Unofficially Speaking

I recently read “America’s Math Problems” (Harold Stevenson, October 1987) concerning Asian children and mathematics. For a number of years I have been observing Asian-American children unofficially while teaching in the Chicago Public Schools. I contend that our Asian-American students are also doing well. Now that I have read Stevenson’s article, the carryover from Asian culture to American culture is striking.

While substituting in Chicago schools (about 100 per year), I found that Asian-Americans usually constituted about one-third of all the honors classes and represented a high percentage of the advanced math and science classes. I have observed that Asian-Americans help one another in their studies and that they also have a philosophy among themselves that they must excel in school.

Certainly, we could take a cue from the Asian-Americans as well as the Asians in producing children who are high achievers in schools.

STEWART E. BREKKE
Physics and Mathematics Teacher
Robeson High School
Chicago, Illinois

Backers for Boyer

I have just finished reading your guest editorial by Ernest Boyer (“It’s Not ‘Either Or,’ It’s Both,” December 1987/January 1988). I will remember his comments: “We are systematically training pedants who have lost a powerful view of themselves as creators of our children need to see clearly, hear acutely, and feel sensitively” (in their daily living), I might add.

I have spent an entire professional lifetime in the classroom with that goal. Dr. Boyer has given me reason to continue looking for some answers—what an interesting editorial.

CAROLYN PURGRASKI
Bay City, Michigan

Why?

As I read George Hillocks’ “Synthesis of Research on Teaching Writing” in the May 1987 issue, one word kept echoing in my mind: why? This wasn’t the why of wonder in the voice of a curious child. It was more the why spoken with a hand on the forehead, a shake of the head.

For years now I have been making up answers to the why question, why the teaching of writing is no better than it is. My favorite made-up answer is that researchers, writers of educational material, teacher trainers, and, sadly, even teachers do not know how to teach writing.

Teachers should have been able to find a natural and effective way to teach writing; after all, they are the ones teaching the stuff. Even by accident some of them should have hit upon a better way to teach students to write, given their daily experiences and the body of research that has been circulating for nearly 15 years.

In my wonderment I talk to teachers, to kids. I’m sure the real answer will be found that way. Probably it will happen by accident some sunny afternoon when a blue sky leaves the mind open for thoughts to fly in and out often enough to become tame and recognizable. Until that sunny day, I seek answers in libraries. I can get excited over reviews of research. So why was I disappointed when I read Hillocks’ synthesis?

I was disappointed in all the jargon Hillocks used; but, more than that, in the issues he chose to discuss. They seemed small. His synthesis made no mention of the research of Donald
Graves or Lucy McCormick Calkins or Susan Somers. The big issues of student choice, of student autonomy, and of allowing students to write about topics they know and care about were not there. The notion of teacher as writer and researcher was also absent. Yet there were so many places in the article where these topics would have made sense.

For example, when Hilllocks described free writing, he seemed to connect “writing about whatever is of interest to the students in uninhibited way” and “the process approach to writing” (p. 80). Yet he mentioned neither the power behind students choosing their own topics nor the necessity of the teachers having internalized the writing process themselves.

Further, Hilllocks concluded that “inquiry,” or what he calls procedural knowledge, has the most power in teaching writing, that is, the teaching of general procedures and specific strategies for the production of discourse and the transformation of data for use in writing (p. 81). Nowhere does his synthesis reflect the change in attitude and ability that occurs when students learn to write because it’s a discovery process, a way to make sense of their lives. I feel cheated. So once again I am, hand on forehead, asking why.

CAROLYN MACHUR
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia

Some Comments on Art Criticism

Congratulations on the excellent issue on the arts in education (December 1987/January 1988). I was pleased to see Anne Meek’s account of the “art appreciation” lesson (p. 57), but the article needs some comment.

Art teachers, as well as elementary classroom teachers need to recognize that there are developmental issues at stake as they proceed to introduce art as grist for the young critic’s mill. There has been some research—too little, in fact—about the ages and stages of aesthetic perception (Project Zero, for example), and it is clear from the excellent picture of classroom dynamics created by Meek that the youngsters involved were still at a stage where they valued the “realistic” Ammi Phillips portrait (Mrs. Mayer and Daughter) over the more abstract Cassatt painting. This is not, I submit, because “their standard for judging was based on their efforts to be neat, to stay within the lines in their own work” but because developmentally, they were not yet able to “see” the value of impressionism until guided by their teacher.

By claiming to prefer the more sophisticated Cassatt Mother and Child, however, the teacher entered that treacherous domain of tastemaking. Had she expressed her preference without denigrating the work of Phillips, she might have given kids (who always want the “right answer”) the opportunity to be “right” about their preference, even if it differed from their teacher’s. The ensuing discussion could still have taken place, and the “Ah-ha!” moment could still have been preserved. As David Perkins suggests, the kids could have had the opportunity to see the art behind the art in both pictures.

We need to look at the “tastemaking” role of teachers and how it sometimes conflicts with our desire to create autonomous learners. We need to develop students with heightened critical faculties, able to describe, defend, and advocate for artists and art, past, present, and future.

As the Getty Institute and the National Endowment for the Arts make strong moves to influence the curriculum writing process in this area, attention must be paid to their unwitting complicity in creating “right” answers within lessons in aesthetic criticism, thus entering the realm of “tastemakers.” Moreover, they and their educational partners must select works to study that do not ignore the ages and stages in perception.

Artists can help us with issues of
Is habit keeping you from considering these new biology texts for your Advanced Placement or Honors programs?

Consider this just published text for your Biology II or Honors program

UNDERSTANDING BIOLOGY

by Peter Raven and George Johnson

Written in an engaging, clear writing style this college level text uses a strong evolutionary approach throughout to help students understand how science and scientific theory develop within an evolutionary framework. Superbly illustrated with more than 1400 photographs and drawings (virtually all in color) this unique text moves logically through the general fundamentals—cell biology, energy, genetics, evolution and ecology in the first 23 chapters and then considers the realm of biological diversity, plant biology and animal biology in the remaining 20 chapters. The content focuses on timely subjects students can relate to such as AIDS, disease, hunger, overpopulation, and gene technology.

Comprehensive learning devices in every chapter assist the student: chapter overviews, for review sections, spot summaries, boxed essays, end of chapter summaries, review questions, self quizzes, problem and thought questions.


If you seek a challenging text to stimulate student interest and make learning more enjoyable, consider this new text for your program.


One of the most popular texts available for your Advanced Placement program

BIOLOGY

by Peter Raven and George Johnson

This highly successful, highly readable text is a college level major text that is used extensively in Advanced Placement programs. Superbly illustrated with more than 1700 full color photographs and drawings, this comprehensive 1280 page book uses a strong evolutionary approach to explore traditional biological topics in depth while incorporating modern developments in molecular biology and genetics.

There are comprehensive learning devices in every chapter. The ancillary material includes Instructor’s Manual, Study Guide, Lab Manual, Test Bank, Quest Bank and Overhead Transparency Acetates. If you are looking for a more challenging, more stimulating text for your Advanced Placement program, evaluate this successful text.


Complimentary copies are limited to teachers making adoption decisions. Please specify title of text currently in use, course title, enrollment and adoption decision date.

The C.V. Mosby Company
11800 Westline Industrial Drive
St. Louis, Missouri 63146
800-352-4177/(314) 872-9070

MEK Repliea: Teacher as Teacher, Not as Tastemaker

If tastemaking had been Mrs. Wainner’s objective, she would have been persistently didactic throughout the lesson. Indeed, in letting the students state their preferences, she digressed from the lesson objectives in a relaxed and informal interlude intended to capitalize on their interest. The resulting crescendo in favor of the Phillips’ painting became an example of peer group as tastemaker. Then, when Mrs. Wainner added her preference to Ben’s, she risked the use of her authority to strengthen attainment of the lesson objectives, not the imposition of her taste. She was teacher as teacher. This concentration on the objectives does indeed raise serious questions about teacher accountability and formal evaluations based on a Hunter-derivative model, but I have only enthusiasm for the objectives.