CHAPTER 7

Does Teacher Education Make a Difference?

I have tried to do two things in this book: to illuminate teachers' espoused ideals and their immediate concerns in particular classroom situations, and to show when and where teacher-education programs influence these ideas. Both purposes are important in light of the long history of failed reform efforts in the United States.

Because the current reform is deeply rooted in a concern for how subject matter is represented to students, I was particularly interested in examining teachers' ideas about subject matter. In the school subject of writing, for instance, it is possible to distinguish three separate ideas about what teachers should be accomplishing with their students. One is that teachers should ensure that students can comply with language prescriptions, another is that they should ensure that students understand important concepts, and the third is that they should ensure that students learn strategies for achieving their own purposes.

These aspects of writing are unrelated to the subject matter topics that often fill our curricula. That is, even if reformers provided teachers with a formal curriculum for teaching writing, they would still find that teachers could teach the various curriculum topics as instances of any of these aspects of writing. The topic of organization, for instance, can be represented as a set of prescriptions, such as how to develop an outline or how to write a five-paragraph essay; as a set of concepts, such as chronology or theme; or as a matter of strategy and purpose. Even a topic as arcane as verb choice can be represented in these different ways. There are certainly many prescriptions for choosing verbs, but there are also concepts that justify those prescriptions and there are occasions when, in order to achieve our purposes, we choose to strategically ignore the prescriptions.

These different aspects of subject matter are important, for they define the central tension between reformers' visions of good teaching and the traditional vision of good teaching. In a traditional grammar school, the subject of writing would be defined as consisting largely of prescriptions, while in a reformer's school, the same subject would be defined as consisting of concepts, strategies, and purposes. This is not to say that anyone—either traditionalist or reformer—fails to recognize the relevance of other aspects of writing, but rather that each perceives one aspect as being most essential.

Given these two views, the central question of teacher learning that this book has addressed has been whether teachers, who have been reared in traditional classrooms and who perceive prescriptions to be at the heart of school writing, can be persuaded to recognize other aspects of writing and perhaps even to shift their sense of the relative importance of these different aspects of writing.

TEACHERS' INITIAL IDEAS

Many of our interview questions involved describing a classroom situation and asking teachers what they thought of this situation and how they would respond to it. From their interpretations and responses, it is possible to delineate some overarching themes. I found five such cross-cutting themes: (1) a lack of relationship between espoused ideals and immediate concerns, (2) an acquiescence to prescriptions, (3) a tendency to overlook students' points of view, (4) a belief that teaching is self-evident, and (5) a connection between ideas and identities.

A Lack of Relationship Between Ideals and Immediate Concerns

Teachers' discussions revealed widespread and consistent discrepancies between their espoused ideals and their immediate concerns. One such discrepancy had to do with their ideas about the practice of teaching: the ideal of caring for students was elicited when we asked them their reasons for wanting to teach, their recollections of their own teachers, and their goals for teaching. Most chose teaching as a profession because they expected it to be a personally rewarding career. The teachers they recalled from their own school days were significant not because of what they taught but rather because they were "nice" or "mean," and teachers often based their own goals on these emotion-laden memories.

But this ideal seemed to disappear when teachers interpreted and responded to the bored student and when they interpreted and responded to Jessie's story. Despite their ideal of caring for students, teachers rarely tried to understand either of these students' points of
view. When confronted with the bored student, for instance, they rarely tried to learn why the student was bored and rarely tried to alter the lesson to make it more meaningful for the student. Instead, they tended to concede that the subject was boring, justify the need to study it, and continue the lesson as planned. Some even rejected or punished the student. When examining Jessie’s story, almost none of them examined the story closely enough to notice what Jessie intended when he used periods before quoted material. Instead of trying to discern Jessie’s thinking or intentions in the text, they tended simply to enumerate each incomplete sentence along with each other grammatical and punctuation error in the text. Even though they had espoused caring as an ideal, that ideal did not translate into any effort to understand the student’s point of view in either of these particular situations.

Ideals also seemed unrelated to immediate concerns when teachers discussed organizational knowledge. When they were asked what students should already know, and what would be hard for students to learn about organization, teachers espoused all three aspects of writing in roughly equal proportions. They mentioned prescriptions, concepts, and strategies and purposes. In addition, several of them also mentioned character traits such as persistence or being an organized person. Yet when they examined a particularly disorganized report about dolphins, most forgot about concepts, purposes and strategies, and character traits and became concerned mainly with how well the author had complied with prescriptions.

These discrepancies suggest that teachers’ interpretations of these situations, and their proposed responses to them, were not influenced much by their espoused ideals. Moreover, there is also evidence that their immediate concerns were not influenced even by their own curricular goals. We saw very similar patterns in teachers’ discussions of Jessie’s story and in their discussions of the dolphin report, even though Jessie’s story was presented to teachers with no curricular context and the dolphin report was presented as a response to an assignment in a unit on organizing texts. It seems that teachers’ immediate concerns did not derive either from their espoused ideals or from their curriculum context. Instead, these immediate concerns derived spontaneously from particular situations.

Still, even spontaneous ideas come from somewhere. The fact that these immediate concerns were so similar across so many different teachers suggests that they derived from broader, culturally based, and often unspoken assumptions about the nature of school subjects and the nature of teaching. I have labeled this complex of ideas the grammar school ideal, a phrase referring to the tradition of American schooling that reformers continually try to change.

An Acquiescence to Prescription

Despite the fact that the current reform movement has been under way for at least two decades, teachers participating in the TELT study were far more likely to be concerned about students’ compliance with prescriptions than about any other aspect of writing. They were more likely to notice the various spelling and punctuation errors than anything else when examining student texts, more likely to propose to correct those errors than anything else, and more likely to consider mechanics than any other criterion when grading Jessie’s story. Moreover, this pattern remained true across almost all program groups and across both baseline and end-of-program interviews, despite the contrary intentions of many of these programs.

In fact, their interpretations of and responses to these situations suggested that their ideas about writing increasingly narrowed toward prescriptions as they moved closer and closer to the action of teaching. When they examined the dolphin report, they were more likely to concentrate on prescriptions than they had been when they espoused their ideals. And when they proposed their responses, they were even more likely to mention prescriptions than they had been when they first examined the report. This pattern of narrowing was true in their discussions of Jessie’s story as well as in their discussions of the dolphin report. As each question drew them nearer to the action of teaching, their concerns became more focused on how well the student was complying with prescriptions.

Those who are deeply aware of the current reform movement in writing might be surprised by this finding. Rhetoric about the importance of strategies and purposes began to appear in the 1960s and was relatively widespread by the mid-1970s. A recent survey from the National Assessment of Education Progress (Applebee et al., 1994) indicated that by 1992, between 35 and 50 percent of teachers were encouraging students to do at least one “writing process,” such as planning the writing, developing an outline, or writing more than one draft. However, since the preservice teacher candidates in this study would have attended elementary and secondary school between roughly 1970 and 1985, they still might not have had much experience with this new approach to teaching writing. Moreover, evidence from other reforms suggests that we should not expect major changes in practice, even
from a reform that appears to have widespread appeal. In this case, for instance, teachers may teach writing processes, but teach them as prescriptions rather than as strategies for achieving students’ own purposes—indeed, they could be presented as prescriptions for how to comply with assigned writing projects.¹

So prevalent were teachers’ concerns about prescriptions, both before and after teachers participated in these programs, that it is tempting to say that prescriptions must be the central idea governing all of their thinking. But this widespread acquiescence to prescriptions requires further elaboration: it is complicated by at least three other factors.

One is the fact that teachers’ knowledge of language prescriptions seemed to be sketchy at best. The most noticeable evidence of their shaky knowledge of prescriptions comes from their responses to the student who asked about using is or are with none. One might have thought, given the prevalence of teachers’ concerns about compliance with prescriptions, that they would have been happy to dictate specific and detailed prescriptions when responding to this student. Yet they generally offered only very sketchy justifications for their verb choices, and many included misinformation in their explanations. I did not formally analyze the specific prescriptions teachers offered to Jessie or to the author of the dolphin report, but I did notice that they offered quite a variety of ideas about what the right prescriptions were for these texts as well. So we cannot say that their widespread concern about prescriptions derived from their extensive knowledge of them.

One could argue, of course, that the verb choice question represents a relatively arcane problem and that we should not expect teachers to know such arcane language conventions. But teachers should know the limits of their own knowledge and should know the relative importance of different prescriptions. They should be able to suggest to the student, for instance, how to change the sentence to avoid the difficulty altogether, yet none did. Or, if they were to suggest that the student look it up, they should have been able to show the student how to look it up. About a quarter of them suggested that the student look it up, but none defined the problem clearly enough that a student would know where to look in a reference manual. So teachers lacked not only specific prescriptive knowledge, but also a sense of perspective on the nature and relative importance of prescriptions in writing.

The second complicating factor in this widespread acquiescence to prescriptions is that many teachers appeared to be uninterested in prescriptions. Few approached the verb choice question with relish or indicated that the problem was intellectually challenging in any way. Similarly, when they discussed language conventions in the context of Jessie’s story and the dolphin report, they never indicated that these conventions were interesting in any way. And finally, when teachers responded to the bored student, about a third of them agreed with the student that schoolwork was indeed boring. So we cannot say that their attention to prescriptions follows from an intellectual interest in this subject matter.

The third, and perhaps most important, complicating factor in this widespread acquiescence to prescriptions was that most teachers felt that they should know this material and were embarrassed by the fact that they didn’t. Some tried to hide their ignorance by suggesting that the student look it up or use his ear to figure it out; others tried, clumsily, to engage students in discussions so that they could gain some time to try to figure it out themselves. For many of these teachers, lack of knowledge of prescriptions was an indication of their lack of expertise, and therefore of their lack of authority to teach.

Teachers’ acquiescence to prescriptions represents more than simply the belief that prescriptions are important for students to learn. There is a sense of fatalism in their acquiescence: a belief that prescriptions are unavoidable, and that prescriptions are onerous, and that teachers should have mastered them.

A Tendency to Overlook Students’ Points of View

The third important theme apparent in these teachers’ interpretations of and responses to these situations was their tendency to ignore or overlook their students’ points of view. Few teachers made an effort to understand the bored student’s point of view, and only two examined Jessie’s story closely enough to notice Jessie’s intention to indicate quoted material. We have considered two explanations that could account for this failure.

One explanation is that they did not know how to discern students’ points of view. This explanation seems especially likely in the case of Jessie. However much teachers may have wanted to care about Jessie and to understand Jessie’s point of view, they may not have known how to interpret the patterns of errors, and so instead concerned themselves mainly with enumerating those errors. Such a lack of knowledge could also explain why there were so many discrepancies between teachers’ ideas and their immediate concerns. That is, teachers may indeed believe they want to practice in other ways, and may indeed believe students should learn other aspects of writing, but when they move nearer and nearer to behaving in particular situations, they find that the only thing they actually know how to do is enumerate errors in prescriptions.
Lack of knowledge could also explain the fact that the grades teachers assigned to Jessie's paper had so little to do with the criteria they thought were important when assigning grades. Perhaps their criteria did not translate into any particular grade because they didn't know how to translate them.

But how can lack of knowledge account for teachers' responses to the bored student? That student's point of view was not hidden in a text; it was explicitly offered to the teacher. No special knowledge was needed to understand it. Yet many teachers resisted the bored student's plea, some by actually punishing him for speaking out, others by denying the claim, justifying the content, and returning to the lesson at hand. Still, perhaps the knowledge teachers lacked in that situation was knowledge of how to alter the lesson. Perhaps teachers resisted the student's plea because they didn't know how to alter the lesson and had no recourse but to continue with it as it was, but did not want to admit this failure to their students.

Another explanation for teachers' lack of attention to student point of view is that the system of ideas that leads teachers to focus on prescriptions and to believe that the subject matter is not negotiable also discourages them from thinking about the student's point of view. Indeed, many teachers conceded their own helplessness in the face of the bored student. They admitted that schoolwork was boring, but they were resigned to it. They often conveyed a sense of passivity or lack of control, and a sense of helplessness in the face of tedious schoolwork. If teachers are just as trapped by the curriculum as students are, there is little point in acknowledging boredom; it simply makes everyone's task more difficult. Similarly, if the teacher's role is to enumerate and correct errors, there is little point in trying to understand the student's point of view, for it is irrelevant to the task.

This second explanation for teachers' lack of attention to the students' point of view also gives us a new understanding of their use of the term caring. Their espoused ideal of caring for students did not mean that they wanted to discern the students' points of view so that they could respond to them; instead, they simply wanted to be benevolent in their exercise of authority.

A Belief That Teaching Is Self-Evident

Another theme that appeared in teachers' discussions of these particular situations was the belief that teaching is a self-evident practice. It is hard to imagine novice physicians offering detailed responses to hypothetical medical situations. They would be more likely to say something like, "I don't know how I would handle that situation; I have not yet completed my medical education." Yet only rarely did the teachers in this study resist answering our questions. They readily commented on the texts we showed them and readily announced how they would respond to student authors. They rarely indicated that they were considering two or more alternative ideas or that the situation presented certain ambiguities to them. Even before they had studied teacher education, teachers were sure of their responses to most of the situations we presented to them.

And on those occasions when they were unsure of themselves, as they were when confronted by the bored student and by the student asking about verb choice, they still never suggested that they hoped to learn how to respond to such questions during the formal study of teaching. In the case of the student asking about verb choice, they still never suggested that they hoped to learn how to respond to such questions during the formal study of teaching. In the case of the student asking about verb choice, many indicated that they would look up the right answer, perhaps together with the student. In the case of the bored student, many indicated that they would somehow miraculously know, once they were in the situation, what to do. This presumption that the right response will be self-evident from each situation is consistent with their practice of deriving their concerns from situations rather than from their espoused ideals or curricular goals.

A Strong Link Between Ideas and Identities

The complex of ideas I outlined above would be important by itself, but it is even more important because teachers define their professional identities in terms of these ideas. These ideas had personal as well as professional meaning to them. The personal nature of teachers' ideas was especially apparent in the case studies, when we could see the earlier experiences that yielded these later beliefs—when we saw, for instance, Chad's conviction that writing had to be meaningful and Monica's conviction that writing was essential to academic success. Similarly, we saw Ginger and Daphne's ambivalence toward prescriptions, and we learned how their high school experiences had convinced them that writing to conform to teachers' assignments was not satisfying.

Both assumed that prescriptions were necessary and both perceived them as uninteresting, yet each responded to that fact in her own way. We also saw the strong feelings Ethel and Sena had about prescriptions and could see how their mastery of prescriptions influenced their thinking. Like Ginger and Daphne, both acquiesced to the necessity of prescriptions, but Ethel lacked confidence in her own mastery of prescriptions and consequently was intimidated by them, whereas Sena felt
confident in her mastery and had no difficulty prescribing solutions to the verb choice question.

One consequence of personal attachment to these ideas was that teachers felt defensive if they could not comply with their own prescriptions for teaching. The anxiety teachers expressed in these situations derived from their belief that they should know what to do. Believing that teaching is self-evident, that it was their job to know what the class should be working on, and that it was their job to know the right answers to substantive questions, they were threatened by student questions that revealed their lack of knowledge. Their need to defend their authority was apparent in their responses to the bored student, where about a fifth of them were threatened by the student's plea and another half justified the content rather than reexamine it. It was apparent again in teachers' responses to the question about verb choice, when teachers indicated a fear of revealing their ignorance. Ironically, their efforts to hide their ignorance led them to be less didactic in response to this student than they had been in any other situation, even though this student had asked a question that invited a didactic response.

One final point about teachers' ideas needs to be mentioned. The various themes I have delineated above are not discrete, each independent from the others. Instead, they form an interlocking set of mutually reinforcing ideas. It would be difficult to alter one of these without altering all the others. And the fact that teachers define their professional identities according to these ideas makes the entire complex even more resistant to change.

THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

People enter teaching carrying a complex network of thoughts about teaching and about how they themselves will behave as teachers. These a priori ideas give teachers a perspective on the nature of school subjects and the nature of the teachers' task. Such ideas can be a tremendous help to an aspiring teacher by providing focus and direction to the work, but they also present a tremendous barrier to reformers who want to promote a different set of ideas about teaching. The question we are left with now is how teachers might learn an alternative version of teaching, one of the many alternatives reformers have advocated over the years.

But not all teacher education programs aim to teach an alternative version of teaching. Many are content to reaffirm the traditional version of teaching. The programs participating in the TELT study differed in many ways, but their most important difference with respect to teacher learning was their substantive orientation. Some paid little attention to the reform agenda. They assumed teachers would enact some version of the traditional grammar school ideal, in which school subjects consist of facts and prescriptions and in which teachers control classroom activities while students learn this content. They teach teachers how to organize classrooms, establish rules of conduct, and package and deliver lessons so that they are efficient and keep students on task.

Other programs adopt a reform agenda. They believe that because writing is done strategically and for a purpose, teachers should help students learn to use writing strategies and learn to concentrate on their own purposes. They take the view that the special nature of the school subject of writing demands a special pedagogy and they aim to introduce this alternative view of writing and of teaching writing to their teachers.

Since teacher education programs have such different orientations, it does not make sense to ask whether teacher education in general can influence teachers, for the nature of the influence would certainly vary from one program to the next. For that reason I distinguished these two broad classes of programs and looked to see if each had distinct influences on teachers, some reinforcing the traditional ideas about teaching and others introducing an alternative set of ideas about teaching. Of course the programs within these categories are not narrowly homogeneous and coherent; rather, they represent tendencies in one direction or another, with many subtle variations on each theme and with many vocal detractors among the faculty of any given program.

Regardless of their orientations, there are many reasons to doubt that these programs would influence their teachers very much. One reason, of course, is that their students already have elaborated ideas of their own about what they will do as teachers. Another is that these programs are usually relatively brief. In many colleges and universities, teacher education consists of no more than half a dozen courses spread over one or two years. They do not have much time to tackle the numerous beliefs teachers already hold. Yet another reason to doubt the potential influence of teacher education is that few programs present students with a coherent vision of teaching. University professors are notoriously autonomous, and education professors are no different. Professors teaching individual courses may have no idea what other professors are offering students.

But these are apologies for teacher education. My purpose is to see whether these programs did, in spite of all of this, have an influence on teachers. Actually, these facts of life may not be as limiting for tradition-
ally oriented programs as they are for reform-oriented programs, because traditional programs are not trying to change teachers’ visions of teaching. Instead, they aim to help teachers improve their practices within the traditional view. But reform-oriented programs have a far more difficult educational challenge, since their aim is to change teachers’ ideas.

Of course it is also possible to have an influence by recruiting teachers whose ideas are already consistent with the program’s orientation. By serving a group of teachers whose personal orientation is consistent with the program’s orientation, the program would have a much better chance of influencing teachers. This possibility led me to make a distinction between two important ways in which program influences might be seen: programs may influence the field of teaching either by changing the concerns of those who enter their programs (an influence on learning), or by enrolling teachers who are already concerned about a particular set of issues (an enrollment influence).

To summarize the program influences I found in this study, I include here two tables, one tallying cases in which programs demonstrated enrollment influence, and one tallying cases in which programs demonstrated influences on learning. My criteria for recognizing an “influence” are as follows: for an enrollment influence, a program has to attract teachers who are noticeably more likely or less likely to express a particular concern, and the concern expressed must be consistent with the program’s own substantive orientation. That is, if a program enrolled teachers who were especially likely to be concerned about prescriptions when the program itself was concentrating on strategies and purposes, I would not count this as an enrollment influence. Influences on learning are those in which teachers’ concerns changed noticeably over time, and again, the change had to be in the direction of the program’s orientation. For either enrollment or learning influences, I counted one “credit” for each occasion in which these criteria were met. I also gave one “discredit” for any occasion in which a program appeared to create noticeable differences in the opposite direction of its own substantive orientation.

Recall that most teachers mentioned more than one idea in response to our questions, and that I counted all the ideas teachers mentioned. Since all ideas were counted, a program could have a separate influence on each separate idea. That is, it could increase the number of teachers who mentioned one idea and simultaneously decrease the number of teachers who mentioned another idea in response to the same question. We have seen many examples in which programs changed teachers’ references to one concern without having any complementary influence on a competing concern. A reform-oriented program, for instance, could reduce teachers’ attention to prescriptions but fail to increase their attention to strategies and purposes, or it could have a double influence by both reducing teachers’ attention to prescriptions and increasing their attention to concepts. I decided, therefore, to count each of these potential changes as a separate influence. Since there were usually at least four possible ideas in each situation (prescriptions, concepts, student purposes, and considering the student as a person), a program could demonstrate four separate influences on the immediate concerns that teachers mentioned in response to any given question.

In tables 7.1 and 7.2, I give programs one “credit” for each influence that meets my twin criteria of (a) noticeable and (b) in the direction of program’s orientation, and one “discredit” for each influence that is noticeable and in the opposing direction.

### Influences on Enrollment

Recall that my criterion for a noticeable enrollment influence is that teachers entering a given program group mention an idea at least 20 percentage points more (or less) often than the idea was mentioned across all program groups. Table 7.1 shows how often each program group demonstrated enrollment influences on the concerns teachers expressed in each of the particular situations we presented. In the upper left-hand corner, for instance, it shows that Urban University had two enrollment influences on what teachers saw in Jessie’s story. The particular influences themselves are not apparent in table 7.1 but are discussed in chapter 4. In this case one of them was that teachers entering Urban University more often mentioned prescriptions; the other was that they less often mentioned the content of Jessie’s story. The remaining numbers in table 7.1 can be interpreted similarly.

Table 7.1 indicates that two program groups were more likely than the others to demonstrate enrollment influences. One “group” includes Urban University, which attracted a population of potential teachers who, even before entering the program, were more likely to interpret these particular situations as raising prescriptive concerns. Across the various classroom situations we presented to our teachers, I found five instances in which teachers entering Urban University differed noticeably from the total group of teachers, and in each case the difference consisted of paying more attention to prescriptions or less to strategies or purposes. I consider these to be enrollment influence, since they are consistent with Urban University’s traditional orientation. The second
Table 7.1. Summary of Program Enrollment Influences on Ideas Elicited Across All Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional orientation</th>
<th>Reform orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-based (State AR)</td>
<td>Field-based (District AR)</td>
<td>University-based (Elite Coll., Normal St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was seen in Jessie’s story</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed responses to Jessie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for grading Jessie’s story</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was seen in the dolphin report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed responses to the dolphin author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed response to the question about verb choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of subject matter relevant to learning organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation-relevant subject matter knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of principles shared about none</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with is or are</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These teachers offered more misinformative principles than any other group of program entrants. Though no program rhetoric addressed the question of informative vs. misinformative content, I am assuming they would take misinformation as a negative.

Table 7.2. Evidence of Program Influences on Teacher Learning Across All Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional orientation</th>
<th>Reform orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-based (State AR)</td>
<td>Field-based (District AR)</td>
<td>University-based (Elite Coll., Normal St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was seen in Jessie’s story</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed responses to Jessie</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for grading Jessie’s story</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was seen in the dolphin report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed responses to the dolphin author</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed responses to the question about verb choice</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of subject matter relevant to learning organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation-relevant subject matter knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of principles shared about none</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with is or are</td>
<td>1,-1*</td>
<td>1,-1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These teachers noticeably decreased the number of principles they provided to the student with the verb choice question. I don’t actually have data indicating whether programs would prefer for teachers to say more or less on an issue like this but am assuming that, since the student asked for information and since the reductions resulted in fewer than one principle offered per person, all programs would view this change negatively.

**One of these changes was a decrease in the proportion of teachers who proposed to give encouragement only, with no substantive comments on the story. I don’t have information on program views toward encouragement without specific feedback but am assuming they would all prefer teachers to provide some sort of substantive comment. Consequently, I considered this a positive, rather than a negative, change.
group which demonstrated numerous enrollment influences includes the two integrated reform programs—Independent University’s inservice program, and Collaborative University’s induction program. I found seven instances in which teachers enrolling in these programs differed noticeably from the total group. In these cases the teachers were more likely to be concerned about strategies and purposes or less likely to be concerned with prescriptions, and these differences are consistent with these programs’ orientations.

Even though all three programs—Urban University, Collaborative University, and Independent University—were enrolling students whose immediate concerns were already consistent with their own substantive orientations, the programs were not recruiting nationally to accomplish this. Each drew its teachers from its own local community. Yet each program did attract unique groups of people into teaching. Urban University was distinctive (and still is) in that it was an open enrollment institution and consequently attracted many students who were less well prepared for college. Often their parents were less well educated than other parents, and often their own admission test scores were lower than those of other students. Urban University responds to its students by offering a remedial course in writing which emphasizes mastery of prescriptions. Perhaps teachers from such backgrounds are less confident in their own mastery of prescriptions and consequently more concerned about complying with prescriptions than are teachers from other backgrounds. The other two programs, Collaborative University and Independent University, were distinctive in that neither program provided a first professional degree. Teachers who enrolled in these two programs already had received their baccalaureate degrees and their teaching credentials, so that program participation was a voluntary effort toward self-improvement rather than a choice taken to meet state certification requirements. Teachers entered these programs, then, because they wanted to, not because they needed a credential. Apparently, they selected programs whose orientations matched their own.

The other two program groups were much less likely to exhibit noticeable enrollment influences. In the case of the university-based programs, this is not a surprise, since most students select colleges based on the merits of the entire institutions rather than the merits of their teacher-education programs. Thus we would not normally expect to see an enrollment influence in a university unless it served a special population, as Urban University does with its open enrollment policy. But we might have expected to see more enrollment influences in the two alternative routes, State Alternative Route and District Alternative Route. Much of the rhetoric about the value of alternative routes is based on the type of individual they hope to recruit. In fact, the State AR explicitly aimed to attract a brighter and more highly educated population into teaching. The state government believed that many well-educated adults might consider a career in teaching if they did not have to return to college to engage in the formal study of teaching. It is possible, of course, that State Alternative Route did attract older people or people with higher test scores, but it did not attract people with noticeably different ideas about teaching, at least when they interpreted and responded to the situations we presented. For these alternative route programs, an absence of enrollment influences suggests that their intentions have not been met.

**Influences on Learning**

Most programs aim to influence learning rather than enrollment. Recall that my criterion for a noticeable influence on learning is that teachers had to mention a particular idea at least 25 percentage points more often (or less often) after they participated in the program than they did before, and the change had to be in the direction of the program’s orientation. Each entry in table 7.2 indicates the number of times such influences appeared in each of the particular situations we presented.

The negative numbers in the bottom row indicate situations in which a noticeable change occurred, but the change was not necessarily in the direction of the program’s orientation. In this case all the negative tallies came from my analysis of the number of informative principles teachers shared with the student who asked about verb choice. In three program groups, teachers noticeably reduced the number of informative ideas they shared after they had participated in the programs. It is not clear that these reductions were necessarily contrary to what the teacher educators in these programs would have wanted. None explicitly addressed this issue. However, I counted them as negative for two reasons. First, by definition, no change can be consistent with both a traditional and a reform orientation, and yet the same pattern appeared across programs with different orientations. Second, since teachers had not conveyed much information to students in the first place, the reductions meant that teachers were offering fewer than even one principle per person when responding to this student’s question about verb choice. It is hard to imagine that many teacher educators would view such scanty responses as instructive, particularly when they were not accompanied by any other advice about the relative importance of this problem or about strategies for avoiding it.
Apart from these negative tallies, table 7.2 offers at least two positive patterns. First, every program group demonstrated some influences on teacher learning, regardless of the group’s orientation or location. In fact, each group demonstrated at least two changes in its intended direction. Second, where changes occurred, they were overwhelmingly consistent with programs’ orientation. In programs with traditional orientations, teachers increased their concerns about compliance with prescriptions, increased their proposals to correct the errors in the text, and increased their reliance on mechanics as a criterion for assigning a grade. Conversely, teachers attending reform-oriented programs reduced their concerns about compliance, reduced the frequency of “correcting errors” as a pedagogical response, increased their concern for the students’ understanding of important concepts, and so forth. Given that teachers initial ideas are so deeply ingrained, so interconnected, and so closely tied to their self-concepts, it is impressive that programs were able to produce even these modest changes.

But table 7.2 also suggests some reason for pessimism: the number of changes that could have occurred across all situations was 33. That is, if a program had had the maximum possible influence it could have, using this crude scoring scheme, it would have a “score” of 33. Yet the scores in table 7.2 range from 2 to 6. Viewed in this way, all program groups appeared to have relatively weak influences on teacher learning.

Three other important points are evident in table 7.2. One is that despite the appearance of program influences in virtually every column and in nearly every row, no programs influenced teachers’ espoused ideals. All of the noticeable influences appeared in the context of particular situations rather than in the context of espoused ideals. This finding is important in light of many arguments about the quality of teacher education programs. Critics of teacher education frequently claim that these programs are overly theoretical or abstract and do not teach teachers anything practical. Yet these data suggest just the opposite: when teacher education programs do influence teachers, the influence is in the context of particular situations, not in the context of espoused ideals.

The second point has to do with differences among the program groups. Table 7.2 suggests that the university-based reform programs demonstrated more influences on teacher learning than any other program group. This is an important finding, especially in light of the received wisdom about teacher learning, according to which teachers learn their subject matter from their liberal arts courses and their technique from their own teaching experiences, so that university-based teacher-education programs are relatively inconsequential. The two alternative route programs participating in this study were based on the received wisdom model of teacher learning. They hired teachers who had already received liberal arts degrees, gave them plenty of classroom experience, sometimes with the help of a mentor, and gave them a handful of teacher-education courses along the way. They expected these smart, well-educated adults to learn from their own experiences teaching. Yet these programs demonstrated only three influences on teacher learning, compared with the six demonstrated by university-based reform programs.

In fact, the combined results from tables 7.1 and 7.2 indicate that these two alternative routes were the weakest program group. These programs demonstrated only two enrollment influences and only three influences on teacher learning. Their weak influence on enrollment is inconsistent with the rhetoric justifying these programs. Either they failed to enroll teachers who were actually smarter than other candidates, or the brighter students they did enroll did not differ from others in their ideas about teaching writing. Their weak influence on learning is inconsistent with the received wisdom model of teacher learning, for that model tells us that teachers should be able to develop their practice without the help of formal study in teaching.

Reformers may find these program influences to be disappointing. Many reformers envision dramatic changes in the character of American classrooms and are impatient to have their visions realized. But the fact is, we know very little about how to produce such radical changes in teaching. Radical changes require teachers to change their minds about what matters most—about what their task is. Yet most discussions of teacher education are based on a received wisdom model of teacher learning that does not account for this kind of change. At its core, the received wisdom model of teacher learning stipulates that teachers develop their subject matter knowledge from their liberal arts courses and develop their techniques from their own experiences teaching. Some variations of the received wisdom model also include a modest contribution from the formal study of teaching, conceding that perhaps teacher education programs might offer knowledge about child development or research on effective teaching techniques, but no version of received wisdom acknowledges that there may be a need to confront and change a network of preexisting ideas about teaching.

Clearly what is needed is a new model of teacher learning that includes a place and time when teachers are encouraged to change their ideas about subject matter and about teaching subject matter—to rethink the assumptions they bring with them from their childhood. The evidence presented here suggests that college and university-based teacher education programs may serve an important role in helping teachers...
change their ideas about subject matter and about teaching subject matter. In fact we saw more changes among teachers participating in university-based reform programs than in any other type of program. This is not to say that these programs demonstrated remarkable success at changing teachers' ideas, but only that they had more success than any other type of program.

### Toward a New Model of Teacher Learning

Despite its limitations, there is much to be said for the received wisdom model of teacher learning, and many teachers will attest that their own expertise developed in just this way. Indeed, the received wisdom model may be useful if we want teachers to teach in traditional ways. That is, if our goal is to help teachers learn to teach as their predecessors have taught, perhaps an education designed according to received wisdom would suffice. Teachers would learn subject matter from their liberal arts programs and would learn to develop and refine their techniques from their experience as teachers. And there could continue to be a modest contribution for teacher education to play: providing knowledge of children's intellectual development, some research findings regarding effective teaching practices, and so forth.

But this model of the contributions to teacher learning is lacking in several important respects. A major omission is its lack of attention to where teachers develop their views about the character of school subjects, the character of school life, and the character of their task as teachers (Nemser, 1983). It is now clear, not just from this study but from numerous others, that teachers' deepest and most fundamental ideas about teaching are learned not from their liberal arts courses, not from their formal study of teaching, and not from their experience teaching, but rather from their experience as elementary and secondary students. There they learn what is supposed to happen in classrooms—what should be taught, how students should act, and how teachers should act. Unless they are challenged, these ideas are likely to be retained throughout teachers' lives and to continue to influence their interpretations of classroom situations and their ideas about how to respond to them. By adding this important additional component to the received wisdom model of teacher learning, we can probably characterize the way most teachers learn to teach.

The problem is, no version of the received wisdom model of teacher learning can account for how, where, or under what circumstances teachers learn a different set of ideas about the essence of school subjects or the essence of their task as teachers. We cannot stipulate that such learning will occur in liberal arts courses, for instance—they provide disciplinary knowledge but do not address the character of school subject matter or the character of teaching per se. Nor can we stipulate that such learning will derive from practice, for if that were so, teachers would each independently invent a new practice that matched reformers' visions of teaching. Finally, we can't stipulate that such learning will occur through the formal study of teaching, for not all teacher-education programs aim to introduce alternative ideas to teachers.

If reformers aim to change the character of American education, it seems clear that an important step for them to take is to abandon the received wisdom model of teacher learning, a model that applies only when teachers are learning to continue with traditional teaching, and formulate a new model that can offer solutions to the problem of change. Though I make this argument in the context of today's reform, it seems likely to apply equally well to other reforms, either past or future, since reformers by definition want change, rather than refinement of past practices. The model of teacher learning that reformers should seek is one that takes as its premise the set of interrelated and mutually reinforcing ideas formulated during childhood. Recognizing these ideas requires a model of teacher learning that (a) expands the list of things teachers need to learn—not just subject matter and technique, but in addition, new ideas about the nature of school subject matter and nature of the task of teaching; (b) defines learning as changing ideas rather than accumulating new knowledge; (c) reconsiders the potential contribution of the formal study of teaching; and (d) encourages the longitudinal study of teacher learning.

### Expanding the List of Things to Be Learned

The received wisdom model of teacher learning addresses mainly subject matter knowledge and technique. Missing from this model is how teachers learn the character of school subjects and how they learn what the task of teaching actually is. These areas of learning are most difficult, in part because they are difficult to articulate, and in part because these are the areas where teachers' preformed ideas are strongest. As we have examined teachers' interpretations of and responses to our collection of particular teaching situations, it has become apparent that what teachers see in these situations and how they propose to respond to them depend on their ideas about the character of subject matter and the character of their task as teachers.

Closely associated with the problem of changing teachers' ideas
about the character of school subjects and of their teaching tasks is the problem of helping them translate these new ideas into particular classroom situations. Unless reformers are very careful, they will persuade teachers to espouse the reformers' ideals, without helping them see how those ideals translate into particular situations. Absent the ability to draw on these new ideas to interpret classroom situations, teachers' spontaneous responses will continue to reflect their childhood experiences.

Defining Learning as Transformation

The model of teacher learning that reformers will need is one that defines learning as changing one's ideas rather than one of refining or developing the ideas one already has. Models of learning that focus on changing one's ideas, rather than on refining existing ideas or accumulating new facts, are frequently called transformational models (Jackson, 1986). The problem is, change is not easy. In fact psychological research on beliefs suggests that certain types of beliefs are more difficult to change than others, and teachers' beliefs meet most of the difficult-to-change criteria. For instance, beliefs formed earlier in life are harder to change than those formed later on; beliefs with affective components are more difficult to change than those that are mainly cognitive; beliefs that are connected with self-concepts are more difficult to change than other beliefs; and beliefs that are interconnected with other beliefs, so that they form a network of beliefs, are more difficult to change. Teachers' ideas about teaching writing meet all these criteria: they are formed early in life; they are associated with deep emotions; they are connected to teachers' images of themselves as teachers; and they represent the integration of beliefs about teaching, about learning, and about the nature of subject matter.

Reconsidering the Role of the Formal Study of Teaching

Received wisdom allocates to formal teacher education only modest contribution to teacher learning. It assumes that teaching is self-evident and that techniques can be refined with experience. Given this assumption, it perceives formal teacher education programs as overly abstract and theoretical.

Even reformers, when they set their sights on teacher education, often base their proposals on the received wisdom model of teacher learning. They propose to increase the number of courses teachers take in the liberal arts, for instance, or to increase the amount of time teachers spend in school-based internships.

One reason reformers do this is that they assume the content of teacher education—topics like classroom management or child development—is unrelated to their visions of reform. Their interest, therefore, is in devising a program structure that will provide sufficient time for teachers to develop their subject matter knowledge and refine their teaching techniques. But program content is likely to be far more important to teacher learning than program structure is. We have seen that programs such as those at Urban University and Elite College, which have similar structures, have remarkably different influences both on enrollment and on teacher learning. Moreover, programs with different structures such as those at Research State University, which offers a fifth-year program, and Normal State University, which offers a traditional four-year degree, can have very similar influences on teachers. What matters most in designing programs to change teachers' ideas, therefore, is not the structure of a program, but rather its substantive orientation.

Encouraging the Longitudinal Study of Teacher Learning

The two central goals of this study both demonstrate the importance of longitudinal research. The first goal, of illuminating teachers' initial ideas about teaching, has revealed that teachers already have many interrelated ideas about teaching before they enter their teacher education programs: they are not blank slates. Therefore any examination of the influences of teacher education must acknowledge these initial ideas. Without knowing the ideas teachers already have, we might easily confuse enrollment influences with influences on learning. We would not know whether programs actually changed teachers' thinking, or whether instead they enrolled teachers whose ideas already matched their own orientation.

The second goal, of examining program influences on teachers' ideas, gives us another reason why longitudinal research is valuable: different programs aim to change people in different ways. If reformers and researchers define learning as the amount and direction of change that occurs, then they need to know what teachers' concerns were prior to program participation in order to see whether and in which direction those ideas change over time.

THE CHALLENGE FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

Should the formal study of teaching be accorded a more important contribution to teacher learning? The TELT study suggests that teacher-
education programs can influence teachers and that most of them do influence teachers. Programs can enroll sympathetic teachers to begin with and then reinforce the ideas teachers already have, or they can help teachers learn to attend to different ideas as they interpret and respond to particular situations. But even when teachers begin to think about these new ideas and to see their relevance in particular classroom situations, they do not completely abandon their old ideas or fully embrace the new ones. Although these programs appeared to have some influence on teachers, there were no cases in which 100 percent of teachers changed their interpretations of any particular situation, nor were there cases in which any single teacher changed her concerns in 100 percent of the situations about which we asked. Moreover, just as all program groups demonstrated some examples of change, all also demonstrated many some examples of no change—of teachers who entered with ideas that were very different from the program’s orientation and who completed the program still clinging to those ideas. For the most part, then, learning was piecemeal and uneven.

Wholesale change is difficult for many reasons. One reason is that teacher education programs are not very lengthy or labor intensive. Another is that they are often fragmented and incoherent. Still another is that the ideas teachers bring with them to their teacher education programs have been developed and refined through years of experience as students. These ideas have been reinforced by their experience and they offer many advantages to teachers, not least of which is that they enable teachers to simplify their interpretations of classroom events. If teachers seriously entertained alternative interpretations of all the situations they faced, they could become immobilized by the additional uncertainty these alternatives would create.

Moreover, the practice of teaching is inherently ambiguous, and teachers face a great temptation to simplify their interpretations of events as much as possible. In fact, all of the ideas we have examined, both about teaching and about subject matter, have some legitimacy. We do want our children to learn language conventions. We also want them to learn strategies and purposes for writing, and we want them to learn important concepts. This difficult truth means that teachers must necessarily depend on their own interpretations of each situation to decide which ideas are of most concern at any given moment. It also means that teacher educators cannot influence teachers by persuading them to abandon their initial ideas completely and adopt a new set of ideas, but rather must try to persuade them to temper their initial ideas with attention to other ideas. This is a more subtle, and therefore more difficult, message to convey.

### APPENDIX

**Portraits of Participating Programs**

Collaborative University is a large state university in the Southwest. The teacher education program we studied there is a graduate-level induction program, operated jointly by the university and a local school district. The program is designed for newly certified teachers—those who have already completed an undergraduate program in teacher education and who have already been certified. The program replaced the traditional sink-or-swim first year of teaching with a full-time internship complete with a mentor provided by the school district and seminars provided by the university. Mentors are released from their teaching so that they can devote their full attention to mentoring, and the university provides training and assistance for the mentors. At the completion of the program, interns receive a masters degree from the university.

Because these teachers are novices, mentors do attend to the fundamentals of managing real classrooms full of real students. At the same time, they encourage a more reflective approach to teaching and try to focus novices’ attention on issues of what is being taught and what is being learned more than how smoothly the classroom is functioning. With respect to writing, the mentors encourage a whole-language approach to language arts.

District Alternative Route is located in a large city in the West. The district serves some very economically depressed populations and a wide range of nonwhite and non-English-speaking students. It has a difficult time hiring enough teachers to fill all its classrooms, and so offers this alternative route as a means of increasing the number of teachers who are at least moderately qualified for the work. Like Collaborative University’s program and the State Alternative Route, this District Alternative Route provides both mentors and seminars while novices are engaged in full-time teaching. And, like the State Alternative Route, this District Alternative Route does not release its mentors from their regular teaching responsibilities, nor does it train them for their
work, so the amount and quality of mentoring that novices actually receive is quite variable.

This program also assumes that its teaching candidates have already completed a bachelors degree in the subject they will teach, and it focuses its curriculum on managing students and complying with district policies. Since the program is entirely confined to a single school district, it also gives a lot of attention to district policies regarding absences, record-keeping procedures, and so forth. The program is not entirely absent attention to subject matter, however. With respect to writing in particular, the District Alternative Route provides novices with state and district curriculum guidelines. In addition, classes for novice English teachers are taught by experienced English teachers, so that even when the content is oriented toward management, the examples are all taken from the English curriculum and tend to incorporate subject-specific goals much more than the State Alternative Route courses do.

Elite College is a small, private, and highly selective college located in the Northeast. The institution's primary purpose is to provide a liberal education to its students. Consistent with that aim, its teacher education program includes relatively few credit hours. The entire education curriculum occurs during the students' senior year, and even student teaching is not considered an essential part of the program. The students who participate in this program therefore receive very few credits in education and receive a substantial number of credits in the disciplines. Students who attend Elite College tend to be privileged—some attended private preparatory high schools, most have families who can afford the high tuition, and if they do not complete their program within the prescribed four-year period, it is because they took a term off to travel abroad, not because they were working part-time.

Because Elite College's students come from privileged backgrounds, Elite's teacher educators attend to issues involved in teaching less advantaged students. They fear that their prospective teachers will not be familiar with much of what they will find if they teach in public schools. With respect to writing in particular, both the teacher educators and the English faculty emphasize strategies and purposes.

Independent University, a prestigious university on the East Coast, sponsors an inservice program that serves teachers in its metropolitan area. The program differs from many in that it works with school faculties rather than individual teachers. University faculty visit selected schools to provide in-class coaching in the writing process. Faculty also offer summer institutes and other ongoing seminars to accompany this field-based assistance. The emphasis is heavily oriented toward the writing process, and teachers are offered a variety of forms of assistance that are conceptually consistent.

Normal State University is located in a small midwestern town. Though it now carries the label of state university, the institution as a whole is still geared heavily toward teacher education. It graduates hundreds of new teachers each year, and many faculty, even in the disciplinary departments, are former high school or elementary school teachers. Like Urban University, Normal State tends to draw its students from its immediate vicinity and to assume that once they complete their programs they will return to nearby communities to teach. Whereas Urban University's vicinity is urban, Normal State's is rural.

Both disciplinary and education faculty at Normal State take an active interest in teacher education. They tend to believe that their students are good, wholesome young people, that they will teach good, wholesome children, and that they will not have too much difficulty with their work. The education courses are arranged into blocks that are designed to be taken in sequence and in tandem with courses in the disciplines. With respect to writing in particular, the faculty emphasize strategies and purposes.

Research State University is located in an urban area in the South. It is quite large and has a large and diverse education faculty, hard to succinctly characterize. It tends to draw its students from throughout the state. Faculty at Research State are more cosmopolitan than those at Urban University or at Normal State. They are more conversant with research literature and more actively involved in reform movements in education. To that end, Research State has extended its teacher preparation to the fifth year. It offers a five-year program for elementary candidates and a fifth-year program for secondary candidates. Secondary candidates are expected to enter the program with a completed bachelors degree in the subject they plan to teach. During their fifth year, they take education courses and a traditional student-teaching internship.

Though the faculty involved in language arts courses emphasize strategies and purposes in their courses, teacher candidates often encounter more traditional prescriptive ideas about writing when they are in the schools for their internships. Moreover, the state has been active in education policy and has established a number of policies that run contrary to the ideas offered by the university.

State Alternative Route is a program offered to college graduates in a northeastern state, provided they meet certain entrance criteria. They need not have studied teaching while in college. The program is structurally very similar to the Collaborative University's program, and to the District Alternative Route, in that it combines full-time teaching with
seminars and a local mentor. However, it differs from Collaborative University in that mentors are not released from their own classrooms to take on their mentoring responsibilities, so novices may not in fact receive much time at all from their mentors, and in that mentors receive no training in how to be mentors. It also differs from both Collaborative University and the District Alternative Route in that the faculty providing the seminars have no permanent relationship to the program and may have little or no idea of what their counterparts have taught in other seminars.

Because the novices participating in this program have already completed their bachelor's degrees and have passed entrance tests, program faculty tend to assume they know whatever they need to know about the subject. Therefore the content of the courses offered of these novice teachers tends to focus on classroom management rather than on particular substantive topics such as how to teach writing in particular or how to teach mathematics in particular.

Urban University is a medium-sized institution in the Southeast which began as a university for black students and has since become an integrated university. The student body is now roughly half black and half white. In contrast to Elite College, which is highly selective and draws its students from throughout the country, Urban University is an open-enrollment university and takes most of its students from the immediate vicinity. Many of them come from families who have not attended college; in fact some of their parents did not complete high school.

Because many Urban University students work and are only part-time students, the teacher education program allows students to take their courses in any sequence and at any time. That is, the courses are relatively independent of one another. The program both preaches and practices a diagnostic-prescriptive strategy for teaching and learning. Course content tends to emphasize behavior management and behaviorist ideas. In addition, the state in which Urban University resides has devised a behavioristic assessment for all new teachers in the state, and so Urban University teaches its candidates the behaviors the state will expect them to exhibit when they begin teaching. With respect to writing in particular, Urban University tends to focus on handwriting and on mechanics rather than concepts, strategies, or purposes.

**Notes**

**CHAPTER 1**

1. Aspects of this argument can be found in a wide range of blue-ribbon commission reports, including, but not limited to, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), which specifically addresses the problem of teacher quality; the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), which addresses mainly the quality and rigor of American secondary education; the National Research Council (1989), which addresses the issue of mathematics education in particular; Holmes Group (1987), which addresses both teacher education and the attractiveness of the work place to teachers; and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996), which also addresses the problem of teacher preparation.

2. For detailed and insightful discussions of this, see Lortie (1975) and Cohen (1988).

3. In the 1980s, several researchers examined this problem. Doyle (1983; 1986) and Doyle and Carter (1984) argued that teachers sacrificed meaningful content in order to keep students orderly, while Sediak et al. (1986) and McNeil (1988) suggested a tension between the desire to maintain friendly relations with students and the desire to teach them rigorous content.

4. The TELT study was undertaken by researchers at the National Center for Research on Teacher Education at Michigan State University. While thirty researchers were involved at different times and in different ways, those most central to the study were Marianne Amarel, Deborah Ball, Joyce Cain, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Robert E. Floden, Mary Louise Gomez, Perry Lanier, G. Williamson McDiarmid, James Mead, Susan Melnick, James Mosenthal, Gary Natriello, Barbara Neufeld, Lynn Paine, Michelle Parker, Richard Prawat, Pam Schramm, Trish Stoddart, Suzanne Wilson, Kenneth Zeichner, and Karen Zumwalt.

5. For a brief history of the evolution of thought in this area, see Nystrand, Greene, and Wiemelt (1993).

6. For an interesting history of efforts within the United States to prescribe proper forms of usage, see Baron (1982).

7. Some, such as Paul Robinson (1979), have argued that writing doesn’t even have social value, but is done entirely for oneself.

8. The terminology and goals of these contemporary authors are varied. For two good illustrative discussions, see Young (1980) and Willinsky (1990).