

Tensions between Traditions: The Role of Contexts in Learning to Teach

Steven T. Bickmore, Peter Smagorinsky, and
Cindy O'Donnell-Allen

Many observers of schools have noted that teachers work within multiple and seemingly contradictory pedagogical traditions. Dixon (1975), for instance, identifies three traditions that influence English teachers' thinking in U. K. schools: one focused on skills, one centered on knowledge of a cultural heritage, and one dedicated to the personal growth of students (cf. Applebee, 1974, in U. S. schools). Together, the skills and cultural heritage traditions emphasize the acquisition of skills and knowledge, while the personal growth model focuses on developmental learning processes and the well-being of the learner. Barnes (1992) describes two approaches to using language in school, one stressing *final draft* or formal expression and one emphasizing *exploratory* thinking, allowing ideas to emerge through talking or writing. Marshall (1993) argues that teachers of literature are simultaneously influenced by two traditions, the New Critical method that emphasizes formal textual meaning and a transactional approach that foregrounds the reader's experiences in relation to reading. Cuban (1993) has called these traditions teacher-centered and student-centered modes of instruction, terms now in common use if not always common agreement.

Others offer more alternatives than the broad product/process, teacher/student binary found in these outlines. Murphy, Johnson, Bickmore, Sanford, Hundley, & Zoss (2004), to give but one of many possible examples (e.g., Berlin, 1987; Hillocks, 1986), identify four paradigms that shape instruction in English classes: transmission (conveying knowledge from teachers and texts to students), constructivist (enabling learners to construct their own knowledge), liberatory (focusing on equality and social justice), and

post-liberatory (using inquiry methods to critique power relationships). This array of traditions is ever-present in teachers' work, often impressed on them by mandates, peer pressure, and other forces. In many cases the various traditions imply conflicting goals and processes to guide and inform teachers' instruction.

Most who have studied schools agree with Goodlad (1984) that some version of an objective, transmission-oriented, teacher-and-text-centered tradition is the most widely established approach in U.S. schools. The ubiquity of such methods may arise from teachers' own experiences as students (Lortie, 1975), the deep-rootedness of this approach in Western education (Cohen, 1989), the incorporation of this perspective into textbooks (Applebee, 1993), the embeddedness of this approach's assumptions in high stakes assessments (Hillocks, 2002), the centralization of this perspective in curricula (Smagorinsky, Gibson, Moore, Bickmore, & Cook, 2004), and other reasons stemming from the institutionalization of this perspective in U. S. schooling.

The presence of other traditions, however, not only gives teachers options but creates the possibility that they will consciously or unconsciously base their instruction on the tenets of multiple and even, at least theoretically, competing or incompatible paradigms. Marshall, Smagorinsky, & Smith (1995) find that these traditions can create conflicts in teachers' instruction. They describe the "doubleness" in teachers' thinking when teachers claim to embrace student-centered, process-oriented goals yet impress particular interpretations of literature on students. To Marshall et al. doubleness refers to a contradiction between thinking and acting rather than a hybrid approach to teaching:

This theme of doubleness is perhaps the most central issue to emerge from the interviews with the teachers. On the one hand, teachers felt that they should facilitate discussions; on the other hand, they felt that they should make certain that the discussions "go somewhere." On the one hand, teachers tried to provide many students with the opportunity to speak; on the other hand, they felt that students should "see" certain things in the literature they read. On the one hand, discussions were "interactions"; on the other hand, the teachers often wanted to lead students further and deeper into an analysis of the text. (p. 23)

In related work (Smagorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003) we have argued that learning to teach represents a twisting path (cf. Vygotsky, 1987), particularly with regard to developing a conception to inform teaching. Rather than viewing teachers themselves as contradictory or thoughtless practitioners, we have looked to the contexts of teaching and learning to teach to understand how teachers can engage in seemingly contradictory

practices. We have found that these contexts often involve contradictory goals and traditions. A school system, for instance, might emphasize personal attention to students and their individual needs and trajectories, but at the same time require students to satisfy external, uniform standards for performance such as those measured on standardized tests. Schools thus often produce for teachers a double bind; that is, they impose conflicting demands that make a consistent response difficult, and thus provide a context that encourages the doubleness found by Marshall et al. (1995).

“Double” bind is perhaps a modest appraisal; in schools, multiple sources often make many simultaneous demands on teachers that inevitably produce seemingly incompatible sets of principles for practice. At times such conflict and contradiction can produce useful innovation and change, while at others it can contribute to tension and pressure (Cole, Engeström, & Vasquez, 1997). We also see the possibility that the contradictions in the setting will be so deeply embedded that participants are not even aware or concerned that they exist; the teachers studied by Marshall et al. (1995), for instance, were often not aware that their stated beliefs were at odds with their teaching practice.

Finally, some might argue that our assessment of the situation is misguided, that these traditions are compatible rather than in conflict. Our response is that the different traditions require different orientations to the subject matter and suggest different ways to arrange class, relate to students, organize student activity, conceive of assessment, regard and encourage knowledge, consider the meaning of meaning, and otherwise orchestrate students' experiences in relation to the curriculum. As such they might be invoked and employed by the same teacher in the same class for different instructional needs but not be melded into a single, consistent teaching approach.

In this study we look at one teacher, Jimmy Ladd, and his early-career efforts to develop an approach to teaching within competing traditions. We pay particular attention to the contexts in which he learned to teach—his university program, his site of student teaching, and his first job—to understand the ways in which they suggested or impressed particular traditions on the teachers within them. Our inquiry is driven by the following questions:

1. In the major settings of Jimmy's learning to teach, what conceptions of teaching and learning were available? How did the goals, structures, and processes of activity in those settings affect Jimmy's development of an approach to teaching?

2. What teaching traditions were evident in Jimmy's teaching? To what extent did his instructional practice exhibit consistency of a teaching conception?

Through our consideration of Jimmy's experiences, we hope to illuminate issues for teacher educators who aim to provide their students with a consistent set of principles and practices to guide their teaching in the often-contradictory settings of public schools.

Context

Jimmy

Jimmy was a native of his college town, having attended as a youth the school in which he ultimately did his student teaching. He began his college enrollment at the Air Force Academy but transferred to and graduated from his state's namesake university. As an undergraduate he planned to go to law school, but during his senior year decided to pursue a master's in English based on his positive experience in a senior English class: "That made me think about wanting to teach. And then I just felt you can have more of an impact on peoples' lives in high school. And so I was interested in that aspect of teaching. Just being able to make an impact in people's lives." Jimmy then began seeking a teaching certificate as part of a master's degree.

Through our consideration of Jimmy's experiences, we hope to illuminate issues for teacher educators who aim to provide their students with a consistent set of principles and practices to guide their teaching in the often-contradictory settings of public schools.

Jimmy was not a "typical" English teacher candidate. He was a male, he got credentialed at the graduate level, and he was somewhat older than those getting certification in undergraduate programs (although roughly the age of the average undergraduate at his university). Yet in the modern climate with alternative paths to certification and other changes in teacher preparation, it is getting increasingly difficult to identify what is typical. Jimmy's experiences, particularly in terms of his effort to teach within competing traditions, are representative of many students who enter teaching, even if he himself did not come from the most common demographic of newly credentialed teachers.

We did not select Jimmy for this study; he volunteered to participate. As Bloome and Bailey (1992), Valsiner (1998), and others have argued, case studies of particular experiences are useful in educational research because they detail developmental paths that, while never representing broader

groups as a whole, illuminate facets of life as members of those groups. As such, they do not provide the sort of generalizable cases prized in much educational research, but rather cases that relate experiences that resonate with those of particular types of people in certain settings and situations.

Settings

University Program

Jimmy's five-year pre-service/master's program included both undergraduates majoring in education and graduate students getting certification. In our view the program was characterized by structural fragmentation (Zeichner & Gore, 1990). The students did not go through as a cohort but instead took classes as they became available. Prior to the methods class, students' coursework had a content-area emphasis with roughly fifteen courses taken in the English department. The semester prior to student teaching, the students took one methods class as their program capstone course, with roughly 40 hours of accompanying field experiences required. Aside from the methods class and an English department course in Theory of English Grammar that was taught by this article's second author, English education students took no courses from faculty in the curriculum and instruction department.

In addition to there being no student cohort, we see this program as structurally fragmented because the dispersal of courses around the university did not allow for articulation about pedagogy across courses, leaving students without a sustained focus or ongoing conversation (Applebee, 1996) that might help students consider and perhaps reconcile discrepant perspectives on teaching and learning. Because students could go through the program taking courses that were not in formal dialogue with one another about pedagogy, they did not engage in the kind of ongoing thematic conversation that gives an education program a particular culture and focus and helps its students to develop a conceptually strong approach to teaching (Smagorinsky et al., 2003); indeed, they could conceivably go through the teacher education program with the same start and completion dates as other students and never cross paths or take courses from the same faculty.

Our notion of a conceptually strong program does not necessarily mean that all faculty and students share the exact same beliefs and orthodoxies. Rather, it refers to a process through which the teacher candidates have participated in a long-term conversation—mediated by different texts, experiences, and discussants—that allows the development of a common conceptual vocabulary for understanding, critiquing, and practicing instructional

Our notion of a conceptually strong program does not necessarily mean that all faculty and students share the exact same beliefs and orthodoxies. Rather, it refers to a process through which the teacher candidates have participated in a long-term conversation—mediated by different texts, experiences, and discussants—that allows the development of a common conceptual vocabulary for understanding, critiquing, and practicing instructional approaches.

approaches. Such a vocabulary is more than words learned in coursework; rather, what makes their terminology conceptual is its grounding in related experiences and its consistent application and refinement across problems, settings, and conversations. The fostering of such conversations, experiences, and terminology is what, we have argued (Smagorinsky et al., 2003), makes a teacher education experience programmatic and provides students with a *conceptual home base* (Smagorinsky, 2002) to ground their teaching. Structurally fragmented programs such as the one that Jimmy experienced do not provide this conceptually strong preparation for teaching.

Jimmy revealed his lack of coordinated preparation for teaching during an interview, saying,

I'm thinking of having objectives for the classroom and maybe developing activities to meet those objectives, which is one thing I wish I would have had more instruction on and more input on throughout my whole experience in the education program. And going from that point to developing lesson plans and the activities that were going to meet those objectives I think is one thing I would like more. . . . In my methods class I never had to write a unit for classrooms, which amazed me that I didn't have to do that. And it was in [the Theory of English Grammar class] that I actually wrote a unit and I didn't have to do that. It was one of the options of projects that I could have done so I chose to write a unit for that. So I could have conceivably gone all the way through my education program without writing a specific unit of instruction for an English classroom.

Jimmy's preparation for teaching, then, included a collection of ideas that were only synthesized in the production of an extended unit of instruction because he chose that option. If students took the various course offerings from a certain array of professors and instructors, and chose course projects that did not include unit design, they could enter the classroom with no formal training in how to design instruction that involved a deliberate relation among texts according to theme or other organizational emphasis, as recommended by Applebee (1996) and other curriculum theorists.

Site of Student Teaching

Jimmy did his student teaching at Willa Cather Mid-High, one of his college town's two "mid-high" schools, which encompassed ninth and tenth grades.

(Aside from Jimmy, all names of people and places are pseudonyms.) The English curriculum reflected the fact that the vast majority of the students were considered college-bound, emphasizing analytical writing and grammar to prepare for college entrance exams. During the research Jimmy was observed teaching two sections of Advanced Sophomore English, his primary teaching assignment at Cather Mid-High.

Cooperating Teacher. Jimmy's cooperating teacher was Kim Forrest. Kim had an excellent reputation in the school and in the community, having recently been named her school's Teacher of the Year and a finalist in the city's highly competitive and prestigious Teacher of the Year selection. She had also recently completed a master's degree in English education at the same university Jimmy attended and had served as a model for instruction featured in the NCTE standards project publications. She was intimately familiar with the courses, the programs, and the faculty at the university; one year, when second author Peter was released from a teaching responsibility by a grant buyout, he sought her out to teach the Theory of English Grammar course in the preservice program.

Jimmy's easy-going personality fit well into the tone of Kim's class and they developed a good rapport early in their relationship. Kim provided an open environment of experimentation for Jimmy while still providing guidelines for his planning and curriculum development. Jimmy said,

The first couple of lessons I did I'd run by her and we'd change them and adapt and things like that. But once I got started, she pretty much left it up to me to come up with what I wanted to do. And I looked at her materials and stuff that she had and kind of got ideas from that too. That helped.

This gentle guidance provided Jimmy with his primary understanding of how to take his knowledge of teaching based on his university coursework and his experiences as a student and channel them into instructional planning.

University Supervisor. Jimmy's university supervisor was Gretchen Camp, whose visits were brief and involved little feedback. He was observed during student teaching but characterized the visits' follow-up discussions as short and not specifically helpful. When asked if she had provided him with useful feedback following observations, he said, "No, not a whole lot. I really didn't [get feedback]. That's one thing I was a little bit disappointed in because . . . it's always good to hear what you're doing right, but you also need to know what you're doing wrong or maybe [learn] an alternative way that you could do something where it might work better." This infrequent and uncritical university supervision, coupled with the absence of a coherent

instructional focus in his coursework, meant that Jimmy's primary instruction in how to teach came through Kim's guidance during student teaching.

Site of Jimmy's First Job

Pullman Central High School. Jimmy began his teaching career in a high school in the nearby metropolitan area. The school day was organized according to four 95-minute block periods. Jimmy met with each class each day for a semester, then a new group of students enrolled for the second semester. In each semester Jimmy taught the same preparation to freshmen in the first two blocks and had a planning period in mid-day. As a freshman football coach in the fall and boys' freshman track coach in the spring, he had the afternoon block free for practices. Although new state legislation had limited class size, during the first semester Jimmy taught 33 students in one class and 59 in the other because his school had interpreted the law to mean that he could teach no more than 120 students per day, rather than that each class had a maximum enrollment.

Entry-Year Committee. Like all new teachers in his state, Jimmy was supervised during his first year of teaching by a committee consisting of one school-based administrator, one school-based teacher, and one university professor. In this state a teaching certificate was not awarded by universities. Rather, the entry-year committee made a recommendation for certification following either a successful first year of teaching or a second probationary year of teaching, and had the authority to deny a teacher certification. Jimmy identified Becky Miller, the teacher on his committee, as the most helpful of the three in terms of his teaching. His assistant principal and the university professor—who was also his professor in his university teaching methods course—were required to observe his teaching three times during the year and, Jimmy said, were more helpful with general problems such as how to set up procedures for running a class than with specific feedback on his teaching.

Jimmy's Teaching

Our goal with this study is to understand how the main settings of Jimmy's initial learning about teaching suggested or impressed upon him particular traditions of teaching, and to understand further how he internalized and integrated those traditions from those particular contexts into his own approach to teaching. The settings on which we focus include his university teacher education program, the site of his student teaching, and the site of his first full-time teaching job.

University Teacher Education Program

We have already reviewed our reasons for finding Jimmy's university teacher education program to be structurally fragmented. Our interviews with students from his program revealed that they did not share a conceptual emphasis, as revealed in the many interviews and collaborative activities we conducted with the six participants from this program. Rather, each participant outlined a different vision of what he or she wanted to accomplish as a teacher, which we infer to follow from what amounted to a cafeteria-style program in teacher education: Each student sampled a unique array of classes and experiences and came away with an idiosyncratic conception of how to teach. Jimmy described the consequences of this lack of program coherence on his preparation for teaching, saying that with respect to developing an approach to teaching, "I have had what maybe are particular elements of it but not—I wasn't really made to put all this together and come up with it on my own. . . . I feel lost at times. Like, what am I supposed to do?"

We infer that this structurally fragmented teacher education program offered too little in terms of sustained discussion of pedagogical concepts for any graduate to come away with a clear conception to guide teaching, much less for a cohort of graduates to share a similar conception. In reaching this conclusion we are not saying that it is possible or even desirable for a whole set of students to become indoctrinated into a single way of thinking; rather, we are arguing that cafeteria-style programs are too fragmented to enable any kind of conception to emerge among their students.

Our goal with this study is to understand how the main settings of Jimmy's initial learning about teaching suggested or impressed upon him particular traditions of teaching, and to understand further how he internalized and integrated those traditions from those particular contexts into his own approach to teaching.

Student Teaching: Willa Cather Mid-High

As we have described, Kim was among the city's most distinguished teachers. She and Jimmy appeared to be a good match. Jimmy described himself as "a real low-key, kind of low conflict person," a disposition that made him easy to get along with. He and Kim developed a respectful and amicable relationship and were compatible in terms of their approaches to teaching. By all accounts Jimmy's student teaching went smoothly and Kim was very supportive of his efforts. "Jimmy is really, really wonderful," she said during an interview. "He is going to be a great teacher." Jimmy said that Kim's teaching style was "congruent with the way I picture myself teaching. . . .

She tries to keep the student at the center of any activity that's going on, rather than giving a lecture, and having them take notes, . . . [and] creating an interest in the material before you actually get into it."

Kim's Approach to Teaching and Mentoring

When asked what she hoped to impart to Jimmy and other student teachers, Kim said she hoped Jimmy's instruction would involve

respecting the students and building on student ideas and really introducing the theme before they go into the literature. And making literature real to the students, . . . really trying to make it come to life and help them to see more of what was happening and what was not written in the page, but some motivations that the author expects you as reader to come up with. We teach them to read more carefully and be more sophisticated readers.

We interpret this statement to mean that Kim had the dual concern of caring for students and using their personal experiences as a critical means of engaging with the curriculum, and teaching them the close reading skills that are prized in the tradition of New Criticism and institutionalized in most literature anthologies (Applebee, 1993). These dual values were reiterated when she identified the most important things that students could learn in her English class as "self-esteem" and "thinking skills," the first foregrounding affective experiences and the second foregrounding rational approaches to reading and writing. This student-centered, activity-based approach involved an emphasis on depth over breadth.

This approach of including more activities and fewer assigned readings fit with what we consider to be a scaffolding approach. The general sequence began with Kim designing introductory activities through which students personally connected with literary themes, helping them see connections to literature. The ultimate goal was for students to be able to interpret texts independently:

I wanted the students to be able to be independent of the teacher and not always having me there to have to guide them. One major approach that I used in almost every unit is building so that they start with no guidance from the teacher and then maybe work with peers on something that is a similar project and then develop their skills and do something a little more difficult that builds on what they already know and then eventually do assignments outside of class that use some of the same skills and finally do a much bigger project on their own.

Kim described this scaffolding approach as arising from a combination of her own ideas about teaching and methods she learned during her master's program, which she synthesized into an application that worked well for her in the setting of Cather Mid-High. Although our data collection did not include opportunities to observe Kim's teaching, her description resonated well with what we knew of her work based on her reputation among her colleagues, her accounts of her classroom and unit designs from her master's program, and Jimmy's descriptions of her work as mentor and model during his student teaching. As Jimmy said in an early interview, "Ms. Forrest very rarely just stands in front of the class and lectures the whole period. It's always the students who are discussing different ideas, either in group discussions, using the overhead projector when students are talking, or through written assignments that they do in class."

Curricular Constraints

Many teachers we have studied in the larger project have identified binding constraints that powerfully shaped and limited their teaching decisions, including a centralized district curriculum (Smagorinsky, Lakly, & Johnson, 2002; Smagorinsky et al., 2004), a state writing test (Johnson, Smagorinsky, Thompson, & Fry, 2005), and other factors. In contrast we found Kim's teaching to be relatively unfettered from without. The only external requirements she described included a grade level curriculum that required particular types of essays (e.g., literary analysis) and departmental agreements on what to teach in particular grades. In 10th grade, for instance, she said, "We do modern novel, we have some choices on [which modern novel], and normally we have an articulation chart with each novel assigned to which grade level based on how appropriate they are in teacher preference and what [students have] already taken." On the whole, however, Kim—as an experienced, established, and exemplary teacher in a school with a flexible curriculum—had a great deal of latitude in what and how to teach, even on a faculty in which, as she said, the teacher-centered tradition was alive and well.

Two Traditions of Teaching Literature

The teaching of literature occupied a great deal of Jimmy's instruction during our observations at Cather Mid-High. The focus of our analysis will be on Jimmy's teaching of literature and what we identified as two conflicting traditions evident in his instruction. Under Kim's guidance, Jimmy designed

instruction conceived to enable students to make personal sense of the curriculum. At the same time he hoped to lead students toward particular preferred interpretations of the literature. In this sense Jimmy illustrates the “doubleness” found by Marshall et al. (1995) among teachers who simultaneously aspired both to lead students toward conventional interpretations and to allow students to enter literature on their own terms. We next outline how these competing traditions were evident in Jimmy’s student teaching.

The Student-Centered Tradition. As we have described, Kim characterized her teaching as attentive to students’ ability to make personal connections to literary themes, to produce writing and other texts about those connections, to participate in interpretive activities such as small group discussions and presentations, and to learn procedures and strategies for engaging in interpretive projects independent of her direct influence. Such constructive activity, she hoped, would raise students’ self-esteem as they demonstrated competence in reading and responding to challenging works of literature as they grew independent of her during the process of instructional scaffolding.

Jimmy believed that student-centered activities enabled him to honor students’ “learning styles,” an idea that he was exposed to in his university coursework and that, he said, “makes sense to me on a gut level.” We infer from this statement that a more programmatic teacher education program might have provided him with more pedagogical tools rather than leaving him to his intuitions in his early-career teaching when planning skills are at their least refined.

Jimmy did describe some strategies for addressing learning styles, however. He said that students might be able to interpret literature “artistically in pictures,” an approach through which students can “show a lot of understanding about what they mean by a novel, a short story.” Jimmy’s recognition that students learn in diverse ways contributed to his comfort level with the kinds of activities through which Kim taught her students literature. The student-centered literary instruction that we observed included designing introductory activities, writing found poems, asking authentic questions, and producing a student newspaper.

Introductory Activities. Among Kim’s routine procedures in a unit of instruction was to design an introductory activity that enabled students to engage with a theme in terms of their own experiences or knowledge (see, e.g., Smagorinsky, McCann, & Kern, 1987). For instance, the class read John

Knowles's *A Separate Peace*, and for the first set of observations, Kim and Jimmy co-designed an introductory activity on friendship to help students prepare for the conflicts and dilemmas that the characters face in the novel. We see two simultaneous scaffolding processes at work: Kim and Jimmy's use of an introductory activity to assist students' initial engagement with the issues, and Kim's mentorship of Jimmy's ability to learn to design such activities on his own.

Kim scaffolded Jimmy's understanding of introductory activities by first modeling them in her own teaching, then designing an activity with him, and eventually having him design his own. Jimmy described the design process of the friendship activity for *A Separate Peace* by saying, "We worked together and developed the group project on friendship, the dialogue thing. We developed that together." He said that their goal was

to do something on building interest for the work before we actually got into it. . . . The assignment is to create a dialogue between two friends who have some significant differences. . . . They have to create a dialogue that develops a conflict, develops some differences between the characters, and then resolves the conflict in some way.

Additionally, he told the students when he made the assignment, they could "draw a picture, write and read your own poem, read a poem by another author, play a song, create a collage." His aim, he said in the post-observation interview, was to design "a fun activity that would get them into the beginning of the novel."

In class Jimmy led a discussion in which students considered their definition of friendship, whether friends can have differences, and what happens when one friend influences another. He then gave the class the assignment and time to develop skits based on the conflicts they identified. Students then presented their skits. In Jimmy's view this introductory activity provided students an opportunity for "advanced critical thinking": "I think some of the skits expressed that, the higher level of thinking about differences between characters and conflicts that they faced." Yet, he added, "probably the easiest way to assess [their learning] would be a test or an essay, or something like that where that's just the specific assignment just to analyze how the setting affects the novel." We see Jimmy's indebtedness to both traditions here: Through the skits he can identify important critical thinking about the issue of friendship, but such thinking is more readily visible through a conventional assessment focused on the relation between setting and other textbook aspects of fiction.

Found Poems. Jimmy also had his students write found poems, i.e., poems created from words or phrases found in a text. The goal of producing a found poem is to read a text's language carefully, identify the most important or revealing terms, and assemble them in poetic form. During the second set of observations, Jimmy assigned a found poem covering the section of *A Separate Peace* in which Gene knocks Finny off a branch. For the assignment he did not require students to relate their found poems to the themes of the novel identified in class, saying that writing found poems "gives them a greater appreciation for language itself," which he believed to be sufficient.

Jimmy scaffolded students' development of their ability to write found poems, first having them write found poems from magazines and newspapers in groups. This assignment, he said, served as "practice for the assignment I am going to give them, which is to do a larger found poem on their own as an individual assignment from *A Separate Peace*." Jimmy's use of found poems, then, illustrated both his understanding of how to scaffold students' learning and how to address student diversity through constructivist activities, both of which figured heavily in Kim's approach to teaching.

Authentic Questions. During the second set of observations, Jimmy broke from his custom of, as he told the students, "cranking out transparencies" that outlined his own interpretations of *A Separate Peace*. He devised an activity that allowed students to "make some decisions about the novel." He grouped the students according to the rows they sat in and assigned the following tasks:

1. choosing the 3–4 most important events from their assigned pages.
2. discussing why those events are significant and then narrowing down to the most important event.
3. choosing a quotation that captures the significance of the event and explaining how it does so.
4. preparing a short presentation for the rest of the class.

In Nystrand's (1997) terms, these questions are *authentic*; i.e., they are open-ended, inquiring into matters for which the teacher does not have a pre-conceived correct answer. Such questions, he argues, enable students to construct their own responses to literature on their own terms and bring their personal knowledge into their academic work.

Newspaper Stories to Interpret Literature. During the final observation cycle in mid-December, Jimmy borrowed an assignment from Kim for Edmond Rostand's play *Cyrano de Bergerac*. The students assumed the personality and perspective of different characters from the play in order to create a class newspaper reporting on events from Acts I and II. Each article required a headline and character's byline, and Jimmy provided possible topics such as New Cadet Arrives in Town, Cyrano Defeats Valvert, Ligniere Writes Song Exposing Crafty Scheme, and Roxane Spotted at Play. For bonus points students could create cartoons, want ads, advertisements, obituaries, and other components of a newspaper. Students worked in groups of 3-4, with the task of writing a newspaper article totaling about one page for each group member. The assignment was coordinated with another teacher whose marketing class would produce and publish the newspaper. His goal for students through this activity, he said, was to "get them to think. In order to write the article they had to be pretty specific about the details of the play. And I think they'll get a better understanding of exactly what's going on in the play so that they'll understand better."

Through this activity, we infer, Jimmy honored students' diverse learning styles by enabling them to interpret the play through this creative medium. By producing a newspaper, students could construct interpretations that might not be available through a New Critical approach emphasizing the formal aspects of the literature and how they can be marshaled in support of an analysis.

The Teacher-and-Text-Centered Tradition. Just as Jimmy's teaching included some type of student-centered instruction in each of the three sets of observations during student teaching, it also included instruction from the tradition variously known as teacher-centered, cultural heritage, objective, and other names denoting the emphasis on learning and analyzing a formal body of knowledge. While Kim's tutelage was primarily oriented to some version of student-centered or constructivist teaching, we also found references to her work in this more dominant tradition. After engaging in constructivist activities during the unit on courageous action, for instance, Kim evaluated students on their performance on a five-paragraph theme, which in the minds of many is the epitome of the formalist tradition. As Jimmy described it, "She spent most of the class period going over the five-paragraph essay format for their essay, and I think they had already learned how to, like last year. . . . But most of them knew what she was talking about." The students' apparent familiarity with the form suggests its institutionalization in the school curriculum.

Jimmy's instruction in the teacher-and-text-centered tradition suggested that he had established a view of how the discussion of the novel should proceed and of what the students' ultimate interpretation should be. This value appears to derive from his adoption of a New Critical approach to literature. New Criticism takes a scientific approach to the study of literature that relies on a reader's grasp of a technical vocabulary (setting, denouement, etc.). Under close New Critical analysis, the literary text exists independent of its author and its meaning resides within its language itself rather than in relation to its context or intertext. The text has a single correct meaning that is available to the astute reader; a work's meaning is inherent, rather than being constructed by readers. Readers avoid the "affective fallacy," the error of equating a work with its emotional effects upon an audience.

In the formal world of schooling, New Critical skills are required for both teachers (e.g., as required to pass the Praxis exam) and students (e.g., as requisite for attaining high scores on the Advanced Placement exam). Marshall (1993) and others have argued that by incorporating these values into textbooks and high-stakes assessments, educational institutions have established them in many teachers' minds as the most appropriate approach to teaching literature. We next describe Jimmy's instruction in this tradition.

Literary Terms. While emphasizing students' connection between their personal experiences and literary themes in the first set of observations, Jimmy also instructed them in the meaning of literary terms. On their unit final exam, for instance, Jimmy planned to include a section on literary terms: "On a test, define a literary term and give an example of it from the novel. Or even have a multiple choice question over it. But I mean, I want them to learn those, and I want to test them on the literary terms." As preparation for this test, Jimmy dedicated class time to defining and illustrating common literary terms, as revealed in the following fieldnotes from the first set of observations. He projected a list of literary terms (setting, foreshadowing, mood) and asked students to copy them down. For each he conducted a brief discussion on the term's definition and illustrated it with examples from *A Separate Peace*. Their discussion of "mood" typified his approach. Jimmy began with an overhead projection defining "mood":

mood: the author's emotional attitude toward the subject
ex.: 1. somber, uneasy, dreary, nostalgic
2. content, happier, lighter, adventurous, anticipatory

Jimmy explained that moods can be portrayed through the setting and the author's directly stated feelings (ex., when the narrator talks about fear). He asked the students how they would describe the mood in chapter one. One boy said, "somber, uneasy." He asked another student, who described it as "dreary."

Reading Guides. During the first set of observations Jimmy provided students with reading guides to help what he called their "comprehension" of *A Separate Peace*. The assignment required students to answer nine questions in complete sentences on their own paper. The questions asked students to comment on such elements in the novel as point of view, setting, the narrator's reactions to the stairs and the tree in the opening scenes, flashback events, the narrator's descriptions of other characters, and the friendship between narrator Gene and schoolmate Finny as it is portrayed in chapter one. The questions referred the students to specific page numbers.

We see Jimmy's use of reading guides as residing in the formalist tradition because of its emphasis on literary terms and its attention to locating instances in the text that illustrated them. Jimmy explained that the idea for reading guides came from Kim, saying, "She had study guides for each chapter and stuff and I looked at those and got ideas from that and I also read the novel, went through it. Sometimes that coincided with what Kim had." These guides, he said, were based on what he thought was important in the novel. Jimmy's remarks reveal both Kim's use of formalist vehicles for literary study and her apprenticeship of him into their employment. As we found throughout our reading of the data, this approach was not reconciled with the generally student-centered teaching that occupied much of Kim's and Jimmy's instruction.

Orthodox Literary Interpretation. In New Criticism the critic's role is to arrive at an established, authoritative interpretation of a literary work. During the second set of observations Jimmy led his students in discussions of *A Separate Peace*. For these discussions, he said, he prepared "discussion questions about things I thought were important to the development of the novel and the characters. . . . I was kind of geared towards leading them a certain direction." Using an overhead projector, Jimmy referred the students to specific passages from the text and displayed 7 questions on a screen. Students were instructed to write answers to the questions in complete sentences in their notebooks, following which he asked for volunteers to read their responses.

Jimmy's intention was for students to "hit on the key elements in the story and relate the significance of maybe a metaphor or some symbolism Or even stuff like character development." One motivation for this approach, he said, was to prepare them for a unit exam in which they would have to support interpretive claims with textual evidence: "Having them support that with a quotation, also, that makes them find evidence for what they say. Which I think is important, especially when they have their test later, they are going to have to do another test. They are going to have to support what they say with evidence from their story." This evidence, we might assume, would best be used in support of an interpretation corresponding to the one Jimmy had arrived at from his own careful reading and stressed in his discussions during class.

Fixed-Answer Quizzes and Assignments. During each of the final two sets of observations, Jimmy gave both quizzes and assignments that required fixed answers and more open-ended questions. Quiz questions were designed to make students accountable for their reading. Examples of fixed answers included "How is Finny injured as a result of falling from the tree?" and "What does Dr. Stanpole say is 'finished' for Finny because of his injury?" A more open-ended question was "Where is the Devon school located in regards to the rivers, and what is significant about this location?" Yet we assume that even this question had a limited interpretation, such as that described in the online Pink Monkey "study resource":

The school is described in almost Eden-like terms with its enormous playing fields, healthy green turf, gently flowing river, and calling birds. This peaceful environment serves as a sharp contrast to the world war that rages in Europe and the personal conflict that rages in Gene's mind. Throughout the novel, the images of water take on symbolic significance. Gene gets a baptism in to his Finny-like life in the clean, delightful waters of the Devon River. In contrast, he gets muddied by the dirty, nasty Naguamsett River during the time that he is in turmoil over Finny's accident. <http://pinkmonkey.com/booknotes/monkeynotes/pmSeparatePeace50.asp>

Summary. For the most part Jimmy's major influence on his teaching was Kim and the curriculum materials available at Cather Mid-High; the only occasion on which he drew from his university training was when students wrote found poems. Kim's own teaching revealed influences of both traditions. While her teaching, for the most part, took her away from the classroom's center stage and placed the onus for learning on her students

and their constructive activity, she also used such formalist techniques as the five-paragraph theme and study guides. Jimmy's attributions for the bulk of his student-centered instruction, however, were to Kim.

Jimmy's indebtedness to the New Critical tradition, then, must generally, although not entirely, be found outside the sphere of Kim's influence. We infer that this tradition's systemic integration into the domain's cultural practices must surely be among the most important reasons for its presence in Jimmy's teaching. The values inscribed in literature anthologies (Applebee, 1995), the ubiquity of this approach in teachers' own experiences as students (Lortie, 1975), the prevailing practices of colleagues as indicated by Kim's points of contrast in describing her own approach, and other institutionalized factors in teachers' understanding of their domain undoubtedly contributed to Jimmy's differentiated approach to teaching. We are reluctant to call his work at this point hybrid in that the instructional practices appear to be unintegrated; rather, he taught in New Critical ways on some occasions and constructivist ways on others, sometimes within the same class period and toward very different ends.

We see a major difference in Jimmy's approach when working in these different traditions. When teaching in the constructivist tradition, Jimmy designed instructional sequences that scaffolded students' ability to work independent of his influence by teaching them learning strategies for their literary inquiries. His New Critical instruction involved far less of what we think of as instructional design; rather, he worked diligently to consider the meaning of a text and devise questions that led students toward that interpretation. We see this different approach to instructional design as being central to the two approaches: One requires expertise in understanding how students learn and sequencing activities to help them acquire procedures for further learning, while the other requires expertise in the texts under study and meticulous preparation in presenting or eliciting the information that leads to authoritative interpretations.

We see a major difference in Jimmy's approach when working in these different traditions. When teaching in the constructivist tradition, Jimmy designed instructional sequences that scaffolded students' ability to work independent of his influence by teaching them learning strategies for their literary inquiries. His New Critical instruction involved far less of what we think of as instructional design; rather, he worked diligently to consider the meaning of a text and devise questions that led students toward that interpretation.

Pullman Central High School

Jimmy's first year at Pullman Central HS was a success, with his entry year supervision committee approving of his work and granting him certification to continue teaching. We next review the major settings within which he taught at PCHS: the curriculum and the influence of his colleagues in the Department of English.

Curriculum

Jimmy's teaching came within the requirements provided by the state, district, and school curricula. The state curriculum consisted of a highly specified list of skills and knowledge that students were required to know and that teachers were required to teach. Jimmy reported, "They actually require you to mark in your grade book when and where you taught each [state curriculum] objective."

The school district required that teachers cover specific content and skills. Jimmy reported that "The curriculum guide is pretty specific. They have certain works that I'm supposed to teach, certain concepts that I'm supposed to go over for each one." The required curriculum included *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *The Miracle Worker*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and a list of short stories. The concepts he referred to were often "the literary terms that would go with them, like plot and things. Then there would be a section of drama and you have to teach *Romeo and Juliet*. . . . heroic couplet, blank verse were some of the literary terms that had to go with that." He also had to teach the research paper and a set of grammar skills.

Early in the year, Jimmy said that these curricula provided good support: "That's been pretty helpful though for me just starting out. . . . If you follow the curriculum guide for what you're supposed to be teaching and what literary terms they are supposed to know, material and stuff, you usually don't have any trouble meeting those." During his first year of teaching, the school curriculum guide strongly influenced his teaching:

They had [the curriculum] broken down into categories that you would teach and the literary terms or concepts they were supposed to learn along with those. I found that it's affected the way I've taught in the fact that I tend to go by categories. Like we started out with short stories, so we'd read short stories. I'd give them activities where they either do some creative writing stuff or they'd write their own short stories . . . and then have to incorporate the terms as far as like having direct characterization and things like that. So, I find myself teaching by those chunks.

Jimmy said that "I don't know that I necessarily like teaching that way" and acknowledged that this approach was not consistent with what his few classes

in pedagogy had stressed at the university. Yet, he acknowledged, “it’s more convenient” for a teacher at the beginning of his career. He hoped “to do more of a thematic type teaching” in his second year after he’d gotten a year of experience under his belt.

Two Traditions of Teaching

As was the case at Cather Mid-High, the teaching we observed at Pullman Central HS exhibited Jimmy’s work in both the student-centered and teacher-and-text-centered traditions of teaching. We next illustrate his work in each tradition.

Student-Centered Tradition

Writing Research as a Travel Project. During the first set of observations of Jimmy’s first year at PCHS, he taught a research project in relation to a thematic unit featuring *The Odyssey*. *The Odyssey* was a required text but, as Jimmy said, “That was my choice to incorporate it in that kind of thematic unit.” To Jimmy this focus meant that the students would consider “why they’re on their journey. They’ve written a narrative essay on some places they’ve gone to and what they’ve learned or experienced on that trip. Just looking at the journey as a theme for life.”

Jimmy reported learning about the research paper idea during student teaching from a colleague who had been his ninth grade teacher at Cather; Jimmy had done the project as a student and contacted her for the activity when he learned that he was required to teach *The Odyssey* at PCHS. The assignment required each student to research a city he or she would like to visit on the continental U. S. and do a travel project in which, as Jimmy described,

they pick a place they’d like to go to and research not only some information about that particular destination, but also they need to plan it out to the minute. If they had to take a plane there, they had to call the airlines and figure out what planes are going where, how much tickets are, and basically come up with a budget as well as an itinerary.

The budget needed to cover food, travel, lodgings, and other expenses incurred during the trip, each calculated in terms of the type of car being driven and the number of people taking the trip. They also had to write a formal business letter requesting information from a Chamber of Commerce or other organization about the site being visited. Students worked individually on their projects but, said Jimmy, “I might have them work in groups or cooperate on things like an editing stage.”

Jimmy's incorporation of the travel project into the journey unit enabled him to meet several curriculum objectives at once. He taught a required text in a context that he felt comfortable with. He also satisfied the research requirement, which he said allowed "a lot of leeway" in how he handled it. He felt that the travel project enabled students to learn research skills as part of an inquiry that might interest them and provide them with useful information.

Improvisations. During the third set of observations in April, Jimmy and his students were reading *Romeo and Juliet*. Rather than having the students read the play together as a whole class, Jimmy broke the students into groups and had each group read an assigned section, thus allowing more students to be involved with speaking roles. Jimmy's role during their reading was to "talk with them about their answers to the assigned questions and about their improvisations, which they prepared and performed in the same groups."

Jimmy had learned about both the small group reading and the improvisation idea from an NCTE book on teaching Shakespeare in the English class. The assignment included the following instructions:

Scene: A street in the middle of Verona, Sunday Morning.

Characters: Romeo and Juliet's Nurse

Action: Juliet has sent her Nurse to find out what Romeo's plans are. What does Romeo tell her? How does the Nurse, who wants Juliet to be happy, reply?

The students outlined and practiced their improvisations, then each group performed. We considered the activity to be student-centered because the students could interpret the characters and perform their roles in multiple acceptable ways.

Teacher-and-Text-Centered Tradition. As we have noted, Jimmy's main influences during his first year at PCHS were the curriculum and his colleagues. Neither of the two student-centered activities we observed had come from the generous loans provided by his colleagues. We infer, then, that in the setting of PCHS, teacher-and-text-centered teaching methods predominated and were the measure of excellence for Pullman City English teachers. We next describe what we considered to be instruction in this tradition that Jimmy provided during our observations of his teaching at PCHS.

Literary Terms. During the first set of observations in October, Jimmy reported that he planned his lessons by "look[ing] up the materials I have to teach

that day and deciding how to break it up and into what materials in there, developing objectives for that particular activity. . . . There's daily objectives about—okay, by the end of this day you should know what a heroic couplet is or what an iambic pentameter is.” Jimmy said that his instruction in short stories focused on plot, character, and other elements of literature required by his curriculum. We observed him teaching in this fashion, as illustrated in the following field notes:

Jimmy writes on the board: exposition; rising action, climax, falling action, resolution. Jimmy draws a diagram. “What in your opinion is the climax?” Student: “When Romeo kills Tibalt.” Jimmy discusses the student's answer. Jimmy explains exposition (Romeo). Jimmy: “When we meet Romeo for the first time, how does he feel about Rosalyn? That tells us about his character. What else is exposition?” Jimmy begins to discuss rising action. Student: “Romeo and Juliet get married.” Jimmy: “What's something else we can put down?” Student: “Tibalt kills Mercutio.”

The lesson continued in this fashion. We considered this instruction to be teacher-and-text-centered because of its dedication to New Criticism's emphasis on literary techniques and the tendency to view one answer as correct.

Orthodox Literary Interpretation. Among New Criticism's tenets is that texts may be analyzed to produce a proper interpretation, usually in line with that of established literary critics. Readers' subjectivities are ideally minimized so as to focus better on the text itself. Jimmy's teaching of literature exhibited this value during his first year at PCHS. During the third set of observations, for instance, he was teaching *Romeo and Juliet* and assigned his students a small group activity to compare and contrast how both the Zeferelli and the Luhrmann film versions of the play presented the same scene.

The field notes then report Jimmy showing the designated scenes from both film versions of the play, stopping the video occasionally to ask questions. We assume that the questions had a narrow range of response in terms of correct answers—Mercutio's personality, for instance, is fixed as “flamboyant and playful”—and that these answers were available through a careful study of the text rather than through some other approach.

Jimmy also stressed authoritative readings of texts with his evaluations. During the first two observation cycles Jimmy led his students through reviews for upcoming tests. These reviews suggest that the tests covered factual knowledge about the literature read during the units. During the second observation cycle, for instance, field notes recorded that he empha-

sized a timeline that provided the play's chronology, telling the students that "The time sequence is something you might see on the test." Again, we see this test depending on students' studying literal information in the text and knowing the correct answer from the choices available.

Finally, Jimmy described his goals for writing instruction as emphasizing students' ability to read literary texts carefully and make evidence-supported claims about them. He said that among his goals was for students to "be able to write a good solid paragraph where they can write a topic sentence and then be able to support that with evidence from a text." Supporting claims with textual evidence, he continued, "is one of the most important and beneficial English and thinking skills that they will use for the rest of their lives." Writing in this fashion also contributes to New Critical values in that it enables students to produce analytic papers that convincingly demonstrate a close reading of the text.

Summary. Jimmy's primary source of teaching ideas during his first year of teaching came from the PCHS curriculum and his colleagues in the Department of English. He reported that his university program had provided general ideas: "Not specific lesson plans, but the process of devising a lesson plan, yeah, as far as having set objectives that you want to accomplish and looking at who your students are and knowing their abilities and what they're capable of and designing lessons to meet that." Also, he said, "I do things that I saw my cooperating teacher do when I was student teaching," although these were not evident during our observations.

Based on what was available to us, we infer that Jimmy's teaching had begun to gravitate toward the norms of PCHS. Jimmy's coaching responsibilities, which often extended into evening commitments for scouting and other duties, cut into the time he had for instructional planning. To compensate he availed himself to his colleagues' lesson plans, which appeared to work within the teacher-and-text-centered pedagogical tradition and to incorporate principles of New Criticism, which is also engrained in textbooks and high stakes assessments. Outside the tutelage of Kim's approach, which included this tradition but leaned more heavily toward the student-centered approach, Jimmy began to adopt the local standards that prevailed at PCHS, through which he was evaluated and encouraged to be a good teacher.

Discussion

It's been a lot of trial and error. [laughter] I'd like to say that it is an easy transition going from the coursework and the classes I took into my stu-

dent teaching and then my student teaching into my first teaching position, but I don't know, it's a lot of trial and error. The things you learn in school and in the classroom, somehow when you're up there in front of the kids either you don't remember them or . . . situations are so different that it doesn't seem to apply at the time.

Jimmy characterized his first year of full-time teaching as making trial-and-error judgments about what to teach. What taught him the most, he continued, was “just having been there in front of the kids and being responsible for what I do in the classroom, what they learn every single day.” He therefore regarded experience as his best teacher, the way to try out ideas to see if they worked: “You took a shot at this,” he said. “That didn't work so well, so maybe next time we'll do it a little bit different.”

We reiterate that Jimmy was a highly regarded candidate for teaching. He was a strong student in his home state's namesake university, seeking a master's degree along with his teaching credentials. Kim, among the most distinguished teachers in an acclaimed college town school system, held him in high esteem, judging him to be a potentially “great teacher.” Like many volunteers in research projects, he had a number of qualities that characterized him as a “good subject” (Orne, 1962, p. 776): He was cooperative and interested in the outcomes of the research extending well beyond his formal participation. His affable personality made him a good fit with Kim, a welcome participant at all stages of the research, and a teacher regarded with affection by his students. Ultimately, his entry-year committee granted him first-ballot endorsement to become a certified teacher. On the whole, we must conclude that Jimmy was an outstanding prospect for pursuing a career in education.

Among our goals in this study is to understand how an outstanding teacher may exhibit the “doubleness” that Marshall et al. (1995) found in the classrooms they studied. To conclude our study we must account for the absence of reconciliation between the two contradictory traditions that we found evidenced in Jimmy's teaching. First, we look to Jimmy's teacher education program, which we have characterized as structurally fragmented. We have argued in related work (Smagorinsky, 2002; Smagorinsky et al., 2005) that a university can provide a *conceptual home base* for the teachers it prepares if certain conditions are in place. Yet Jimmy's program was too diffuse and random to provide the kind of conceptual continuity for him and his classmates to develop a strong, consistent vision to guide their teaching.

Jimmy characterized his first year of full-time teaching as making trial-and-error judgments about what to teach . . . He therefore regarded experience as his best teacher, the way to try out ideas to see if they worked.

Jimmy's program was too diffuse and random to provide the kind of conceptual continuity for him and his classmates to develop a strong, consistent vision to guide their teaching.

We draw this conclusion not only because he taught comfortably within conflicting paradigms but because he did not recognize, at least in the context of our research, that they represented different visions. A conceptually coherent program, we believe, would provide the critical faculties for recognizing the disparity between the traditions and enabling both recognition and critique of their differences. We found this ability in students from other programs we have studied that were more conceptually unified, reported in other published case studies (e.g., Smagorinsky, 1999; Cook, Smagorinsky, Fry, Konopak, & Moore, 2002; Smagorinsky, Cook, Jackson, Moore, & Fry, 2004; Smagorinsky et al., 2002; Smagorinsky et al., 2004). This ability, however, was absent among classmates of Jimmy's who participated in the research and produced other case studies (e.g., Johnson et al., 2003; Murphy & Smagorinsky, 2005).

We also see the settings of Jimmy's teaching as having significant and differential effects on his development as a teacher. Kim worked closely with Jimmy, mentoring him by scaffolding his development of a teaching approach through a sequence of modeling instruction, co-planning lessons, and then having Jimmy design his own instruction with her attention and feedback. Under her guidance he learned the importance of relating students' lives to their literary experiences and encouraging this connection through his instructional design. Planning in this setting involved considering the world from students' perspectives and planning activities that enabled them to engage with literary themes on their own terms.

We found his instruction at Pullman City to lean more heavily toward the teacher-and-text-centered tradition. Again we look to the setting of his teaching. Teaching all new courses, experiencing time management problems because of his coaching duties, and being cut off from his colleagues by the school schedule, Jimmy had to rely on a small group of kindly colleagues to help him prepare for his classes. Most of this help, offered by teachers who themselves had little free time, came through access to lessons in file cabinets, rather than the close and careful mentoring available through Kim. He taught these lessons with a trial-and-error approach, hoping that with further experience he would know which ones worked best for him. Like the curriculum itself, these lessons embodied the teacher-and-text-centered pedagogical tradition, one generally at odds with the teaching approach generally favored by Kim at Cather Mid-High. Our final observa-

tions of Jimmy found him moving toward this norm, an approach that appeared congenial to the values and practices of his school district.

As teacher educators our concern is the apparent absence of synthesis of ideas evident in the “doubleness” exhibited by Jimmy in his teaching. He is hardly the exception in this regard; the experienced, exemplary teachers studied by Marshall et al. (1995) and many other fine teachers are similarly ensconced in these two apparently contradictory philosophical worlds. Our conclusion as teacher educators is that we need to provide greater conceptual unity in the programs we offer. Sizer (1984), Applebee (1996), and others have criticized school curricula that are fragmented and disjointed, arguing that programs of study ought to have overriding themes and conceptual continuity in order to be effective. We see the same issues as being relevant to teacher educators. As this study suggests, when teacher education programs do not provide conceptual unity, even a strong candidate can emerge without what we consider to be essential critical tools to inform and motivate his or her teaching.

Our conclusion as teacher educators is that we need to provide greater conceptual unity in the programs we offer.

In essence, our study of Jimmy's teaching situates teacher education programs in the context of the old breadth vs. depth discussion about learning to teach: Which is preferable, broad coverage of all possibilities or a more limited and concerted study of fewer approaches, particularly across time and settings? Each has different consequences: a more inclusive tool kit in one case, a more unified tool kit in the other. We hope that our account of Jimmy's early-career teaching experiences in these settings contributes to this discussion and illustrates one possible set of consequences for teachers whose programs do not provide what we consider to be overall coherence and articulation.

Author Note

Work on this article was supported by a grant to the second author from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to the Center on English Learning and Achievement (CELA). The Center was supported by the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Award # R305A60005). However, the views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the department. Thanks to our CELA colleagues, especially Jane Agee, Pamela Grossman, and Sheila Valencia; and to Michael Moore and the external reviewers of *English Education* for their guidance in shaping the final version of the article. Direct correspondence to Steven T. Bickmore at Riverton High School, 12476 S. Silverwolf Way (2700 W.), Riverton, UT 84065; e-mail: steven.bickmore@jordan.k12.ut.us.

References

- Applebee, A. N. (1974). *Tradition and reform in the teaching of English: A history*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A. N. (1995). *Literature in the secondary school: Studies of curriculum and instruction in the United States*. NCTE Research Report No. 25. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A. N. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barnes, D. R. (1992). *From communication to curriculum* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bloome, D., & Bailey, F. (1992). Studying language and literacy through events, particularity, and intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multiple disciplinary approaches to researching language and literacy* (pp. 181-210). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English and National Conference on Research in English.
- Cohen, D. K. (1989). Teaching practice: Plus que ça change. . . . In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: Perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 27-84). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Cole, M., Engeström, Y., & Vasquez, O. (1997). Introduction. In M. Cole, Y. Engeström, & O. Vasquez (Eds.), *Mind, culture, and activity: Seminal papers from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition* (pp. 1-21). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, L. S., Smagorinsky, P., Fry, P. G., Konopak, B., & Moore, C. (2002). Problems in developing a constructivist approach to teaching: One teacher's transition from teacher preparation to teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102, 389-415.
- Cuban, L. (1995). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890-1990* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dixon, J. (1975). *Growth through English set in the perspective of the seventies* (3rd ed.). Yorkshire, UK: National Association for the Teaching of English.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English and ERIC.
- Hillocks, G. (2002). *The testing trap: How state writing assessments control learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Johnson, T. S., Smagorinsky, P., Thompson, L., & Fry, P. G. (2005). Learning to teach the five-paragraph theme. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38, 156-176.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Luhrmann, B. (Director) (1996). *Romeo and Juliet*. Hollywood, CA: Twentieth-Century Fox.

- Marshall, J. D. (1993). Toward a theory of practice: Readers, texts, and the teaching of literature. In G. E. Newell & R. K. Durst (Eds.) *Exploring texts: The role of discussion and writing in the teaching and learning of literature* (pp. 307–323). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Marshall, J. D., Smagorinsky, P., & Smith, M. W. (1995). *The language of interpretation: Patterns of discourse in discussions of literature*. NCTE Research Report No. 27. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Murphy, S. L., Johnson, T. S., Bickmore, S. T., Sanford, A., Hundley, M., & Zoss M. (2004). *Pedagogical paradigms in English education. Athens, GA: The GSTEP BRIDGE (Georgia Systemic Teacher Education Program—Building Resources: Induction and Development for Georgia Educators)*. Retrieved April 19, 2005, from <http://www.teachersbridge.org/pages/file.php?id=1204>
- Murphy, S. L., & Smagorinsky, P. (2005, January). “*You have to make it personal so that they will be able to understand it*”: An early career teacher’s quest to develop a conception of engaged learning. Paper presented at the annual QUIG Conference on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies, Athens, GA.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Orne, M. T. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, *17*, 776–783.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace’s compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smagorinsky, P. (1999). Time to teach. *English Education*, *32*, 50–75.
- Smagorinsky, P. (2002). *Teaching English through principled practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., Jackson, A. Y., Moore, C., & Fry, P. G. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*, 8–24.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Johnson, T. S. (2005). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record*, *105*, 1399–1436.
- Smagorinsky, P., Gibson, N., Moore, C., Bickmore, S., & Cook, L. S. (2004). Praxis shock: Making the transition from a student-centered university program to the corporate climate of schools. *English Education*, *36*, 214–245.
- Smagorinsky, P., Lakly, A., & Johnson, T. S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance in learning to teach within a prescribed curriculum. *English Education*, *34*, 187–213.
- Smagorinsky, P., McCann, T., & Kern, S. (1987). *Explorations: Introductory activities for literature and composition, grades 7–12*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English
- Valsiner, J. (1998). *The guided mind: A sociogenetic approach to personality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In L. S. Vygotsky, *Collected works* (vol. 1, pp. 39–285) (R. Rieber & A. Carton, Eds; N. Minick, Trans.). New York: Plenum.

- Zeffirelli, F. (1968). *Romeo and Juliet*. Hollywood, CA: Paramount Studio.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp.529–548). New York: Macmillan.

Steven T. Bickmore recently received his Ph.D. from The University of Georgia. He has returned to teach in Jordan School District, UT, where he taught from 1978-2002.

Peter Smagorinsky is a professor in the program in English Education at The University of Georgia.

Cindy O'Donnell-Allen is an associate professor in the program in English Education in the Department of English at Colorado State University.

2005 CEE Election Results

Elected to the **CEE Executive Committee** for four-year terms are **Janet Alsup**, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana; **Todd Goodson**, Kansas State University, Manhattan; and **Tonya Perry**, University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Elected to the **2005–2006 CEE Nominating Committee** are Eurydice Bouchereau Bauer, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, *Chair*; Helen Duffy, National Academy of Education's Committee on Teacher Education, San Francisco, California; Judith Hayn, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois; Kathleen Dudden Rowlands, California State University, Northridge; and Leslie S. Rush, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

On the NCTE Web site, see the "Election News" area for additional election results and the "Nominations" area for details on submitting nominations for the 2006 elections (<http://www.ncte.org/about/gov/elec>).
