

Synthesis of Research on Good Teaching: Insights from the Work of the Institute for Research on Teaching

The emerging knowledge base will make the profession multifaceted rather than simplified and will challenge educators to organize schools and teacher roles so as to achieve optimal student learning.

Recent years have witnessed greatly increased appreciation of the centrality of good teaching to the effectiveness of schooling and of the role of research on teaching in developing a knowledge base to inform the teaching profession. This article draws on findings from the past decade of research on teaching, and in particular on findings developed at the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT), to present a model of what good teaching is, a better understanding of why it is difficult, and some hypotheses about how it can be increased.

The Emerging Prominence of Research on Teaching

In the 1960s and early 1970s, scholars and policymakers concerned about educational equity and improvement did not see much need for research on teaching or for upgrading the quality of the teaching profession. For example, reports by Coleman and his colleagues (1966) and by Jencks and his colleagues (1972) were interpreted as indicating that neither schools nor teachers made important differences in student achievement. In addition, President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs for educational improvement were based primarily on a production-function approach (e.g., outcomes follow expenditures), although this theory had already become suspect by 1977. When input

from scientists was enlisted in school improvement efforts, the scientists tended to be subject matter specialists but not researchers studying teaching. Their efforts featured attempts to develop "teacher proof" curriculums. Those approaches did not meet with much success, and gradually the recognition grew that achieving genuine improvements in educational quality would require working through teachers rather than trying to work around them.

Since the early 1970s there has been a surge of activity in research on teaching. The work has featured sophisticated methods of interviewing and observing teachers, development of rich descriptions of classroom processes, and, frequently, information about linkages between classroom processes and student outcomes. Much of it was predicated on a deceptively simple thesis: Effective school learning requires good teaching, and good teaching requires professionals who exercise judgments in constructing the education of their students. In retrospect, this thesis was revolutionary, representing an ideological premise as well as a scientific claim. It led to transformations in thinking about the role of research in providing a data base to inform educational improvement.

In 1977, teachers were viewed either as weak links in the educational process to be circumvented or as tech-

nicians to be programmed. Now educational reform leaders state that the key to success lies in creating a profession equal to the task—a profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy 1986). Today educational practitioners are looking less for prescriptions and more for principles that will increase their effectiveness as semi-autonomous professionals who negotiate and mediate among complex and sometimes contradictory task demands as they pursue goals of excellence and equity. In the words of Michigan teacher Linda Alford (1983),

Research lets us see how others teach... We can see the effects of their behavior, test our decisions against theirs, match our strategies against theirs, and gain insights into ourselves and our teaching.

These views of teaching and research are very different from earlier views that cast teachers as technicians who deliver "teacher proof" curriculums. Research (Brophy and Good 1986) has shown that students who receive active instruction and work supervision from their teachers achieve more than those students who spend most of their time working through curriculum materials on their own. Other research (Clark and Peterson 1986) shows that much of this

active instruction results from professional planning, thinking, and decision making by teachers. Good teachers adapt instruction to the needs of the students and the situation rather than rigidly following fixed scripts.

Conceptual Framework

Figure 1 provides a model of good teaching that identifies factors influencing teachers' instruction of particular academic content, including information that teachers might consider during preactive planning of instruction and actions that they might consider during interactive teaching. Proceeding from left to right, the model portrays good teaching as a tightly coupled rational process in which background and milieu factors influence teachers' development of professional pedagogical knowledge and routines. These, in turn, influence the planning of instruction, which influences the nature of the instruction that actually occurs. And this instruction (along with student aptitude and motivation factors) influences students' immediate responses to instruction and, ultimately, its long-term outcomes. There is also a self-correcting mechanism: Good teachers reflect on the feedback that they get on the effects of their instruction. This reflection in turn enhances their professional knowledge and affects their future instructional planning.

The model illustrates that teaching is highly complex, containing many points for possible breakdown or error. The best teachers negotiate their way through this complexity by attending to each relevant factor. Most teachers, however, are less sophisticated and systematic in planning and carrying out instruction. The sheer complexity of the teaching task and of the milieu in which it is conducted—typical classrooms—makes it necessary for all teachers to rely on procedures, routines, implicit decision rules, and other simplification strategies that make the task manageable. Teachers operate with "bounded rationality" within these simplifications (Simon 1957). Research has documented substantial differences in the degree to which individual teachers' implicit

models are rational and effective for generating good instructional planning and decision making.

Several features of Figure 1 highlight ways in which recent work has moved beyond earlier conceptions of teacher thinking and its role in instructional planning and implementation:

- Both the origins and the outcomes of teacher thinking are represented; early research on teacher thinking was largely descriptive, with little attention to where it came from or what its effects on students might be.

- The model represents long-term effects on students' academic learning as mediated by students' immediate reactions to instruction. Effective teaching not only provides students with input, response opportunities, and feedback, but also attracts their attention and interest and stimulates them to activate information-processing strategies, sense-making strategies, and other cognitive and metacognitive components of learning for meaningful understanding.

- The model represents subject matter as an essential context for understanding teachers' thoughts and actions. Early research on teacher thinking did not consider how teachers' thoughts and actions might vary in important ways depending on the content to be taught.

- Teachers' routines are included along with teachers' conscious planning and interactive decision making as determinants of instruction. Many teacher practices occur not because they are consciously planned but because routines developed through prior experience are activated automatically in relevant situations. Originally some of these routines were consciously developed; others were acquired as habits through modeling or conditioning and have never been consciously examined.

- Teacher knowledge is represented as encompassing (1) knowledge about the content to be taught, (2) knowledge about pedagogical strategies for teaching the content, and (3) knowledge about the students (in

Highlights of Research on Good Teaching

Good teaching is fundamental to effective schooling. From the studies of the Institute for Research on Teaching and those of others over the last 10 years, we have a picture of effective teachers as semi-autonomous professionals who:

- are clear about their instructional goals;
- are knowledgeable about their content and the strategies for teaching it;
- communicate to their students what is expected of them—and why;
- make expert use of existing instructional materials in order to devote more time to practices that enrich and clarify the content;
- are knowledgeable about their students, adapting instruction to their needs and anticipating misconceptions in their existing knowledge;
- teach students metacognitive strategies and give them opportunities to master them;
- address higher- as well as lower-level cognitive objectives;
- monitor students' understanding by offering regular appropriate feedback;
- integrate their instruction with that in other subject areas;
- accept responsibility for student outcomes;
- are thoughtful and reflective about their practice.

As future research developments expand our understanding, better teacher preparation should result. However, we can't expect lasting changes in practice if, for example, the benefits of proposed interventions don't outweigh the costs of implementation; if teachers are asked to add new procedures without suggestions about what to relinquish to accommodate them; and if researchers continue to view teaching in small fragments instead of the complex day-to-day operation that it is. With clarification of issues such as these, though, we can anticipate both improved learning and teaching that is at once more systematic and yet still gratifying.

particular, about student background knowledge that can be capitalized upon and about student misconceptions that will need to be confronted during teaching). Good teaching requires possession and use of all three of these categories of teacher knowledge, not just knowledge of subject matter.

- External influences on teacher thinking and action are included in recognition of the fact that some aspects of instruction occur in response to external pressures rather than to the teacher's own ideas about what is appropriate.

- Direct influences (power) and indirect influences (persuasion) are distinguished to explain why, for example, some teachers continue to teach in a way that is consistent with a policy even after that policy has been terminated, whereas other teachers will resist compliance with a policy or will comply with it only so long as it is in effect and backed by sanctions.

- Personal experiences, especially teachers' own experiences as students, are represented as important determinants of how teachers think and what they do.

- Teachers' thoughts and actions

are represented as dynamic, reflecting the fact that teachers can and do learn from experience.

Insights from Recent Research on Teaching

Since 1976, the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University has conducted research on teacher planning, classroom management, student socialization, and instruction within several subject matter areas. Despite the diversity of topics addressed, the Institute's projects shared several common features worth noting.

First, they have focused primarily on the roles of teachers and the thoughts and actions involved in carrying out teaching activities and only secondarily on students, curriculums, or other topics. Thus, most of the information developed is directly relevant to those who wish to understand and improve the practice and profession of teaching.

Second, the research has focused on enduring problems of practice—problems that are inherent in the fact that teachers are charged with simultaneously meeting the needs of 25 or 30 students, while working within the resource limits and constraints typically

found in schools. Many of these enduring problems cannot be solved in any complete or final sense; rather, the teacher can only make the best decision that circumstances permit (Lampert 1985). These dilemmas usually require professional judgment and decision making rather than adoption of some routine procedure.

Third, IRT research has focused on the planning, thinking, and decision making that lead to teachers' classroom behaviors, not just on behaviors alone. Finally, the research was planned and conducted with participation by collaborating teachers (i.e., not just faculty members and graduate students). This feature helped to ensure that the research was of interest and use to practitioners, that the assumptions built into research designs and procedures were valid, and that at each stage, from planning the research to interpreting the obtained results, important complexities and situational specifics were taken into account (Porter 1986).

Because of IRT's leadership in research on teaching and the breadth and scope of its research program, its findings are representative of the contributions to the knowledge base that




Fig. 1. Model of Factors Influencing Teachers' Instruction of Their Students in Particular Content

“Today educational practitioners are looking less for prescriptions and more for principles that will increase their effectiveness . . .”

researchers on teaching have developed in the last 10 years. It is not possible to inventory in this article the many findings produced by the Institute's individual research projects. Instead, we have extracted a number of macro-level findings concerning the nature of classroom teaching and what it looks like at its best. These findings are summarized below.

Orientations to Teaching

With its focus on teacher planning and decision making, recent research on teaching has sought to discover the origins of teachers' actions as well as their consequences. These studies (see Clark and Peterson 1986) reveal that teachers seldom conform to the totally rational model depicted in Figure 1 (setting clear instructional objectives, planning activities against those objectives, monitoring outcomes, and making adjustments when outcomes indicate that adjustments are needed).

Nevertheless, teachers' classroom practices have been shown to be influenced in important ways by the goals that teachers hold for schooling and the responsibilities that they are willing to accept for themselves.

One of the fundamental challenges of teaching is that the number of important goals that could be pursued exceeds the number that can be accomplished within the time and energy available. To cope with this dilemma, teachers simplify their work environment by concentrating their efforts. Because most teachers have a great deal of autonomy in determining what they do once the classroom door is closed, there is great variance in the nature and appropriateness of the goals that teachers adopt, resulting in important differences in teacher practices and in student accomplishments.

Some teachers emphasize goals that would be widely questioned if they

were known. For example, some teachers emphasize "survival and convenience" goals, passing time in ways that are as pleasant as possible for them and their students. When teachers and students strike such a "bargain," which features sacrifice of standards in pursuit of a comfortable environment, the result is a compromised curriculum (Sedlak et al. 1986).

At the other extreme, negative consequences can occur when teachers do not have focused goals and attempt to accomplish too much. For example, teachers are much more easily persuaded to add new topics to their instruction than they are to delete topics that they have been teaching (Floden et al. 1981). Although such good intentions and willingness to respond to emerging developments and information needs are laudable, the net result of their decisions is a thinning out of the curriculum. Gradually,

HOW
YOUR SCHOOL
CAN ENABLE EVERY
STUDENT TO ACHIEVE SUCCESS

OBE

OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION (OBE):

The best of the *Effective Schools* research combined into a single, comprehensive, and powerful model whose goal is success for every student.

Now . . . THE OBE PRACTITIONER'S HANDBOOKS
by Charlotte Danielson

In use in more than 40 states and 7 foreign countries.

Practical help for teachers, principals, and central-office administrators implementing Outcome-Based Education/Mastery Learning from an educator who has been involved in all phases of planning and implementation.

In this series of 6 booklets, you'll find out what is possible, what is involved, and *what* to do *when* to create an effective outcome-based program.

ORDER YOUR SET TODAY!

Introducing OBE—An overview.

The Outcome-Based Curriculum—Alignment and integration, testing, materials.

Developing the Building Plan (Elementary Grades)—Team planning, grouping of students, and school and parent communication.

Teaching for Mastery—Applying the best instructional practices.

Using Categorical Funds for OBE—Using a significant resource effectively.

A 5-Year Action Plan—An implementation plan discussing the "who," "what," "when," "where," and "how."

Individual titles \$5.95 each (quantity discounts on 10 or more of one title)

Set of all 6 titles. \$33.50 (quantity discounts available—10 or more sets)

Please add 10% shipping and handling to all orders

MAIL ORDER TOGETHER WITH PAYMENT OR PURCHASE ORDER TO:
OUTCOMES ASSOCIATES • PO Box 1046 • Monroe, WA 98272
(208) 743-8000

more topics are taught for briefer periods of time, to the point that many of them are merely mentioned with little hope for student mastery. This issue surfaces frequently in educational policy debates, because "mentioning without really teaching" is one of the problems identified by critics of contemporary school curriculums (Armbruster and Anderson 1984).

Although all teachers ultimately must set goal priorities, an important recent finding has been that teachers need not always give up one goal in order to obtain the time and energy to pursue another. For example, one IRT study found that elementary teachers who stressed goals concerning both academic achievement and socialization were more effective in attaining both sets of goals than were teachers who placed a high priority on socialization goals but a low priority on academic achievement goals (Prawat 1985). A second study of elementary teachers found that those who integrated language arts instruction with instruction in other subject areas were successful in teaching both the language arts skills and the other subject matter content, although few teachers taught in such integrated fashion (Schmidt et al. 1985). Research in 9th grade general mathematics classes found that interventions that put more emphasis on students' conceptual understanding of mathematics and less emphasis on drilling them in computational skills resulted in improvements not only in conceptual understanding but also in computational skills (Madsen-Nason and Lanier 1986). These studies also suggest that some forms of instruction are more efficient than others, and in particular, that balanced and integrated instruction is more effective than instruction that tries to develop knowledge or skills in isolation from one another or that emphasizes certain objectives but slight others that are equally important.

In summary, differences among teachers in the goals they hold for their instruction help explain the differences in the teachers' effectiveness. However, there is no one-to-one relationship between teachers'

goals and student outcomes. Teachers' effectiveness in attaining their goals is also determined by their knowledge of subject matter, pedagogy, and students; their classroom management and instruction skills; and other factors.

Teachers who accept responsibility for student outcomes are more effective than teachers who see their students as solely responsible for what they learn and how they behave. Just as earlier research showed that it is important for teachers to believe that students are capable of learning from instruction (Brophy and Everson 1976), recent research has shown that it is useful for teachers to believe that, when the teaching/learning process breaks down, both the teacher and the student must assess the situation and make corrective adjustments.

For example, in a study of teachers' strategies for coping with students who present sustained problems in personal adjustment or behavior, teachers who were identified as the most effective in coping with such problems viewed them as something to be corrected rather than merely endured. Furthermore, although they might seek help from school administrators or mental health professionals, such teachers would build personal relationships and work with their problem students, relying on instruction, socialization, cognitive strategy training, and other long-term solution strategies. In contrast, less effective teachers would try to turn over responsibility for the problem to someone else (such as the principal or a school social worker or counselor) or would confine their personal responses to attempts to control student behavior through demands backed by threats of punishment (Brophy and Rohrkemper 1981).

As another example, research in secondary science classes showed that low-aptitude students achieve much more if their teachers accept responsibility for seeing that all students learn science than they do if their teachers attribute degree of science mastery primarily to ability and motivation factors residing solely within

the students themselves (Lee and Gallagher 1986).

Given the variety and range of individual differences with which teachers are asked to cope, it is not surprising to find that teachers are selective in the range of responsibilities that they are willing to accept for themselves. Nor is this necessarily a negative finding, because teachers may be willing to take on increasing responsibilities if they are also given effective strategies for discharging those responsibilities.

Characteristics of Effective Instruction

Process-outcome research on teaching has produced a great deal of information about relationships between particular classroom management or instructional behaviors and gains in student achievement (Brophy and Good 1986). Recent research on teacher thinking and decision making has complemented that work (Clark and Peterson 1986). As the findings from these and other forms of research on teaching have become better integrated and more fully incorporated, it has become possible to extrapolate general principles of effective instruction that help to make sense of and coordinate the findings concerning specific behaviors and to "package" them in ways that make them more accessible to teachers.

Attention has shifted from identifying individual teaching skills as correlates of achievement gain to the development of broader and better integrated theories to explain teacher effects on student outcomes. Increasingly, these theories refer to coherent teaching strategies rather than isolated teaching skills (Doyle 1985); they also refer to the learning of particular content with meaningful understanding rather than merely to scores on standardized achievement tests when describing student outcomes (Anderson and Smith 1987).

Teachers promote learning by communicating to their students what is expected and why. Just as teachers do, students behave in ways that are generally consistent with the goals that they set and the responsibilities that

they accept for themselves. Unfortunately, many students do not view school as a place for learning important academic knowledge and skills but rather as a place they are required to be in order to acquire a certificate.

Some teachers are especially effective at helping students understand what is to be learned and why the learning might be useful to them. These teachers begin their lessons with explicit statements about what is to be learned and how it relates to what has been learned earlier or will be learned in the future. They motivate their students to learn by providing explanations that go beyond the immediate school context. Throughout the lesson, they monitor student task orientation to ensure that all students understand the reasons behind assignments as well as how to complete the assignments. Similarly teachers' making sure that students understand what is expected and why ap-

pears to be equally useful in fostering personal and social responsibility in students (A. Anderson et al. 1985, L. Anderson and Prawat 1983) as it is in promoting academic achievement (L. Anderson et al. 1985, Duffy et al. 1986).

Teachers promote learning by providing their students with strategies for monitoring and improving their own learning efforts and with structured opportunities for independent learning activities. Making sure that students understand what is to be learned and why can be viewed as one step toward preparing students to share responsibility with the teacher for their own learning. An important complementary step is to provide students with skills and procedures that give them the capacity to learn independently. Teachers can accomplish this by explicitly modeling and instructing their students in information processing, sense making, comprehension monitoring and correction, problem

solving, and other metacognitive strategies for purposeful learning (Duffy et al. 1986, Palincsar and Brown 1984, Raphael and Kirschner 1985).

Helping students to acquire metacognitive strategies is not sufficient by itself to ensure mastery of those strategies. In addition, teachers must provide their students with opportunities to practice the strategies by working individually and in groups on independent learning assignments. There is tension, however, between giving students too much close supervision of their work and giving them too much latitude over what to do and how to do it. Insufficient latitude for independent learning will limit what students can accomplish, whereas insufficient structuring may lead to confusion or even chaos instead of worthwhile learning (Navarro et al. 1986).

Effective teachers not only know the subject matter they intend their students to learn but also know the mis-

THE QUESTION: How to improve the quality of staff development?



THE ANSWER:

Participate in NSDC Custom-Designed Workshops!

- The National Staff Development Council is the largest professional association with an exclusive focus on staff development.

THE TOPICS:

- Effective, Staff Development Practices
- Skill Building (School Improvement, Motivating Adult Learners, etc.)

THE PARTICIPANTS:

- Staff Developers
- Administrators
- Teacher Leaders

THE RESULTS:

- Improved Knowledge Base
- Enthusiasm
- Participation

HOW LONG?

One, two or three-day workshops are available.

YES, please contact me regarding NSDC Services and Workshops.

Name _____

Address _____

Phone () _____



**National Staff
Development Council**
P.O. Box 240
Oxford, OH 45056

conceptions their students bring to the classroom that will interfere with their learning of that subject matter. It cannot be taken for granted that teachers understand the content they are expected to teach. Even at the elementary level, some teachers have a much better grasp of the concepts, skills, and applications their students are supposed to learn than other teachers do. Even greater differences among teachers exist in their ability to enrich instruction by drawing on subject matter knowledge that goes beyond the immediate goals for student learning. Research has begun to document ways in which command of subject matter influences teachers' expectations for what students can and should learn, as well as the effectiveness of the teachers' pedagogical strategies (Anderson and Smith 1987, Flower and Hayes 1980, Hollon and Anderson 1986).

In addition to command of the subject matter they teach and of pedagogical strategies for teaching it, teachers need to know how to adapt their instruction to students' preexisting knowledge and beliefs about the subject matter. This means not only "beginning where the students are" and building bridges linking the content to be learned to the students' existing knowledge, but also drawing out and confronting any misconceptions they may have about the topic that may distort their learning. For example, most elementary students believe that plants get their food from the soil—an idea that squares with commonsense language and understanding but conflicts directly with the scientific explanation that plants manufacture their own food via the process of photosynthesis. Instruction proceeds much more effectively if teachers confront this misconception directly, summarizing and contrasting the key differences between the commonsense notion of food and the scientific concept of food. Unless teachers confront student misconceptions directly and contrast them sharply with the more precise and accurate scientific conceptions to be taught, students may not recognize the differences and may emerge from the unit with their mis-

conceptions still intact (Eaton et al. 1984).

This is but one example from a much larger literature on what is becoming known as "conceptual change teaching" (Anderson and Smith 1987). Conceptual change teaching strategies are based on the premise that teaching does not involve infusing knowledge into a vacuum but instead involves inducing change in an existing body of knowledge and beliefs. Traditional instructional strategies have emphasized the facilitative role of relevant preexisting knowledge and beliefs in providing anchoring points and starting places for extending students' knowledge. Conceptual change teaching acknowledges these advantages to the extent that relevant preexisting student beliefs are accurate, but it calls attention to the fact that sometimes such beliefs constitute misconceptions that need to be confronted and changed rather than readiness factors to be reinforced and built upon. Conceptual change teaching strategies are especially applicable to instruction in science, where student misconceptions abound, although they are sometimes needed in teaching other subject matter.

Despite recent interest in improving schooling and reforming teacher education, scant attention has been paid to the need to develop in teachers a working knowledge of subject matter, pedagogy, and students that is integrated and accessible. Teacher education courses provide general knowledge about pedagogy and child development but seldom provide integrated and specific information about teaching particular content to particular types of students. Arts, sciences, and humanities courses teach advanced knowledge in the various disciplines but do not address issues of curriculum and instruction in the subject matter in elementary and secondary classrooms. While much remains to be learned about effective instruction in particular academic content, more is already known than is being taught systematically to teachers. Thus, an important goal of teacher education reform efforts should be to

remedy this problem, not only by infusing relevant content into teacher education programs but also by introducing structural changes in such programs to ensure that knowledge about subject matter, pedagogy, and students is developed in an integrated and application-oriented fashion.

Published instructional materials usually contribute to instructional quality. Partly as an unfortunate backlash to attempts to create teacher-proof curriculums, many teacher educators view published curriculum materials as sterile. They socialize new teachers to believe that good teachers are not textbook followers. Instead, they urge prospective teachers to believe that they should break new ground in their instruction, either developing their own instructional materials or expecting students to learn without the support of published curriculums. The idealism underlying such teacher education may be praiseworthy, but the advice given is impractical and counterproductive. Teachers are not trained to develop their own materials, and the constraints of the typical teaching assignment do not provide the time needed to develop good instructional materials in any case (Ball and Feiman-Nemser 1986).

Clearly, published instructional materials have their faults. The literary and pedagogical value of passages in reading texts on which students spend large quantities of time has been questioned (R. Anderson et al. 1985, Leinhardt and Smith 1985, Shulman 1986). So has the tendency of mathematics texts to cover large numbers of topics briefly (Freeman et al. 1983). However, the implied assumption that teachers can do better working on their own with scarce time and meager financial resources is even more questionable. If teachers carefully select instructional materials to fit the curriculum goals and the characteristics of their students and then make extensive use of these materials, they will be able to devote most of their time and energy to practices that enrich the content through reinterpretation and expansion and that clarify the content through presentation,

recitation, discussion, and evaluation activities.

Subject Matter Contrasts

Recently, research on teaching has moved from general issues of classroom organization and management, time-on-task, and general styles of teaching toward more specific issues concerning the effective teaching of particular academic content (e.g., how to teach students to read strategically and monitor their efforts through metacognitive awareness when reading for meaning and comprehension, how to decide what mathematics knowledge and skills to teach, how to confront and correct student misconceptions when teaching science, and how to increase the amount and improve the quality of writing instruction in elementary schools). To date, there has been practically no research designed to apply a common conceptual and measurement framework in order to identify similarities and differences in instruction in different subject matter areas, although extrapolation from the findings of studies done within single subject matter areas does suggest some commonalities as well as some ways in which teaching is unique to particular subject areas. We have been discussing the commonalities; we now turn to the differences.

Studies of elementary school teachers indicate that they spend much more time (30 to 45 percent of their total instruction time) teaching reading than any other subject (Schmidt and Buchmann 1983). Mathematics is a distant second; still, there is a regularly scheduled period for mathematics each day, typically ranging from 30 minutes to an hour (Schwille et al. 1986). In contrast, science is rarely taught every day in elementary school classrooms (Anderson and Smith 1987), and writing is generally not taught at a regularly scheduled time (Florio and Clark et al. 1984, Florio-Ruane and Dunn 1987).

There are also differences in use of textbooks and curriculum materials. In reading, instructional materials usually specify both the content and the methods to be used for teaching stu-

“Teachers simplify their work environment by concentrating their efforts.”

dents to read, and teachers typically follow these guidelines closely (Duffy et al. 1987, Shannon 1987). In mathematics, teachers tend to view texts as resources to be added to or (more often) deleted from, as appropriate. Math texts are usually silent on how instruction is to proceed, serving primarily as sources of content (Freeman et al. 1983, Schwille et al. 1983). In science, teachers normally follow the text closely, although the teacher's edition usually does not have much to say about how instruction should proceed (Roth et al. 1987). Published materials for the teaching of writing are largely unavailable as yet (Florio-Ruane 1983, Florio-Ruane and Dunn 1985).

There also appear to be important differences in the level of subject matter knowledge and related pedagogical knowledge that teachers have in different content areas, at least at the elementary level. Elementary teachers tend to be most knowledgeable about reading, variable in their knowledge about and interest in mathematics and writing (Clark and Florio-Ruane 1983), and typically weak in knowledge about science (Anderson and Smith 1987). Secondary teachers usually possess strong subject matter knowledge if they are teaching the subject that they majored in but may have very spotty knowledge otherwise.

In summary, research on teaching has begun to reveal important differences in the ways that different subject matter areas are taught, especially in elementary schools. These differences

appear to result from subject matter area differences in the preservice course requirements imposed on teachers, inservice education opportunities available, pressures from curriculum guides and testing programs, and degree of support and structuring provided in the published curriculum materials.

Good Teaching as Thoughtful Practice

Research on teacher thinking and decision making has added important information to our understanding of the principles and practices that collectively constitute effective instruction. Drawing on the preceding sections and filling in gaps from other sources, it is possible to develop an image of the good teacher as a thoughtful practitioner who operates with considerable autonomy yet purposefully works toward a set of goals that are simultaneously differentiated and integrated.

Effective teachers are clear about what they intend to accomplish through their instruction, and they keep these goals in mind both in designing the instruction and in communicating its purposes to the students. They make certain that their students understand and are satisfied by the reasons given for why they should learn what they are asked to learn.

Effective instruction provides students with metacognitive strategies to use in regulating and enhancing their learning. It also provides them with structured opportunities to exercise and practice independent learning strategies.

Effective teachers create learning situations in which their students are expected not just to learn facts and solve given problems but to organize information in new ways and formulate problems for themselves. Such learning situations include creative writing opportunities in language arts, problem-formulation activities in mathematics, and independent projects in science, social studies, and literature. Such learning situations are intrinsically more demanding for both

teachers and students than expository instruction followed by drill-and-practice exercises, but they must be included along with these more familiar learning situations if instruction is to address higher-level cognitive objectives in addition to lower-level ones.

Effective teachers continuously monitor their students' understanding of presentations and responses to assignments. They routinely provide timely and detailed feedback, but not necessarily in the same ways for all students.

Effective teachers frequently integrate their instruction across disciplinary boundaries so that, for example, students practice reading skills on texts that are worthwhile in their own right (e.g., interesting and well-written literature intended for children and youth, nonfiction books on topics studied in social studies or science classes) and have opportunities to write about some of the things that they are reading about. Effective teachers realize that what is learned is more likely to be remembered and used in the future if it serves students' purposes beyond meeting school requirements.

Finally, effective teachers are thoughtful about their practice: They take time for reflection and self-evaluation, monitor their instruction to make sure that worthwhile content is being taught to all students, and accept responsibility for guiding student learning and behavior.

How Much Can We Expect from Teachers?

What is already known about effective teaching provides useful guidance to teacher-education and school-improvement efforts, and this existing knowledge base will continue to be elaborated through future research. This suggests considerable optimism about prospects for improving the quality of teaching in the schools, especially if one assumes, as we do, that research on teaching is in its infancy and the existing knowledge base is but a tiny fraction of what it eventually will become.

However, the same research that has documented the principles described earlier as elements of effective instruction has made it clear that few teachers follow all of these practices all of the time. Yet most teachers believe that they are doing an effective job. Certainly there are many outstanding teachers and many others who routinely do some things particularly well. However, the generally high level of satisfaction among teachers concerning their own personal effectiveness as instructors suggests that, as a group, teachers may not see much need for making the substantial investments that would be required to change their teaching practices in the directions outlined here.

Teachers are usually receptive to suggestions for change if those advocated changes make sense to them. Typically, interventions designed to change teachers' practices in particular ways are successful with most teachers, at least in the short run (Stallings and Krasavage 1986). However, after teachers have acquired the knowledge and skills needed, to change their practices in the prescribed ways, and in many cases even after they have seen positive results

“Conceptual change teaching strategies are especially applicable to instruction in science, where student misconceptions abound.”

with their students, all too often they revert to their previous practices (Porter 1986).

There are many possible reasons why interventions seldom achieve stable, permanent changes in teaching practices. One is that the advocated changes are not really improvements or do not bring about benefits sufficient to justify the efforts involved in implementing them. But why do many teachers drift away from worthwhile and cost-effective innovations? For some teachers, part of the explanation may be that they teach in isolation, free from surveillance and possible critical commentary by peers and other adults. Another part of the explanation is that teachers must cope with a full agenda that typically precludes time for serious reflection, so that it is easy for them to drift in and out of habits and routines without being very aware that it is happening. Another factor is orientation toward a trial-and-error, “see what works for you” view of professional decision making that is often promoted by teacher educators, an orientation that causes many teachers to overemphasize personal preference and underemphasize concern about student outcomes when making decisions about instructional practices (Buchmann 1986).

Another part of the explanation is that, as research identifies more and more elements of effective teaching practice, there will be further increases in recommendations about additional things for teachers to do and few if any recommendations for what should be given up. The picture of good teaching that emerges from research features hard work, hard thinking, tough choices, and objective evaluations. The energy required to teach this way is probably underestimated by research that considers only one segment of a teacher's professional life at a time. Research tends to look at teaching in small segments, typically concentrating only on particular lessons taught within one subject matter area. More attention needs to be focused on larger units of instruction and on what is required to teach effectively all day, every day, year after year.

Similarly, more needs to be learned about the costs that teachers pay in adopting new approaches to teaching and about how these costs might be ameliorated.

The Evolution of Effective Teaching

Research on teaching reveals that overly ambitious models depicting teachers as fully rational curriculum designers, developers, and implementers are inappropriate, and so are models that depict teachers either as nonthinking technicians or as artists who operate mostly on the basis of unarticulated intuition. As contemporary research on teaching continues to fill in the developing picture of effective professional practice, and especially if improvements in teacher education result in better preparation of teachers to engage in such practice,

we can realistically begin to expect everyday instruction to conform to rational (or at least "boundedly rational") models such as the one shown in Figure 1. Such models would depict teachers as selecting and delivering curriculums (recognizing that the content will have to be interpreted using appropriate examples and otherwise adapted to local student needs) and as making decisions based on relevant content and pedagogical knowledge with particular objectives in mind (rather than on some less optimal basis).

Although these anticipated developments will make everyday teaching more systematic and predictably effective, there is no need to fear that they will make teaching mechanistic, remove the artistic or craft elements from it, or result in the deskilling of teachers. On the contrary, the devel-

opment of a knowledge base to inform teacher education and teaching practice will make the profession more multifaceted rather than simplifying it, just as the development of a medical knowledge base has increased the complexity of medical practice. In fact, as the relevant knowledge base develops, the major challenges facing education as a profession will revolve around developing preservice and inservice professional education programs that are effective in enabling practitioners to learn about and keep abreast of developments in the field. At the same time, the profession will be seeking to develop methods of organizing schools and teacher roles that will enable teachers to make use of available information, with the goals being to optimize student outcomes and make teaching manageable and rewarding. □

Start your own 4MAT library...

with **The 4MAT System Book, The 4MAT Workbook, 4MAT in Action and 4MAT and Science.**

These were the books that started it all. With 4MAT rapidly growing in popularity among school districts across the nation, wouldn't it be to your advantage to have these books at your fingertips?

If you're just getting started with 4MAT, the System, Action, Science and Workbook can give you the introduction and background you need. If you want to expand your 4MAT collection these books are the perfect reference materials.

The System Book--The first 4MAT book revised, it provides new insights and research on the 4MAT System. \$25.95

The 4MAT Workbook--The next best thing to a 4MAT workshop, it allows you to actively participate in exercises while learning about 4MAT. \$12.50

4MAT in Action--4MAT in the classroom. This book provides sample lesson plans in a variety of disciplines, Kindergarten through College. \$19.95

4MAT and Science--A wholistic approach to teaching science, it explores the overlay of instructional modalities to the teaching of this diverse discipline. \$19.95

Each book sold individually will be at the retail price noted above. However, if purchased as a set of 4, the System, Action, Science and Workbook will only cost you \$60.00. That's a significant savings to all our **Educational Leadership** readers.

To order by phone call 1-800-822-4MAT and specify seeing this advertisement, or send mail orders to:
Excel, Inc. Dept. 5-01, 200 W. Station Street, Barrington, IL 60010.

References

- Alford, Linda. "Can Research Help Teachers?" *IRT Communication Quarterly* (Spring 1983): 2.
- Anderson, Ariel C. H., Linda Anderson, and Richard Prawat. *Socialization into the Student Role: Teacher and Student Influences*. Research Series No. 160. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1985.
- Anderson, Charles W., and Edward L. Smith. "Teaching Science." *The Educator's Handbook: A Research Perspective*, edited by Virginia Koehler. New York: Longman, 1987.
- Anderson, Linda, and Richard Prawat. "Responsibility in the Classroom: A Synthesis of Research on Teaching of Self-Control." *Educational Leadership* 40 (April 1983): 62-66.
- Anderson, Linda, Nancy Brubaker, Janet Alleman-Brooks, and Gerald Duffy. "A Qualitative Study of Seatwork in First-Grade Classrooms." *Elementary School Journal* 86 (November 1985): 123-140.
- Anderson, Richard, Elfrieda Hiebert, Judith Scott, and Ian Wilkinson. *Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1985.
- Armbruster, Bonnie B., and Thomas H. Anderson. "Structures of Explanations in History Textbooks or So What if Governor Stanford Missed the Spike and Hit the Rail?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 16 (April/June 1984): 181-194.
- Ball, Deborah L., and Sharon Feiman-Nemser. *Using Textbooks and Teachers' Guides: What Beginning Elementary Teachers Learn and What They Need to Know*. Research Series No. 174. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1986.
- Brophy, Jere, and Carolyn Everson. *Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.
- Brophy, Jere, and Mary Rohrkemper. "The Influence of Problem Ownership on Teachers' Perceptions of and Strategies for Coping with Problem Students." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 73 (June 1981): 295-311.
- Brophy, Jere, and Thomas L. Good. "Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd ed., edited by Merlin C. Wittrock. New York: Macmillan, 1986, pp. 328-375.
- Buchmann, Margret. "Role Over Person: Morality and Authenticity in Teaching." *Teachers College Record* 87 (Summer 1986): 529-543.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
- Clark, Christopher M., and Penelope M. Peterson. "Teachers' Thought Processes." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd ed., edited by Merlin C. Wittrock. New York: Macmillan, 1986, pp. 255-296.
- Clark, Christopher M., and Susan Florio-Ruane. "The Written Literacy Forum: Combining Research and Practice." *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Summer 1983): 58-87.
- Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James J. McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfield, and Robert L. York. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Doyle, Walter. *Content Representation in Teachers' Definitions of Academic Work*. R & D Report No. 6161. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1985.
- Duffy, Gerald, Laura R. Roehler, and Joyce Putnam. "Putting the Teacher in Control: Basal Reading Textbooks and Instructional Decision Making." *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987): 355-366.
- Duffy, Gerald, Laura Roehler, Cassandra Book, Michael Meloth, Linda Vavrus, Joyce Putnam, and Roy Wesselman. "The Relationship Between Explicit Verbal Explanations During Reading Skill Instruction and Student Awareness and Achievement: A Study of Reading Teacher Effects." *Reading Research Quarterly* 21 (Summer 1986): 235-252.
- Eaton, Janet, Charles Anderson, and Edward Smith. "Students' Misconceptions Interfere with Science Learning: Case Studies of Fifth-Grade Students." *Elementary School Journal* 84 (March 1984): 365-379.
- Floden, Robert E., Andrew C. Porter, William H. Schmidt, Donald J. Freeman, and John R. Schville. "Responses to Curriculum Pressures: A Policy-Capturing Study of Teacher Decisions About Content." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 73 (April 1981): 129-141.
- Florio, Susan, and Christopher Clark, with Janice Elmore, June Martin, Rhoda Maxwell, and William Metheny. "The Environment of Instruction: The Forms and Functions of Writing in a Teacher-Devel-
- oped Curriculum." In *Comprehension Instruction: Perspectives and Suggestions*, edited by Gerald Duffy, Laura Roehler, and Jana Mason. New York: Longman, 1984, pp. 104-115.
- Florio-Ruane, Susan. "What's So Hard About Writing? The Issues for Teachers and Students." *Elementary School Journal* 84 (September 1983): 93-99.
- Florio-Ruane, Susan, and Sandra Dunn. "Teaching Writing: Some Perennial Questions and Some Possible Answers." In *The Educator's Handbook*, edited by Virginia Koehler. New York: Longman, 1987, pp. 50-83.
- Florio-Ruane, Susan, and Sandra Dunn. *Teaching Writing: Some Perennial Questions and Some Possible Answers*. Occasional Paper No. 85. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1985.
- Flower, Linda S., and John R. Hayes. "The Dynamics of Composing: Making Plans and Juggling Constraints." In *Cognitive Processes in Writing*, edited by Lee W. Gregg and Erwin R. Steinberg. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1980.
- Freeman, Donald J., Therese M. Kuhs, Andrew C. Porter, Robert E. Floden, William H. Schmidt, and John R. Schville. "Do Textbooks and Tests Define a National Curriculum in Elementary School Mathematics?" *Elementary School Journal* 83 (May 1983): 501-513.
- Hollon, Robert E., and Charles W. Anderson. "Teachers' Understanding of Students' Scientific Thinking: Its Influence on Planning and Teaching." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research on Science Teaching, San Francisco, March 28, 1986.
- Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephan Michelson. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Lampert, Magdelene. "How Do Teachers Manage to Teach? Perspectives on Problems in Practice." *Harvard Educational Review* 55 (May 1985): 178-194.
- Lee, Okhee, and James J. Gallagher. "Differential Treatment of Individual Students and Whole Classes by Middle School Science Teachers: Causes and Consequences." Paper presented at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, March 28, 1986.
- Leinhardt, Gaea, and Donald Smith. "Ex-

pertise in Mathematics Instruction: Subject Matter Knowledge." *Journal of Educational Psychology* (June 1985): 247-271.

Madsen-Nason, Ann, and Perry E. Lanier. *Pamela Kaye's General Math Class: From a Computational to a Conceptual Orientation*. Research Series No. 172. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1986.

Navarro, Richard A., Ramona Berkey, and Francine Minnick. "The Art of Becoming an Instructional Leader." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 19, 1986.

Palincsar, Annemarie, and Ann L. Brown. "Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-Fostering and Comprehension-Monitoring Activities." *Cognition and Instruction* (Spring 1984): 117-175.

Porter, Andrew C. *Collaborating with Teachers on Research: Pioneering Efforts at the Institute for Research on Teaching*, Occasional Paper No. 105. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1986.

Porter, Andrew C. "From Research on Teaching to Staff Development: A Difficult Step." *Elementary School Journal* 87 (November 1986): 159-164.

Prawat, Richard S. "Affective Versus Cognitive Goal Orientations in Elementary Teachers." *American Educational Research Journal* 22 (Winter 1985): 587-604.

Raphael, Taffy E., and Becky M. Kirschner. *The Effects of Instruction in Compare/Contrast Text Structure on Sixth-Grade Students' Reading Comprehension and Writing Products*. Research Series No. 161. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1985.

Roth, Kathleen J., Charles W. Anderson, and Edward L. Smith. "Curriculum Materials, Teacher Talk, and Student Learning: Case Studies in Fifth Grade Science Teaching." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* (November-December 1987): 527-548.

Schmidt, William, and Margaret Buchmann. "Six Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes and Their Curricular Time Allocations." *Elementary School Journal* 84 (May 1983): 162-172.

Schmidt, William, Laura Roehler, Jacqueline Caul, Barbara Diamond, David Solomon, Patricia Cianciolo, and Margaret Buchmann. "The Uses of Curriculum Integration in Language Arts Instruction: A Study of Six Classrooms." *Journal of*

Curriculum Studies 17 (July/September 1985): 305-320.

Schwille, John, Andrew Porter, Gabriella Belli, Robert E. Floden, Donald J. Freeman, Lucy B. Knappen, Therese M. Kuhs, and William H. Schmidt. "Teachers as Policy Brokers in the Content of Elementary School Mathematics." In *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, edited by Lee S. Shulman and Gary Sykes. New York: Longman, 1983, pp. 370-391.

Schwille, John, Andrew Porter, Linda Alford, Donald Freeman, Susan Irwin, and William Schmidt. *State Policy and the Control of Curriculum Decisions: Zones of Tolerance for Teachers in Elementary School Mathematics*. Research Series No. 173. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1986.

Sedlak, Michael W., Christopher W. Wheeler, Diana C. Pullin, and Philip A. Cusick. *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform*

in the American High School. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Shannon, Patrick. "Commercial Reading Materials, a Technological Ideology, and the Desking of Teachers." *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987): 307-330.

Shulman, Lee S. "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." *Educational Researcher* 15 (February 1986): 4-14.

Simon, Herbert A. *Models of Man*. New York: Wiley, 1957.

Stallings, Jane, and Eileen M. Krasavage. "Program Implementation and Student Achievement in a Four-Year Madeline Hunter Follow-Through Project." *Elementary School Journal* 87 (November 1986): 117-138.

Andrew C. Porter and Jere Brophy are Co-Directors, the Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 318 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

SLAMS

SEQUENCED LANGUAGE ARTS & MATH SKILLS

The SLAMS program has been developed for educators charged with the responsibility for administering a basic skills program in language arts and/or mathematics in grades K-6.

It will help identify, sequence, and suggest when each skill should be introduced, developed, and finally mastered.

SLAMS materials may be used to:

- check for omissions in the district's basic skills program;
- serve as an aid in textbook selection;
- identify critical skills that students must master before moving to more advanced skills.

SLAMS Manual \$25.00 Indiana residents add 5% sales tax
SLAMS Handbook 4.00 Add \$1 handling for orders under \$5
(For Administrators)



Phi Delta Kappa

P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789
(812) 339-1156

Copyright © 1988 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.