly a collaborative project from start to finish. That video may also be viewed on the Enochs ERWC youtube.com channel.

The best part in putting this unit together was seeing the students take action to get involved in their community and to raise awareness. Fifty-five of my students voluntarily attended a panel discussion called “Ending the Culture of Violence on College Campuses” on March 19, 2015. The panel discussion was hosted by American Association of University Women, Delta Kappa Gamma Society International, and Stanislaus County Office of Education. What came from the students attending that discussion was the idea that they wanted to host their own panel discussion—to continue the conversation. They were so empowered that, on April 22, 2015, they successfully hosted their own event, presenting a panel discussion and their awareness campaigns, including the Ending the Culture of Violence class project, to an audience of approximately 150 students, parents, teachers, and community members. The event was called “Ending the Culture of Violence II—Hearing the Youth Perspective” and was sponsored by The Haven Women’s Center of Stanislaus County, with support from Epsilon Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma and The American Association of University Women. Additionally, The National Alliance
for Mental Illness, The League of Women Voters, Creative Alternatives, Healthy and Responsible Relationships Troupe, and Concerned Family Counseling set up information booths and provided handouts, flyers, and contact information.

Seeing my students proudly present their research, awareness videos, and PowerPoints and answer some difficult questions from the audience was beyond gratifying. In those moments, I remembered why I became a teacher in the first place: to touch the lives of others in a meaningful way and to empower them to do the same. We are taking action in ending the culture of violence.
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The Charge is Ours: Teaching Elementary School Mathematics through Best Practices and Common Core Initiatives
By Jennifer H. Osborne

The author provides educators with the charge of utilizing best practices for teaching elementary school mathematics while addressing the needs set forth through the Common Core State Standards Initiative. She reviews and summarizes supporting research to promote the use of nontraditional, engaging pedagogy. Through the information provided in this article, she advocates a more student-centered approach to teaching mathematics.

As a university professor of elementary education whose primary focus is to train preservice and practicing teachers in the best methods for teaching primary and middle grade mathematics, I have encountered countless dispositions and preconceived notions of what it means to be a quality mathematics teacher. The old-fashioned methodology of having one’s students work the even problems from the assigned text during class and the odd problems for homework surprisingly still exists among many. Research has shown the need for instructional shifts in the mathematics classroom for many years (Mathematics Association of America [MAA], 2008). However, the present evolution of public educational systems has changed what was once merely a research-based indication of the need for an instructional change to a full-on demand for such a shift through the Common Core State Standards.

The Common Core State Standards have called for significant shifts within the mathematics curriculum. “These Standards are not intended to be new names for old ways of doing business. They are a call to take the next step” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2015, para. 6). The new, deeper standards require a more refined skill set for teaching based upon relevant Pedagogical Content Knowledge [PCK]. Of course, research
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has indicated the need for more complex mathematical instruction for years. Shulman (1999) described the knowledge of mathematics content and the knowledge of how to teach mathematics appropriately as being intertwined in complex ways and coined the concept of PCK to describe the intersection of subject knowledge with pedagogical knowledge (Shulman, 1987). Shulman described PCK in more detail:

Pedagogical content knowledge also includes an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them to the learning of those most frequently taught topics and lessons. (1986, as cited in Lowenberg Ball et al., 2008, p. 392)

The art of perfecting this intersection has been explored by many in the course of the last decade. Teachers’ deficiencies in both subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge have been documented by researchers (Ball, 1990; Hill, Ball, & Schilling, 2008), and The National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (2008) reported a profound lack of understanding among teachers with regards to teaching and learning of mathematics in Grades K-12—a lack of understanding that may lead to the use of ineffective teaching practices. In addition, research has indicated that teachers in the United States are beginning careers with insufficient knowledge to teach mathematics effectively (Da Ponte & Chapman, 2006). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2003) stated that mathematics teachers should “possess a deep understanding of how students learn mathematics and use the pedagogical knowledge specific to mathematics teaching and learning” (p. 3). Such knowledge must be learned through the teacher preparation programs of preservice teachers, professional development opportunities for practicing teachers, and significant classroom experiences (Lannin et al., 2013).

In conclusion, the charge is ours. It is up to all educators to accept the charge to embrace current best practices for teaching mathematics. To do so, educators must immerse themselves in current research, strive to incorporate best methods of mathematics instruction, and become educational experts regarding the Common Core State Standards for Elementary School Mathematics. Teachers must become advocates for the instructional shifts needed to provide the best quality of education possible in all primary and middle-grade mathematics classrooms in the United States and across the globe. The time to embrace current best practices for teaching mathematics is now. Through such improvements, math educators will better serve the needs of the whole child. The Common Core State Standards are designed to help students reach academic standards that prepare them for college and careers, and the standards require teachers to rethink current practices. Yes, indeed, my fellow educators, the charge to improve education—in mathematics and every discipline—belongs to each and every one of us.
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Digital Literacy: Bridging the Gap with Digital Writing Tools
By Suzanne McKee-Waddell

The author argues that educators must upgrade their methods to meet students where they are in the digital age and to help young people develop digital literacy. Teaching of composition with digital writing tools is the example provided, along with a comprehensive list of tools arranged by general purpose.

Digital literacy is an emerging field of progressive literacy instruction. It is defined as “the ability to use information and communication technologies to find, evaluate, create, and communicate information, requiring both cognitive and technical skills” (Visser, 2012, para. 2). Current methodologies that deliver instruction in digital literacy are constantly advancing, and the instruction, delivery, and tools used in the classroom are being merged to create an all-inclusive learning experience. This evolving technique gives educators the ability to reinvent the methodology used to teach writing, which is crucial to the college-and-career readiness curriculum. Teachers are seeking inventive forms of digital technology instruction to enable, engage, and propel instruction in composition. Through the use of emerging digital tools, classroom teachers of composition are able to enhance the quality of teaching methods while also practically reorganizing instructional methods. The utilization of these tools, coupled with instructional curricular changes, increases student engagement with technology while promoting positive classroom curricular adjustments.

Digital Literacy: Digital Composition and the Writing Component

For decades, the classroom setting has offered teachers strategies to formulate and implement the writing process while continuing to learn each day what it means to “teach” writing. This method of teaching forced educators, as Hicks (2009) stated, to “listen to [their] students, shape [their] responses and lessons around their needs” (p. 1).

Digital composition is one such area of literacy in which more research, specifically about partnering the writing component with technology, is evolving. In the past, teachers have facilitated instruction in digital composition in conventional “face-to-face” classrooms or programs delivered at a distance. Now, teachers are seeking more relevant media and technology tools to deliver classroom instruction on many levels. In other words, many classrooms and facilitators need access to forthcoming ideas and resources to proliferate the possibilities of digital literacies for connectivity with past and present tools that will gradually transform the way students express ideas and learn in school.

One would probably agree that, given the technological proficiency of young people, today’s classrooms are in “catch-up” mode, and students often comment that they have to “power-down” during the school day. Must facilitators power down students, or rather, as Lankshear and Knobel, proposed, should they “braid together new digital literacies and old” (as cited in O’Brien & Scharber, 2008, p. 67) to establish new literacy pedagogies? As
technology evolves, so must pedagogical practices.

Simply stated, educators should engage and embrace students’ technological knowledge instead of allowing old avenues to constrain the medium of instructional delivery. As Lankshear and Knobel (in O’Brien & Scharber, 2008) suggested, even as educators maintain basic existing standards in order to strengthen digital literacies, “modes in which the practices are framed” (p. 67) are still evidential. However, this is not a change in the process of teaching and assessing literacy but an addition to the already existing foundation. O’Brien and Scharber (2008) stated that the modality and benefits of digital literacies are “socially situated practices supported by skills, strategies, and stances that enable the representation and understanding of ideas using a range of modalities enabled by digital tools” (p. 67). School personnel must embrace this range of modality opportunities and take advantage of this braiding (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006) to afford literacy instruction. The braiding of these digital technology tools provides resources for this morphing instructional tool.

**Digital Writing Tools: Bridging Digital Literacy Gap with Resources**

One evolving component of the digital literacy initiative is the component of digital writing. Educators must not negate the present standard of written instruction and print-based literacy instruction relative to the development of curriculum and forms of testing but, instead, provide ideas and agendas to supplement progress rather than obstruct the pre-existing pedagogical standard. A wide variety of braiding digital tools may be resourced into the curriculum for instructional purposes—a task now available to the teacher in the educational setting. The list of digital tool resources (Table) is designed to empower and afford compelling possibilities to engage, motivate, and enhance the classroom writing environment with the infusion of digital tool technology.

The list (Table) suggests that digital tools are available for a wide variety of components of both teaching and learning the writing process. In addition to providing resources for teachers to inspire student writing, such as visual prompts, digital tools can help students structure, edit, and publish their work. Sharing and interacting with student writing can occur in a variety of ways by utilizing collaborative tools and social media. In addition, these resources provide students an outlet for personal expression by offering the technology to produce a variety of videos, infographics, and word clouds.

**Conclusion**

These various digital resources that improve and enhance digital writing in the instructional setting are easily accessible. New standards for writing competencies have taken a national stage as classroom teachers gravitate toward new and inventive means of embracing digital environments. As a result, these digital tools should drive teacher instructional strategies. In the proposed digital writing environment, educators will offer
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students opportunities to evolve critical thinking writing skills in preparation for lifetime learning.

Witte (2007) wrote,

"[W]e know that the nature of literacy has changed in the digital age, but unfortunately, we do not have decades to catch up to this change. In other words, we cannot take three decades to put down the metaphorical “red pen” as it is related to digital instruction. (p. 59)

The modern learner has evolved, and so must modern teaching strategies. Educators, put down the red pens and join students in this technological age to redefine learning and ensure the continuity of learning.
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Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources to Improve and Enhance Digital Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Writing Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TitanPad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MixedInk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackedit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penflip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackpad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story Telling/Story Writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storyjumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Story Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerpoof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching/Editing/Revising: The Writing Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EssayPunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudySync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThreeRing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Cube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrostic Poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quillpad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easybib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Forge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aMap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prezi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowToon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZohoWriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glogster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animated Short Videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VoiceThread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Clouds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagxedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TagCrowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease.ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StatSilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidblog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weebly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edublog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchoolCircle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Prompts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Writing Prompts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Prompts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Street Prompts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missing in Action: Good Citizenship and Good Learning

By Susan Szabo

The author presents a position inspired by the theme of this issue: teaching the whole child. She notes four negative consequences of an exclusive and excessive emphasis on accountability and federally mandated high-stakes testing. Offering an alternative, the author explains the three learning domains and how they are interconnected and necessary for growth in student achievement. Logically, she then offers an explanation of research-based instructional practices that should be used in the classroom to improve student achievement scores instead of focusing on teaching-to-the-test and reading a scripted curriculum. She concludes with what she believes are important points for doing what is right for children.

“All learning has an emotional base.”

– Plato

The theme of this issue of the Bulletin, with its focus on education and the teaching and learning process, the whole child, and issues that include social, emotional, and civic development, inspired this position article. After reading the topics for the theme, I realized they are my soap-box issues that not only all go together but also have serious consequences for both good education for all children and the American way of life.

Accountability, High-stakes Testing, and Federal Mandates

Even though No Child Left Behind and the Race to the Top that made standardized tests mandatory in the United States were supposed to help all children, these initiatives have, in fact, been detrimental. A 9-year study showed that these federally mandated educational policies actually hurt the learning process and undermine teacher autonomy and student engagement (Shepard, Hannaway, & Baker, 2009). The conclusion of the study comes as no surprise to those who teach.

To make my position clear: There is nothing wrong with standards-based education and accountability. In fact, they have been around since 1845. However, an emphasis on high-stakes test scores has become a political tool used to damage schools, teachers, children, and the teaching and learning process. According to U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan (2011), “Performance scores label more and more schools as ‘failing,’ triggering prescriptive federal mandates that eat up local and state resources and divert schools from their core mission” (para. 17).

As Shepard, Hannaway, and Baker asserted, “Accountability pressures have resulted in increased use of test data to redirect instructional efforts, extensive test-preparation practices, and increasing use of benchmark tests administered periodically to monitor progress toward mastery of standards” (2009, p. 2). In addition, school administrators and school boards have often adopted and followed a similar top-down approach. Thus,
teaching has once again become a whole-class phenomenon, where the teacher is required to “teach to the test.” This approach has narrowed the curriculum, created top-down mandated interventions, and siphoned considerable money away from the curriculum, not only to meet the prescriptive mandates from both the federal and state levels but also, of course, to purchase yearly grade-level tests (Becker et al., 2013). More consequences are discussed below.

**Some Negative Consequences**

Unfortunately, teaching-to-the-test practices have had many detrimental effects, limited here to four major considerations. First, because social studies is not a subject that is being tested, it is often not being taught (Hinde, 2005; Howard, 2003). Whether this omission is by accident or design, it hampers students’ ability to understand their civic responsibility and, ironically, to be protected from legislators, special interest groups, school board members, and even some administrators who believe “fixing” education can be done simply by telling teachers what to teach as well as how to teach (Leithwood, 2001). Second, teaching to the test skews all effective-teaching research, which indicates that the high quality of the teacher has the most impact on student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Third, a top-down, regimented approach to teaching actually forces teachers to break components of the Educator’s Code of Ethics. Fourth, humiliating and frustrating children is not the way to impact their achievement or emotional growth positively. Children need caring adults who believe in their ability to become successful adults, as well as knowledgeable teachers who use educational research with integrity.

**Lack of civic knowledge and hope in the system.** First, knowledgeable and intelligent citizens are critical. However, the results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 2010), which assesses what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas (new results will appear sometime in summer of 2015), have indicated that most of the nation’s high school seniors had, at most, only a basic knowledge of American government and a very limited understanding of how government works. This limited understanding has allowed for “an accumulation of power in Washington, DC at the expense of state and local authority and responsibility” (Boychuk, 2010, para. 9).

Second, the United States needs citizens who take their civic responsibility seriously. The founding fathers gave citizens the power to have a say in important decisions by exercising their right to vote. However, voter turnout in the United States is very low. The highest percentage of voter turnout occurred in 1900, with 73% of citizens voting; the percentage has steadily decreased until, in 2012, only 54% of the voters voted in the presidential elections (Desilver, 2014). Thus, a full 46% of U.S. citizens are not taking advantage of their constitutional rights. I contend it is vital that social studies and civic education be restored into the curriculum, as civic responsibility is paramount to the success of democracy and education (Dewey, 1916).

Third, the founding fathers believed education was critical to maintaining a democracy.
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Because they argued that all citizens should have access to free and equal public education, they believed that each state could do a better job of providing education to their citizens (Desnoyer, 2014). Accordingly, one of the main jobs of state legislators is to ensure that their state invests in education (French, Lily, & Fisher, 2009). However, in the 70s and 80s, state and city government officials began to look aggressively at economic development that involved creating tax-incentive packages to entice businesses leaders to their states (Fisher & Peters, 1998). Unfortunately, such cutting of the tax base to attract businesses is both inefficient and ineffective, as business tax breaks lead to less available monies for education (Fisher 2013; Lynch 2004). I believe that state elected officials need to return to doing one of their major jobs well—that of funding of education for their citizens. This is important, as a well-educated workforce is necessary to the prosperity of any state (Berger & Fisher, 2013; Pelika & Mitchell, 2013).

**Disregard of scientifically based research.** As a first example, a considerable body of research shows that “play” is the “work” of young children (Frank, 1968; Garvey, 1990; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2000). Unfortunately, instead of embracing the importance of play and providing the funding needed to create the kind of hands-on learning experiences needed for play to continue in the classroom, educators now have pre-K, Kindergarten, and Grade 1 students filling out worksheets, which promotes memorization and learning in isolation. Nothing about the practice of sitting still for hours and filling out worksheets either promotes maximal learning or is developmentally appropriate.

A second example deals with the body of research that shows it is the teacher’s talent and skills that make the difference in student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2000). Far too often, curriculum directors, principals, and legislators are telling teachers that they cannot use teachable moments and that all grade-level teachers must be doing the same thing at the same time. With this approach, there is no need for highly qualified teachers who can ply the art and science of education. With a curriculum- or textbook-driven approach, student’s developmental levels are not readily honored. As a result, more and more students are left behind because the foundation of their understanding is shaky. Learning issues emerge as children move into Grade 4 and beyond, because their weak learning foundation often crumbles.

A third example of using skewed research deals with children who have such foundations that completely crumble. The answer has been retention. Many states have mandated—through policy or law—that any student who cannot pass the required high-stakes test must be retained—an approach that is not supported by research. In fact, a large body of research suggests retention not only does not help but even causes problems in higher grades (Jimerson, 2001). Instead of retaining students, teachers should be encouraged to become more knowledgeable about ways to differentiate using various response-to-intervention strategies depending on the strengths and weaknesses of each child (Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005).

The final example of poor attention to research deals with the idea that one mandated test will accurately tell what is working and what is not for all children. Such a belief is pure...
nonsense. I believe the reason test scores have flat-lined is because key decision-makers have ignored the research that tells educators how to promote learning and to do what they know works.

**Breaking the Educator’s Code of Ethics.** Teaching, like all professions, has ethical codes provided by the Association of American Educators (AAE), National Education Association (NEA), and each state’s Department of Education (SDE). These codes provide a set of guidelines that determine professional conduct within the educational system. However, mandated approaches to teaching that have been forced onto teachers actually compel them to break many of the standards found within the Educator’s Code of Ethics, as the following examples (emphasis added in bold) illustrate.

- **Standard 3.2** states, “The educator shall not intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly treat a student or minor in a manner that adversely affects or endangers the learning, physical health, mental health, or safety of the student or minor” (Texas SDE).
- **Standard 3.3** states, “The professional educator does not interfere with a colleague’s freedom of choice, and works to eliminate coercion that forces educators to support actions and ideologies that violate individual professional integrity” (AAE, 2015).
- **Standard 1.1** states, “The educator strives to help each student realize his or her potential as a worthy and effective member of society and … to stimulate the spirit of inquiry” (NEA, 2015).
- **Standard 1.5** states, “The educator shall not expose the student to embarrassment or discouragement” (NEA, 2015).

Perhaps this is one reason many good teachers are quitting—because educators cannot be ethical in their educational decisions as they are pressured into using skewed research to teach to rigid curriculum and standards rather than to diverse students’ needs. In addition, because teaching has changed, so has the learning (Bullough, 2011). The curriculum has become very narrow with no inquiry-based learning to promote student curiosity and critical thinking (David, 2011). Perhaps this is why students are not doing well on so many mandated and biased tests (Popham, 2012) that are written at above-grade reading levels (Szabo & Sinclair, 2012).

**Negative impact on student achievement and emotional development.** There is a reason why student achievement has “flat-lined.” Teaching has become more focused on efferent knowledge while the social-emotional knowledge of the child has been ignored (Cohen, 2006). This approach has not only hurt the learning process but also has impacted student achievement, because one’s emotions and cognitive processes are connected.

In addition, because the affective side of children has been ignored, emotional growth has been hindered (Elder, 1996; Valiente, Swanson, & Eisenberg, 2012). Thus, society has young adults and teenagers who do not think it is wrong to steal, lie, cheat, or even plagiarize (Elias et al., 1997; Glazer, 2013). Given current research on child development and learning, it is past time to stop the debate on which is more important—efferent or affective. Educators need to look at the development of the whole child if they want students to grow up to be happy, caring, productive, civic-minded adults.

**Learning: The Three Domains**

Teachers need to plan purposefully for and include each of the three domains of learning—cognitive, affective, and psychomotor—into the lesson. When emotions and tactile activities are included in lessons, cognitive growth is enhanced (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956).
Efferent domain includes cognitive development. The efferent domain refers to growth and change of cognitive intellectual abilities. Cognitive development has six stages: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956). Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) substituted “creating” for “synthesis” as they believed that when individuals create something with the knowledge they have learned, they are synthesizing the information. However, in the Age of Accountability, the two lowest levels of the cognitive domain have become the most important focus, which is why teaching to the test became appropriate. Students were, at best, just memorizing information. However, learning is more than memorization, and I believe the last four stages of the cognitive domain are the most important.

Affective domain includes social and emotional development. The affective domain also has five sequential stages, moving from simple feelings to more complex attitudes (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1973). The affective objectives include receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization. Receiving is the simple awareness that feelings and emotions are present. Responding occurs when one responds to the emotions and feelings of others. Valuing is the ability to see the worth of someone else’s ideas and feelings. Organization is the ability to prioritize actions and emotions. Finally, characterization is the ability to internalize moral values and use them to guide one’s behavior (Kohn, 1984; Lewis, Haviland-Jones, & Barrett, 2008).

People are wired to be social and emotional. “Developing competencies in these domains enhance a person’s ability to succeed in school as well as positively influence mental health, success in work, and the ability to be a citizen in a democracy” (Huitt & Dawson, 2011, p. 1). Vygotsky (1978) believed that social development and learning were linked. He reasoned that cognitive functions are linked to the social world. Thus, he developed the concept of the zone of proximal development to explain that children (as well as adults) learn in a logical, systematic way with the help of an educated other. The dialogue that happens between these two individuals is what promotes learning, critical thinking, and reflection. For educators, it is increasingly obvious that learning is ultimately a social process (Bandura, 1986; Dewey, 1916; Vygotsky, 1978).

Social-emotional development is linked to academic success (Huitt & Dawson, 2011). A recent study found that “children who do not begin kindergarten socially and emotionally competent are often not successful in the early years of school—and can be plagued by behavioral, emotional, academic, and social development problems that follow them into adulthood” (NAEYC, 2000, para. 1). On the other hand, children with well-developed social-emotional skills are more able to

- express their ideas and feelings;
- self-regulate;
- display empathy towards others;
- manage their feelings of frustration and disappointment easily;
- feel self-confident;
- easily make, develop, and keep friendships;
- succeed in school; and
- become life-longer learners (Albrecht, 2006; Gardner, 1999).
Emotional development or emotional intelligence (EQ) is the ability to identify, use, understand, and manage one’s emotions in positive ways to relieve stress, communicate effectively, empathize with others, overcome challenges, and defuse conflict (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). EQ concerns the improvement of thinking via emotion and emotional knowledge and helps explain why people with average IQs can outperform those with higher IQs: They were able to manage behavior, navigate social complexities, and make personal decisions that achieved positive results. EQ consists of four core skills that pair up under two primary competencies: personal competence and social competence.

**Kinesthetic domain includes tactile and hands-on learning.** The third domain is the psychomotor or kinesthetic domain (Harrow, 1972). The six objectives in this domain include reflex movement, fundamental movements, perceptual abilities, physical abilities, skilled movements, and non-discursive communication. This domain is used when one is creating something to show his or her understanding of a topic.

**Effective Teaching to Improve Student Achievement**

If one believes in the research behind the three learning domains, he or she would favor some of the following teaching ideas and approaches:

- development of thematic units that integrate all the subject content and all the learning styles (Gardner, 1999; Noble, 2004);
- differentiation using the intelligences and varied resources (Noble, 2004; Tomlinson, 2000);
- inquiry-based learning, also known as problem-based learning, which uses small-scale investigations and projects to show one’s understanding (Vygotsky, 1962);
- development of good questions to help students make connections and think critically—i.e., questions that move students from simple knowledge and comprehension of the text to synthesis and evaluation of the text with other texts or world understanding (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956; Keene & Zimmerman, 1997). Good questions can have an efferent response or an affective response. An efferent response emphasizes text information, while an aesthetic or affective response is the reaction to the text and reflects the reader’s background knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This idea is supported by Reader Response Theory and Transactional Theory (Rosenblatt, 1995);
- support of metacognition in order to help students think about the connections they are making, to self-monitor what they think they know and what they have learned—and then to adjust their understanding if it is wrong (Flavell, 1976);
- emphasis on the affective levels by including concepts and ideas students care about so they are more motivated to put forth effort in the learning process (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1973);
- embracing the idea that human beings need positive relationships with others to promote better learning and a risk-free environment (Maslow, 1954; Nodding, 2013);
- use of hands-on learning activities that involve students doing and creating, because, when one is busy, his or her brain is busy. Such an approach would be particularly useful in the early years because children are primarily kinesthetic learners until around Grade 2 or 3 (Kolb, 1984);
- creating critical thinkers and good readers by emphasis on oral language in the classroom (Roskos, Tabors, & Lenhart, 2009). For some reason, many leaders believe that a quiet classroom is a learning classroom. In reality, the exact opposite is true. Learning is social, and humans must be able to talk about what they are learning in order to learn it well;
• using guided reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996) and language-experience-approach groups daily (Allen, 1976) in Grades 1-5;
• using writing daily because reading and writing are reciprocal (Moran & Billen, 2014).

Conclusions

The founding fathers of the United States wrote that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are concepts that cannot be denied to any individual. I believe this is an important concept within our schools and for our children. When the founding fathers wrote about the pursuit of happiness, they most likely were “thinking about the Greek and Roman philosophical tradition in which happiness is bound up with the civic virtues of courage, moderation, and justice” (Hamilton, n.d., last para.). “Happiness is the feeling of self-worth and dignity individuals acquire by contributing to their community and to its civic life” (Bridgeland, 2012, p. 36).

In my opinion, high-stakes testing, which requires considerable expenditures by individual districts, is not motivated by helping individuals contribute to their community and civic life but by misplaced exercise of power and the (excessive) profit mentality of test-development companies. Some need to be reminded that life and the pursuit of happiness are not self-centered but rather community centered, and happiness can only be pursued by individuals as long as their pursuit does not sacrifice or diminish the individual rights of others (Bridgeland, 2013). That is, one’s pursuit of happiness should not make others miserable. Unfortunately, many individuals within the educational system find fighting for what is right and being advocates for all children and learning are both stressful and frustrating endeavors.

School is just the beginning—not the end—of the learning process. Knowledgeable teachers should encourage curiosity and use inquiry-based learning approaches in order to promote lifelong learning rather than to promote scores on a high-stakes test. However, teachers cannot do it alone, and they are obviously losing the battle.

We are all unique individuals, and that uniqueness needs to be honored because it is what makes communities and society strong. If all students are to receive maximal learning opportunities geared to their uniqueness, everyone should be equally involved in the teaching and learning process and several things need to happen:
• Educational research needs to be used with integrity so teachers have the autonomy to teach effectively on the child’s developmental level.
• Teachers need to be respected for their knowledge of both the curriculum and child development.
• Children need to be respected, and the whole child needs to be developed. That is, children need to gain emotional strength, moral standards, and self-worth as well as content knowledge.
• Where it has disappeared or been deemphasized, social studies needs to be put back into the curriculum.
• State legislators need to stop listening to special interest groups and stop giving incentives to attract new businesses to the state, remembering instead that those in businesses have families who want their children to obtain a good education.
• Citizens need to become loud, vocal advocates to promote happiness for all.
• Citizens need to become voters who support leaders who advocate for what is best for children’s mental and moral growth.
• Citizens need to be informed and ensure that school leaders and state leaders are doing the right thing—not just assume they will.
• Citizens should attend school board and city council meetings to ask thoughtful questions, to challenge authority, to find out the why behind decisions, and to assess mandated policies.

Effective attention to and development of the whole child is imperative for educators and all stakeholders. Successful attention to all dimensions of learning will, in turn, create an educated and active public who can safeguard quality in education—and thus in all phases of society—in the future.
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Care: Whole Teachers and Whole Students in Writing Classrooms

By Sarah L. Morris

The author examines, through thematic rendering, the lived experience of four high school English teachers and manifestations of care in their personal, professional, and teaching lives. In particular, she considers care as it contributes to teaching and teachers in wholeness, defined as understanding of the self in a context and in relationship with others. Implications for writing pedagogy are explored, as are suggestions for teachers for cultivating wholeness for themselves, their professional communities, and the young people in their classrooms.

Introduction

Much work has been done to consider the whole child in schools. The research discussed in this article addresses the whole teacher and pedagogical implications that arise from caring for oneself to better care for students. Self-care and care for others contribute to wholeness, particularly in the writing classroom. Wholeness here is defined as understanding of the self as fully as possible (mind, body, spirit) in a particular context (the world) and in relationship to others (the many roles one plays). When teachers live in wholeness, as persons, practitioners, and writers, they are better able to respond to whole children.

Literature Review

Fostering the whole child in schools has long inspired discussion, from Thoreau to Dewey to Piaget to Froebel to Montessori. More recently, Noddings (2005) discussed an approach toward wholeness in engaging students in relevant, interconnected curriculum. This kind of program may involve movement (Bresler, 2004), community engagement (Brooke, 2003), a sense of place (Sobel, 2005), engaged play (Brown, 2009), immersion in nature (Lou, 2005), and curricular choices that support integration of ideas into the real world outside schools (Miller, 2007). Evidence also exists of action toward changes in programming to support children in wholeness. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development’s Whole Child Initiative, for example, advocates for sustainable practices that engage children in ways that support health, wellness, safety, engagement, support, and learning in schools (ASCD, 2015).

Whole-child instruction has particular implications for teaching writing, especially in teaching children as writers and teaching writing as meaning-making, i.e., as process rather than product. A process approach allows writing to become discursive and connected to people, ideas, time, and issues; it offers voice, develops students’ independence, and allows deep engagement (Graves, 1994). Writing instruction can move toward wholeness through
authenticity in writing assignments, feedback, purpose, and audience (Atwell, 2015; Calkins, 1994; Elbow, 1998; Graves, 2003; Murray, 2002). McGarrell and Verbeem (2007) suggested that writing instruction should emphasize process rather than product through modeling and conferencing. Real writing offers wholeness, yet in schools, the approach to writing instruction is increasingly fragmented. Honoring the whole child in writing instruction also means teachers “create conditions in which learning can happen” and use writing to help “students to ask questions, to notice and wonder and connect and inspire” and also “to stay wide awake in life” (Calkins, 1994, p. 484). In this way, writing instruction can contribute to a depth of engagement that can facilitate a learner’s wholeness of self.

The whole teacher, one able to know and care for herself, understanding herself as a person in a context in relationship with others, is best poised to care for whole children. Palmer (2007) suggested, “Teaching, like any truly human activity, emerges from one’s inwardness, for better or for worse,” so that “good teaching requires self-knowledge” (pp. 2-3). In a holistic classroom, teachers approach students as fellow learners, offering “not just cognitive meaning but a way of walking, sitting, standing, and relating to the world,” as well as a “guidance in being, rather than merely doing” (Leonard, 1968, p. 249). Wholeness in being has particular implications for writing teachers. The National Writing Project suggests that everyone can write, that writing can be taught, and that teachers of writing should be involved in a community of practice (National Writing Project, 2015). Many scholars advocate writing along with students as more experienced writers engaged in meaningful, relevant, and authentic discourse (Gallagher, 2006, 2011; Gillespie, 1985; Kittle, 2008; Shafer, 2006). The idea that writing teachers must care for themselves as people and as writers suggests development of intellectual and personal wholeness.

Method

This work is drawn from my dissertation study (Morris, 2013), which incorporated Van Manen’s (1997) human science phenomenology as a method for seeking essential themes with pedagogical implications. This work began with the overarching phenomenological question: What is the lived experience of moving meditation for finding flow in thinking and writing? My work focused on the lived experiences of four high school English teachers: Alyx, Annalee, Holly, and Traci. During four sessions of gentle walking, reflective journaling, and recorded conversations, we discussed, among other topics, ways in which self-care could extend into classroom practice. Hermeneutic phenomenological analysis of the teachers’ journals and conversation transcripts uncovered secondary phenomenological questions related to care, including

What does it mean to truly care for others? What does it mean to care for the self? In what ways does care become a power source for these teachers—professionally, interpersonally, and personally? And what does it look like when self-care lends energy to care for others and becomes transformative…? (Morris, 2013, p. 231)
Drawing from insights gleaned in these conversations, in this article I examine the emergent phenomenological theme of care as it developed in conversations and participants’ journals. Orienting toward pedagogical implications, I engage with the lived experience texts of these teachers in order to suggest ways in which they created wholeness through care: caring for themselves, caring for each other, and caring for student writers. In doing so, they fostered growth of writing and writers—and also teachers—in wholeness.

Self-Care

Alyx, Annalee, Holly, and Traci all reflected that caring for themselves allowed them to care better for others. In perhaps its simplest form, self-care manifested as caring for one’s physical health. Alyx addressed this in her journal, writing,

I believe that a person’s mental health and intellectual capacity, to an extent, depend on or are influenced by a person’s physical health. It’s been my experience that I am in a much better mental state when I am physically caring for myself. This belief was evident in Alyx’s discussion of her fitness journey, because making health adjustments affected every aspect of her life. She wrote, “I’m so much happier now. Everything has improved in my life. I took the time to focus on my physical self, and everything else improved with that.” Alyx found that physical self-care had a spiraling effect in the rest of her life. She wrote,

I’m happier with myself and others. I can handle more stressful situations without losing my cool. I can look at my faults and those of others and accept them, at least the ones I can’t change. My success has made me also have hope when I do see the potential for growth and change. Since changing her lifestyle, Alyx revealed, “I got my master’s degree in educational leadership, and I make it a point to learn something new every day. When a person’s physical needs are being met, he or she can focus on other things, like education.”

Holly cared for herself in quiet moments spent alone in thought: “It’s always so relaxing to me to be outside and be walking.” This peaceful, reflective activity allowed her to relax and to recharge. “When I walk,” Holly expressed, “whether I’m trying to figure anything out, or whether I’m just trying to use it as de-stressing or whatever, I just don’t even think about the concept of time or what time it is...” This time out of time with the self represented a deep, easy kind of self-care. In conversations, these teachers consistently referred to this kind of personal, thoughtful, and meditative element of life as “me time” and indicated that they felt incomplete and less able to function without it.

Annalee approached physical care and reflective practice a bit differently, combining the two. In her journal, she composed a poem about “me time,” addressing the way that running allowed her to relax and concentrate:

Run muscles
flex and stretch
Physically busy
breath pattern
focused—
fade away
like white noise
freedom to
think. Relieve
stress—relax

Time alone, running, allowed Annalee to care for herself and recharge.
Teachers, who spend so much time caring for others, need to have time alone to care for themselves physically and mentally. One of Traci’s journal entries illustrated this need clearly:

I sometimes feel like I don’t have enough time to do what I need. Housekeeping. Grading. Lesson Plans [sic]. Relationships. Exercise. Yearbook. Being out here and talking with Holly illustrates that further for me, too. Even the simple stuff […] is overwhelming. Finding time to see a friend I don’t work with is tough. Traci voiced the conflicts teachers feel when caught up in such a time-intensive profession. She recognized the need to care for herself outside the “teacher self” and the need for balance. These teachers struggled with a profession that becomes an identity and a calling. Palmer (2007) discussed this calling as “the voice of the teacher within, the voice that invites [us] to honor the nature of [the] true self” (p. 30). Teacherly work tends to define teachers; however, it can smother them, too. As Alyx expressed, “…when you’re a teacher and you have these kids that you bond with, taking care of them, it becomes more important than taking care of yourself or the other obligations you have.” The teacher who lets teaching swallow her may find herself stuck physically: out of shape and neglectful of self.

These teachers found that practicing self-care helped them care for students. Teachers who defined themselves by teaching, they struggled to care for themselves without becoming subsumed by their work. Annalee voiced this, saying, “I feel better when I do take care of myself…. I go back and I feel like I am a better teacher when I’ve had that mental break.” In caring for herself, she showed care for teaching. She sought actively to find a balance because, as she wrote, “I want a life beyond grading without compromising the quality of my work.”

Collegial Care

Although these teachers established “me time” as important for sense of self and wholeness, they also thrived through community. Holly suggested that, to feel healthy, she needed to experience caring for and from others: “…I love hanging out with friends and family; I’m also just as comfortable being by myself. For a while—then I need human interaction.” Inasmuch as Holly needed to be alone, she also needed relationships with other people to prevent loneliness and provide stimulation.

Sharing time together, the teachers in this study deepened their friendships. Alyx and Annalee frequently worked together to support one another in health-practice goals. Alyx explained,

We went on a self-discovery together. We’ve been using each other sort of like a push, I guess, because we... Everything I’ve looked at says when you have someone else who shares a common goal with you, then it pushes you further, it makes you do better, and so, when I started looking at my health, working out and stuff, Annalee and I had a conversation where we’re sharing some of the same frustrations with life, and that’s sort of where we started. I said, ‘Can you just be my partner in this, and I will be your partner, and we will motivate each other?’ So I think that’s where we both sort of had that mindset.

Alyx and Annalee partnered with one another in personal goals and partnered together with Holly and Traci in teaching, curricular, and classroom goals. Alyx expressed this, saying, “…there’s a core group of us [who] really do work well with each other, and listen to each other, and provide support for each other, and are friends with each other.”
Care a teacher receives from others helps shape her or him as a whole teacher. Both Traci and Holly addressed directly their relationships with their own teachers and mentors as a component of their own teaching practice, specifically in the assignments they incorporated and methods they chose, recreating successful teaching drawn from their own successful learning experiences. Sharing common assignments, planning together for vertical alignment, and offering students a sense of shared purpose throughout their English courses became an activity in professional wholeness for these teachers. Sharing common goals for themselves and for students created community among them. Alyx indicated, “We all push our kids and have a high level of expectations for them, and we bond over that.” Sharing planning time, teaching ideas, and goals for learning brought these teachers together, allowing them to care for one another professionally and to learn from and with one another. Alyx, Annalee, Traci, and Holly developed a rich community of practice, and writing and walking and talking together illuminated that. They became friends personally and professionally, connected through care. The care they showed for themselves and for one another contributed to a sense of wholeness for them as people, as teachers, and as a department.

All four of these teachers worked toward a sense of wholeness in their lives. They read books, wrote, worked out, and spent time with partners, families, and pets. They had hobbies, homes, and lives outside of school, yet they were incorporated very much into the school community. They were yearbook advisors, sports and academic team coaches, teacher mentors, and part of a culture. They attended school dances and functions. They had impromptu conferences with parents in grocery stores and restaurants. They were individuals playing many roles within the community, seeking wholeness. This wholeness, in turn, colored their care for students, especially in teaching writing.

Caring for Writers

Holly, Traci, Annalee, and Alyx consciously nurtured students as writers even when there was not much time for writing in the curriculum. Among all the standards to be met, writing was only one, and yet these teachers prioritized writing because they recognized its value in students’ lives.

They used writing to build connections with students as people. In doing so, the exercise of writing became a means of relating. They regularly designed assignments that asked students to reflect upon their lives, circumstances, and ideas. As such, writing took on authentic, communicative purpose and became a way of building relationships. Holly described this kind of assignment in one of our conversations:

During the first week of creative writing, one of the things they have to do is write and respond to the prompt ‘What does writing mean to me?’ and basically they have to tell me why do they write, why they’re taking the class, what they hope to get out of it.

This assignment, Holly explained, not only allowed her to assess student skills but also allowed her access beyond what normally might be revealed in regular classroom interaction. She discussed one student’s response to this prompt:

...she has a lot of anger problems, and she doesn't really know how to handle her anger. What she has learned is that writing about it keeps her from going out and getting in a fight or going out and doing something stupid. ... It's very interesting that as a 15-, 16-year old, she's realized that writing is a way to cope with all the issues she's been dealing with, and she's able to do it in a positive manner.
Even though Holly did not yet know this student, she already had some foundation on which to build academic skill and relationship, as well as an idea for how writing functioned in this student’s real life. Through writing as authentic expression, Holly gained understanding of this student in wholeness—not only as a student in a classroom writing for academic purposes but as a person in the world, using writing for her own, individual purposes.

The importance of relevant work became a theme toward wholeness of teaching practice. To provide students with meaningful writing experiences became important. In conversations and in their writing, Holly, Annalee, Traci, and Alyx voiced frustration about often-used formulaic approaches to writing. Their students wanted clear guidelines, examples, frequent reassurance, and comforting guidance from more experienced writers in the classroom; sometimes they wanted to be told how to manufacture the product of writing rather than actually doing the work of process. Some students hoped for a one-size-fits-all formula that would assure them a grade of A—whether or not they found meaning or learning in their work. Traci understood formulaic writing as something upon which students became dependent. She expressed, “They’re so afraid of failure, of not knowing what is expected, they always need that crutch.” The “crutch” of the formulaic essay became a point of interference in the wholeness of writing process.

Although these teachers did see the benefits of formula for troubled writers to build confidence and provide some security, they wanted students to move beyond formula and take ownership of their own processes. As Traci indicated, “The formula just makes them feel better. It’s a little bit of a notion of that spoon-feeding they’ve grown so accustomed to.” Still, these teachers saw the formula as something students already relied heavily upon and that must be unlearned. Annalee suggested that formula is a temporary structure that must be transcended eventually, saying,

I imagine that the formulas are like little floaters or training wheels, and that at some point you just need to shove them in the pool without those floaters on. They need to use what they learned from the floaters and swim.

In a reliance on formula, it is as if these young writers were disconnected from their “selves,” their writerly voices. They were also disconnected from the whole act of writing in the world because they were writing for a graded task instead of for a more authentic purpose.

Murray (2002) characterized much of what professional writers learn to do as “unlearning to write” because school writing often emphasizes fragmentation with conventions such as “form comes before content,” “always outline first,” and “there is one right way” (pp. 18-23). When formulaic school writing defines what composition is, “most students never experience the power of their ideas or the structuring of them within a larger conversation, never get the chance to use writing to think, feel, and wonder” (Brannon et al., 2008, p. 18). Furthermore, formulaic writing “does not allow students to participate as writers and language users—as readers and writers in the world” (Brannon et al., p. 18). When student writing is limited to product and exercise rather than becoming a meaning-making activity, perhaps students feel a lack of wholeness of understanding of themselves as whole writers in a clear context in relationship with others. Instead of encouraging writing for a purpose in relationship with an audience, the formulaic approach emphasizes writing a specific way for a specific grade. Not only are the writing instruction and the writing fragmented, the writers’ conceptions of themselves are fragmented, too.

These teachers worked beyond formula by writing with their students, by modeling, and by mentoring them as whole writers themselves, informed by deep understanding of their own thinking and knowing, in a clear context, in relationship with others. Alyx
discussed the importance of writing with her students and of offering assignments with real-world validity and meaning:

...any time that I ask my kids to write for me, I do the same assignment. And they think I’m crazy because I do the same assignment as them, but at the end of it, I hand in my work, too, so when they’re peer editing, mine’s in the mix. Or if I want them to share, I share mine first. I think they look at you as a teacher in a different manner. I always say “I wouldn’t ask you guys to do something I wouldn’t do myself.”

Holly and Traci wrote with their students, too. Traci elaborated that she wrote with students “because they say they can’t do it. I’ll say ‘Give me a topic. Give me a topic and we will write a poem together right now,’ and that gets them going.” By becoming the example and allowing herself to be a writer amid writers, Traci eased student fears. Annalee used her own high school papers as models for students in the course she taught, presenting herself not only as a fellow writer but also as a (one-time) high-school student.

Alyx explained that students need to see how writers work in real time: “…when I’m in front of them asking them to brainstorm, I will sit and I’ll brainstorm again in front of them.” Alyx did this for every class, because

[even though I may have already done it in 3rd period, I will do it in 4th period, because I want them to see my process, too. So despite the fact that I’ve already had it running around and around in my brain, just for them to see me do it, too. Her students were able to see and respond to her as fellow writer. This required some risk, as Alyx expressed:

Sometimes they’re not open to the differences we may present them with, in a way. I think I’ve struggled with this for the last couple of years, where I kind of had that feeling. I wanted to be open and on a closer level with my kids.

Alyx chose to become vulnerable, opening herself to students and writing beside them. In this way, she became a writer and learner, engaged in a community of other writers and learners.

These teachers also communicated active feedback to students through conferences and extensive written response. Traci emphasized the importance of active presence: “[I]f you’re over their shoulder and you’re talking to them about [writing], it seems that it helps them along more because of that support system.” By being with students “over their shoulder,” by “talking to them about it,” shared meaning developed.

Such interaction reflects the relational ethic of care described by Noddings: “[A]ll its deliberations focus on the human beings involved in the situation under consideration and their relations to each other” (1988, p. 218). These teachers participated in various series of encounters in which the involved parties feel something toward each other” (Noddings, p. 218). They felt responsibility for one another as teachers and friends and for their students as writers and persons and responded accordingly, as “motive energy flows in the direction of the other’s needs and projects” (Noddings, p. 220), for one another and for shared and common goals. Their care grew people—writers—in wholeness.

Pedagogical Implications

The teachers in this study sought wholeness. They tried to nurture themselves wholly with lives, families, loves, interests, and selves outside the classroom, and they saw their teacher identities intertwined throughout their lives. Palmer (2007) called this “an undivided life” (p. 173), one in which personal and professional identities merge. They sought wholeness in their instruction, authenticity in assignments, and meaningful work.
They strove to see students in wholeness, as writers with something to say to an audience outside the classroom. Throughout the course of our conversations, it became clear that, when these teachers prioritized self-care and meaningfully connected with others, they also were better capable of providing genuine care for their students as people and writers.

**Implications**

Although this work is not meant to be prescriptive, important implications exist for pedagogy and for teachers in general. To that end, three simple suggestions emerged from this thematic analysis. Educators benefit as individuals—and schools benefit—when they follow these recommendations.

1. **Take care of themselves in wholeness.** They find “me time” for self-care; take walks; keep journals; read for pleasure; reflect, recharge, respond to themselves. They seek wholeness of person, context, and relationships. Palmer (2007) discussed the pain associated with the stress of teaching that leads teachers to be “disconnected from our own truth, from the passions that took us into teaching, from the heart that is the source of all good work” (p. 21). Reconnecting and remembering who one is helps the individual care for students and helps students better care for themselves, so that teaching “can come from the depths of [one’s] own truth—and the truth that is within [students] has a chance to respond in kind” (Palmer, p. 34). Self-care helps teachers remember who they are and where they are and allows them to better care for others.

2. **Take care of others in wholeness.** This can be done through cultivating relationships and collegiality; talking openly about teaching; seeking mentorship, partnership, and meaningful feedback; and working together to support students and create solutions. Too often teachers use their time together as a venue for airing frustration. The teachers in this study used planning time as an opportunity to collaborate in meaningful, positive ways to benefit students. They embodied what Graves (1994) asserted, that “...each day we work around people who possess valuable lore about teaching, whose experience and wisdom can contribute to our ongoing education. Their classrooms are some of the best contexts for a dialogue about teaching” (p. 362). When cultivating whole students as people in the world becomes a focus, teachers can work toward bigger goals and not be distracted by the daily tasks and troubles of the hard work of teaching. When people work together and share experiences, “the deepest friendships evolve” (Louv, 2005, p. 78). Those friendships can feed individuals in wholeness.

3. **Take care of students in wholeness.** Teachers may use work as an opportunity to engage students with themselves and others in reflective thinking. They can offer authentic, relevant assignments that grow voice and engagement and can write with students. They can model and mentor. They can provide meaningful feedback in active ways. In school writing, especially, disconnection is reinforced by institutional feedback that emphasizes grades, instructional priorities, and skills, rather than the real purpose of writing, the conveyance of ideas that students think are important and want to share (McGarrell & Verbeem, 2007). Teachers can learn to know their students as writers in a context in relationship with others. As Graves discussed, “When students feel ‘known,’ then they learn more easily. This is especially true if they feel that the teacher knows them” (Graves, 1994, p. 7). When teachers know students, students show what they need: “Our research data show that entire years—or even school careers—can be wasted if we don’t let our students teach us” (Graves, p. 16).

Last, teachers must be authentic to themselves and to students, because meaningful teaching involves “real eye contact, a moment of person-to-person interaction,” and in that
interaction, students and teachers “emerge .... All of a sudden the curriculum and manuals and kits and workbooks and programs recede, and what comes forward is the relationship between one child and another child, between a child and her teacher” (Calkins, 1994, pp. 18-19). In these moments, teachers rely not on fragmented work, on writing prompts, or on writing assessments but rather on human energy and physical presence to teach and learn in wholeness.
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By Terry Wiedmer

The author stresses the importance and the challenges of working with a multigenerational workforce of employees from the five generations: Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, and Generations X, Y, and Z. Drawing on literature, she identifies specific attributes for each of these five generations and argues that workforce supervisors need to take these characteristics into consideration to maximize worker engagement, employment, satisfaction, leadership, and longevity.

Supervisors in all businesses and organizations are challenged daily to determine how to recognize, reward, and motivate workers from each generation in their workplace. To maximize effectiveness, they must strive to support and nurture an age-neutral workplace that fosters worker productivity, tolerance, teamwork, and a sense of valuing of all employees to be all that they can be for as long as they desire. The purpose of this article is to underscore the importance of all members of multigenerational workforces working together to accomplish identified workplace goals, even as individuals realize their professional goals and aspirations. It is very important to understand and implement practices that complement workers’ and learners’ generational preferences, differences, and similarities.

In a school setting, accomplishing this goal requires that school administrators and supervisors possess an understanding of generational similarities and differences and are able to talk with people in a manner that resonates with the individual(s) and the issue(s) at hand. Teachers are a unique group to lead, as each is already a leader in his or her own right. Accordingly, a teacher-leader or supervisor must respect the teacher’s unique authority and expertise while keeping the individual working toward the larger and overarching plan for all school stakeholders, including students, parents, staff, and community members.

Generations Referenced

Categorically speaking, each of the five generations currently found in workforces and schools include Traditionalists; Baby Boomers; and Generations X, Y, and Z. Each of these groups is profiled in this article, which also summarizes similarities and differences to enable workplace administrators and supervisors to work effectively with individual workers and teams of workers comprised of individuals from the different generations.
Traditionalists. Clause (2015) defined Traditionalists as people who were born 1900-1945 and comprise the oldest generation in American culture. Traditionalists have generally aged out of the workplace through retirement and thus constitute a mere 5% of today’s workforce. Traditionalists generally prefer to work in conservative, hierarchical places where there is a clear chain of command (top-down).

The term “Traditionalist” is often associated with a variety of other generational terms, including Radio Babies, Builders, Industrialists, The Silent Generation, and World War II Generation (Buahene & Kovary, 2003; Kane, 2015). Many of these generational references relate to world events, inventions, and creations that occurred during the timeframe, such as invention of the radio. Historically, Traditionalists lived through Hitler’s 1941 Russian invasion, the United States’ 1941 World War II entry with the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the 1945 end of World War II in Japan and Europe, and the beginning of the 1950 Korean War.

Typically, Traditionalists respect authority and possess family values that keep their work and family lives separate. Generally motivated by money and position like their Baby Boomer children, Traditionalists take pride in being self-sacrificing and thrifty. They tend to work hard from a sense of pride and determination, consider debt or obligation to be embarrassing, and acknowledge that change comes slowly. According to Kane (2015), Traditionalists describe themselves with two words—loyal and disciplined—and view education to be a dream. They reportedly learn best through traditional, instructor-led instruction; generally prefer tangible items for recognition or reward, such as certificates, plaques, or trophies; and seek to feel supported and valued by their employers and supervisors.

Baby Boomers. Human resources expert Heathfied (2015) defined Baby Boomers (Boomers) as the generation of Americans born in a baby boom following World War II, 1946-1964. Boomers have had good health, constitute the wealthiest generation, and optimistically view the world as improving over time. Today, the oldest Boomers are considering their retirement options and are seeking ways and opportunities to make their elder years personally meaningful. Adcox (2015) estimated that there are approximately 76 million Boomers. Those born 1945-55 are often referred to as Early Boomers, and those born after 1955 are referred to as Late Boomers—and substantial differences exist between the two groups (Adcox, 2015). Those responsible for Social Security and Medicare express concerns about what will happen when the bulk of Boomers 65 and older are ready and able to retire. Adcox (2015) noted that the number of people 65 and older will double between 2010 and 2050.

Robinson (2015) noted that Boomers grew up in a time of prosperity and an absence of world wars, although they experienced the Cold War era of living in fear of a Russian nuclear attack, building bomb shelters, and hiding under desks at school as drill practice. The turbulence of the 1960s defined the world for Boomers from many different perspectives, including the music; Vietnam War; and the assassinations of President John
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Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. As compared to Early Boomers, Late Boomers were more apt to use illegal drugs during their teen and young adult years and were not subject to the military draft. Alive during the Civil Rights and Women’s Rights Movements, Boomers are a part of the largest living generation.

Kane (2015) noted that Boomers are generally well established in their careers and hold positions of power and authority. As an example, Kane stated that nearly 70% of law firm partners are Boomers. Labor statistics indicate that nearly 80 million Boomers will exit the workplace in the next decade—retiring at the rate of 8,000 per day or more than 300 per hour, which will be an unprecedented loss of skilled labor (Kane, 2015).

Loretto (2015) and Kane (2015) characterized Boomers as being extremely hard workers and very committed to their personal and professional goals. Thus, when Boomers retire, they will leave a vast gap in the workforce as they have typically worked their way up the ranks through their career focus and work ethic. Motivated by perks, prestige, and position (3Ps), Boomers are described as work-centric, independent, goal-oriented, and competitive, typically equating their work and positions with self-worth. In the workforce, Boomers’ typical beliefs in hierarchical structure and rankings have resulted in many of them having earned significant positions of responsibility and authority.

Heathfield (2015) noted Boomers, as young adults, had numerous new opportunities opened up to them that fed their ambitions and whetted their appetites for success. Typically, Boomers were the first to be educated in their families, and their education translated into upward mobility. Even today, money, power, and recognition are Boomers’ primary motivators. Boomers strive for authority and work prioritization, and they do expect to be valued and rewarded. Boomers’ strong work ethic and take-charge attitudes have pushed many to very responsible positions that they do not want to relinquish, as they see their identities are tied to their work. Loretto (2015) noted that leading, administering, or supervising Boomers is tricky because they are competitive and are angered by any perceived threats to their authority or prestige.

**Generation X.** Robinson (2015), owner, author, and creator of Career Planner.com, defined Generation X as the generation born after the Western Post-World War II Baby Boom; birth dates range from 1961-1981, and current ages range from 34 to 54. Miller (2014) noted that the generation includes 84 million people in the United States.

Originally called “Gen Bust” (Schroer, 2015) because their birth rate was vastly smaller than that of the preceding Baby Boomers, Generation X is associated with a variety of terms including Gen X, Gen X’ers, Post-Boomers, Twenty-Somethings, and Baby Busters. Schroer (2015) noted that they are sometimes referred to as the “lost” generation—the first generation of “latchkey” kids exposed to lots of daycare and divorce. Gen X, for the most part, had parents who were Boomers and, as children, Gen X often experienced broken families and absentee parents. Where families remained intact, parents of Gen X individuals were often workaholics driven by personal gratification, authority, and rankings (Loretto & Kane, 2015). Schroer (2015) noted that Gen X individuals are starting to form families with higher levels of caution and pragmatism than their parents demonstrated. Gen X are engaging in financial planning, avoiding broken homes, and ensuring that children grow up with a parent available.

The 1961-1981 Gen X timeframe included numerous important historical events and social events. Gen X experienced the 1976 Arab Oil debacle, the first U.S. gas shortages, the price of gold soaring to $1,000 an ounce, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the splitting apart of the Soviet Union, and the tragedy of Tiananmen Square in China (Robinson, 2015). In addition, a global energy crisis occurred, Margaret Thatcher was named the first female...
British Prime Minister, and John Lennon was killed. Technologically speaking, Apple and Tandy marketed personal computers, and AIDS was identified. Often called the MTV Generation, Gen X experienced the emergence of music videos and new wave, electronic, heavy metal, and hip hop music.

In 2012, “The Generation X Report” (based on annual surveys used in the Longitudinal Study of today’s adults) found that Gen X are highly educated, active, balanced, happy, and family oriented (Swanbrow, 2012). This report dispelled the materialistic, slacker, disenfranchised stereotypes often associated with Gen X 1970s and 1980s youth. Robinson (2015) also noted that Gen X was the generation to experience the highest education level in the United States to date. Schroer (2015) confirmed that, with 29% of Gen X obtaining a bachelor’s degree or higher, this is arguably the best-educated generation.

Gen X employees typically expect to maintain a balance between work and family life and do not work exceptionally long hours for money or titles (Leibow, 2014). Gen X are generally less loyal to their employers and are more comfortable demanding flexible work arrangements. At work, Gen X are pragmatic and direct, expect change, and also require some flexibility in rules and workplace regulations.

Gen X watched their Boomer parents get laid off and have grown to expect and embrace change, which has resulted in their being more independent, more apt to job hop to increase marketability, and more likely to see their work-and-life balance as extremely important (Leibow, 2014). Workers in this generation are likely to question policies and projects; therefore, those who lead and supervise Gen X must provide credible reasons for tasks, decisions, and procedures, as well as insure opportunities for them to provide input due to their likelihood of questioning policies and projects (Leibow, 2014).

Gen X are described as geeks, independent thinkers, and artists who prefer to be fast-paced, engaged in interesting work, and efficient because they value their personal time and enjoy working on self-directed or independent projects (Grimes, 2015). Gen X workers resist micromanaging bosses and find them to be distasteful and undesirable; they find informal policies on dress codes and workplace habits or formalities to be fun and motivating. Gen X expect freedom and balance in their personal and workplace lives—work is only a portion of the quality of the life they possess and seek to achieve (Grimes, 2015).

**Generation Y.** Generation Y is also referred to as Gen Y, Echo Boomers, Millennials or Millennials, Generation We, Internet Generation, Connect 24/7, and Leave No One Behind (Schroer, 2015). Born 1980-1990s, Gen Y number 71 million and constitute the largest generational cohort group since the Boomers.

Some of the historical events that occurred during Gen Y’s lives include the prison release of Nelson Mandela, Princess Diana’s death, the World Trade Center attacks, Columbine High School shootings, beginning of the Iraq War, Oklahoma City federal building bombing, and two weather-related happenings: Hurricane Katrina and the Asian Ocean tsunami. This generation is also web savvy and highly connected via social media. They have been raised at a time of constant information about world events as they connect with technology, including computers, the Internet, mobile phones, and so forth.

Compared to members of other generations, Gen Y tend to be more social and confident as they seek personal and work-life balance (Gibson, 2015). They are generally less independent, more inclusively community oriented, and seek a sense of meaning in greater contexts. Gen Y had parents who were more available to them than Gen-X individuals; however, Gen Y expect more supervision and feedback, clear goals, structure,
and mentoring (Gibson, 2015). Driven by technology, Gen Y expect to multitask and approach projects from a variety of creative vantage points.

Although easily bored, Gen Y typically enjoy experimenting and discovering new approaches and solutions to issues and problems as they are motivated by their need for a sense of purpose and belonging to meaningful communities. Gen Y generally seek independent learning that implements thorough and comprehensive online research; and, when recognized as students or employees, they prefer certificates or monetary rewards to indicate that they and their work are supported and valued by supervisors and employers.

Gen Y are attracted to companies and businesses that embrace technological advancements that have changed the way of doing business globally. Gen Y are making a significant move from traditional forms of employment to self-employment because they are very entrepreneurial—engaging in multiple jobs with diverse career paths (Gibson, 2015). Because Gen Y seek happiness in their work and life, the notion of one job, one career mindset is no longer valid. Gibson (2015) noted that Gen Y integrate work and life by pursuing multiple job options. As future business leaders, they will build into businesses natural Gen Y traits and attributes, such as data, speed, and execution.

**Generation Z.** Generation Z is the latest generation and will be leading the world in several decades. Schroer (2015) stated that Generation Z members were born 1995-2015 and currently constitute a rapidly growing population of 23 million. Renfro (2015) noted that the exact starting and stopping points for Gen Z are unclear in generational labels, with no agreement on the name or exact birth-date range; however, for the purposes of this article, 1995-2015 is the Generation Z timeframe. Cross-Bystrum (2015) indicated that, although there is not a lot known about this generation yet, much is known about the environment in which Gen Z are growing up.

Varied names have been suggested to be associated with this generational group, including Generation Z, Gen Z, Zs, Gen Z’ers, iGeneration, Gen Tech, Gen Wii, Net Gen, Digital Natives, Gen Next, Post Gen, and Plurals (Menzies, 2015; Schroer, 2015). Regardless of the term used to describe this generation, they currently fill educators’ classrooms. This is a key and critical point that all individuals need to remember as instruction is designed and delivered for today’s Gen Z students.

Most of the traits that will define this generation have yet to emerge; however, many are highly connected to having the lifelong use of communication and technology such as the World Wide Web, instant messaging, text messaging, MP3 players, mobile phones, and tablets. Such technological connections have earned this generation the name “digital natives” (Horovitz, 2012). Cross-Bystrum (2015) noted that, thanks to Facebook, Skype, Facetime, and so forth, Gen Z are communicating in a “real” way with individuals who do not occupy the same physical space. This type of communication with family and friends can occur across the country or around the world and may include constant updates, texts, and real-time dialogue with visual connections and interactions. Although this connectivity characterizes most, however, not all Gen Z have ready access to the digital world because of socioeconomic status and geographical location.

Although young, it appears that Gen Z will mobilize around causes and be more socially and environmentally aware than previous generations. Many of the earliest Gen
Z (1995-2000 birthdates) are beginning to enter the workforce, and they are typically tech savvy; socially connected to their peers through social media; bright, with IQ scores higher than previous generations; and generally accepting of diverse populations (Renfro, 2015). Gen Z have typically been connected in a seamless world of friends, data, and entertainment. With regard to schooling, Renfro (2015) noted that this is the most home-schooled generation in the modern public school era (1920-today) and that Gen Z typically require less direction because they have ready access to digital tools that enable them to think they can do anything.

Renfro (2015) described Gen Z learners as driven by graphics, disliking lecture-test classrooms, expecting instant feedback, and preferring customized learning. In many cases, teachers of Gen Z students are not as comfortable and proficient with technology as are the learners. In order to meet future needs, Gen Z students need to be challenged by their teachers with project-based, active-learning opportunities. Typically, Gen Z learners do not take the time to determine the reliability of what they are researching on their technologically-supported learning devices; therefore, in working with Gen Z individuals, teachers and other leaders should focus on helping them evaluate resources.

As higher education becomes more cost prohibitive, Gen Z will seek alternative ways to enter their preferred, chosen professions. Renfro (2015) noted that 65% of grade-school students today will work in jobs that do not currently exist. Gen Z will be different types of professionals: not 40-hour per week cubicle workers, but freelance contractors with great flexibility, who solve problems with particular expertise. Gen Z will want to enter the professional and technical idea economy, although the largest growth will be in the service economy (Renfro, 2015).

Members of the other generations must be able to deal with and adjust to Gen Z’s changing (or missing) social skills that are being driven by advancing technologies. The gap between what teachers are teaching today and the unknown needed skills of the future is widening. One thing educators do know is that the Gen Z world is increasingly collaborative and that school projects should be adjusted to reflect this. In sum, it is important for teachers to teach Gen-Z learners to discover, curate, and manage information, as these skills are required in this Gen Z idea-and-knowledge era.

**Leading the Diverse, Multigenerational Workforce**

In this fast-paced, changing global economy comprised of a multigenerational workforce, workplace leaders and supervisors must assess current practices to determine if workers are being effectively led, managed, and challenged to be the best they can be. As noted above, each of the various generational cohorts has its own values, motivations, and attitudes. To lead multigenerational workforces effectively, leaders must uniquely communicate with each generation; accommodate employee differences; create workplace choices; be flexible in leadership styles; respect teachers’ and workers’ competence and initiative; and foster and nourish faculty and worker retention (Under 30CEO Community, 2015). Strong multigenerational workforce administrators and supervisors also effectively support their workers’ values, bridge between the different generations to build teams and shared

“Identifying and retaining valuable intellectual capital among a multigenerational workforce are critical goals for leaders . . .”
understandings, identify and support each generation’s unique outlook on life that directly impacts their work commitments, and demonstrate that veterans’ dedicated approaches are understood and valued.
- Traditionalists are driven by duty before pleasure. As a result, they seek a directive leadership style, with clear, leader-defined goals, directions, and measurements (Under 30CEO Community, 2015).
- Boomers are driven to do better than their parents and will typically go the extra mile on the job. Sometimes workaholics, inventing the 60-hour work week, Boomers often achieve their identity through the work they perform (Under 30CEO Community, 2015).
- Xs have a huge distaste for micromanagement; they prefer to be told what is expected of them, be provided appropriate feedback, and be empowered to get the job done. Xs seek to work on their own terms and have balance between their personal and professional lives (Under 30CEO Community, 2015).
- Ys are typically tech savvy. They prefer to communicate through e-mail and text messaging instead of face-to-face and opt for webinars and online technology instead of traditional, lecture-based presentations. Generally family-centric, Ys seek flexible hours and schedules that lead to a better work-and-life balance. Achievement- and team-oriented, Ys crave attention through feedback and guidance, appreciate being kept in the loop, and benefit from mentors who help guide their professional growth (Kane, 2015).
- Zs are also very tech savvy and connect with global peers. They prefer interacting with media rather than passive TV or print texts and classroom lectures. They expect to be able to work, learn, and study wherever and whenever they choose. Zs have less need for direction because they have access to the answers, especially for things about which they are passionate. Consistent multitaskers, Zs look for constant feedback, clear goals, rewards, and personal challenges. Flexibility is important for Zs as they expect quick results (promotions) and will keep their resumes handy and current (Renfro, 2015).

In particular, in a multigenerational workforce, leaders must facilitate knowledge transfer among workers to optimize performance and success as well as workers’ satisfaction and rewards. Accordingly, leaders must devote time and planning to assess the most available knowledge, understand who holds key knowledge, and consider various methods of knowledge-transfer so the desired knowledge is converted and transferred to best serve a multigenerational workforce (Stevens, 2010). For example, a leader may decide to develop and implement reverse-mentoring policies and practices to foster and create attitudes of openness to the experience of younger workers.

**Conclusion**

Identifying and retaining valuable intellectual capital among a multigenerational workforce are critical goals for leaders who understand the tremendous amount of institutional wisdom possessed by workers of all ages and generations. The overall well-being and effectiveness of schools and businesses are fostered and built when leaders make a conscious effort to expand and share knowledge among workers. Ultimately, administrators and supervisors of multigenerational workforces will be more effective in their leadership roles when they recognize employees’ generational representations, work styles, and motivators to insure that the teachers and workers are engaged, satisfied, challenged, and happy at work.
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<td>Review of Literature: Presents supporting and nonsupporting evidence to clarify a topic and/or problem of interest and value to educators; synthesizes and critiques the literature; draws conclusions; mentions procedures for selecting and reviewing literature; may include narrative review, best evidence synthesis, or meta-analysis.</td>
<td>1,500-3,000</td>
<td>Abstract; documentation; bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Program Description: Provides an overview and details of a single program in an educational setting. Goals, resources, and outcomes are included. No marketing or promotion of a program is allowed.</td>
<td>1,500-2,000</td>
<td>Abstract; documentation; bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Book/Technology Review: Combines summary and personal critique of a book, Web site, or app on an educational topic or with educational relevance.</td>
<td>400-700</td>
<td>Introduction; documentation; bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Classroom Practice/Program: Describes practice or initiative used in a classroom to advance educational excellence</td>
<td>700-1,200</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>DKG Chapter/State Organization Practice/Program: Describes a practice or initiative used by a chapter or state organization to advance the purposes of DKG</td>
<td>700-1,200</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Viewpoint on Current Issue: Defines and addresses an issue related to education, women, children, or DKG</td>
<td>700-1,200</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Personal Reflection or Anecdote: Shares a personal experience that provides insight to the human condition, particularly related to educators and women</td>
<td>500-700</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Inspirational Piece: Provides transcript of speech delivered at chapter, state, regional, or international events</td>
<td>700-1,200</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Bio and/or Interview: Shares the story or thoughts of a key woman educator or leader in education, women's issues, or children's issues</td>
<td>700-1,200</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Book Review: Combines a summary and personal critique of a textbook, resource, or book (fiction or nonfiction) related to education or to women and children</td>
<td>400-700</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Technology Review: Combines a summary and personal critique of an educational application, program, or piece of hardware that is useful in the classroom or that is useful in the life of an educator</td>
<td>400-700</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal or Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Letter to the Editor: Responds to items previously published in the Bulletin</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>Author's name; chapter/state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal or Collegial Exchange</td>
<td>Poetry/Creative Work: Original expressions in any creative format</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Bio; photo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** More detailed explanations of each category may be found on the Editorial Board page at www.dkg.org.