Charles Moran

A MODEL FOR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE FIELD OF WRITING

At the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, in the past ten years we have developed training programs for teachers of writing at the secondary and post-secondary levels, both in-service and pre-service. We work with experienced secondary-level writing teachers, grades five to twelve; we work with undergraduates preparing for certification in secondary English; we work with graduate students who are preparing to teach or are already teaching in our Rhetoric program; and we work with graduate students who will leave us to teach in four-year colleges and universities, two-year colleges, writing laboratories, and communications skills centers. I say that *we* have developed these programs because the effort has been collaborative. Involved in almost every aspect of this effort have been Walker Gibson, James Leheny, Joseph Skerrett, and Charles K. Smith of this University, and James Collins, originally of Springfield Technical High School and now at SUNY Buffalo. That I write instead of one of these colleagues is an historical accident.

The programs that we have developed differ in dimension only. The most extensive is the eighteen-month Institute for the Teaching of Writing, sponsored by the University and by the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1977-8 and again in 1981-2. These Institutes involve in-service secondary-level writing teachers. Next in scope is the fourteen-week graduate course, English 712, "Writing and the Teaching of Writing," given at the University to a mix of in-service secondary-level, in-service college-level, and pre-service college-level writing teachers. This course has its undergraduate equivalent, English 290, taken by undergraduate English majors who intend to teach. Least in scope are in-service teacher training workshops given in secondary schools. We have designed workshop series, and we have designed single, two-hour after-school workshops.

Charles Moran is Associate Professor of English at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

DOI: 10.37514/JBW-J.1981.3.2.06

Each of these teacher training efforts, whether eighteen months or two hours long, is based upon the same assumptions about writing, about teaching writing, and about teacher training in this field. We assume that, in its essentials, writing is more properly considered an activity than a subject. The writer, we assume, is an active, fully-human being, engaged in making choices among alternative subjects, voices, structures, sentence patterns, and words. Teaching writing then becomes something like coaching, or teaching shop or studio art classes. The writing teacher, we believe, is most effective as an in-process editor, rather than as an after-the-fact critic. About teacher training in our field we assume that teacher behavior needs to be changed, and that if this change is to occur, it will occur as the teachers act, not as they listen to us.

I do not believe that in these times I need to support our assumption that writing is most properly considered an activity; and if not, I do not have to argue for our model of the effective writing teacher: the in-process editor. I do need to give some support, however, to our assumptions about teacher training in this field. Our first assumption, that teacher behavior needs to be changed, is shared by all teacher training programs in all fields, but it is seldom stated or supported. By change we intend both change of actual behavior on the part of in-service teachers and of potential behavior on the part of pre-service teachers. We see the need for change on the basis of a great deal of actual classroom observation of veteran and student teachers at all levels and our long and fruitful acquaintance with hundreds of writing teachers in our own careers, which have included work in writing laboratories, remedial programs, and writing classes in jails, schools, and colleges.

In our work we have seen, and still see, teachers teaching writing by reading to their classes from Warriner's *English Grammar and Composition,* despite the clear and ancient understanding that there is no useful correlation between learning formal grammar and learning to write. We see teachers giving their students advice about good writing, advice that is dead wrong: "avoid the passive," "use strong verbs," "vary your sentence structure," "be specific," and "avoid the first person." We have heard teachers tell their students to outline before they write, think before they write, attend to spelling while they write the first draft. My children come home from their schools with delightful, well-written essays that have been marked down because they were not five-paragraph themes. To teach writing by teaching grammar, to teach writing as a system of precepts, to assume that there is a single model of the good essay—all this seems to us, and to most who have thought about the matter at all, to be desperately wrong.

Yet, the teachers who teach writing in these ways are decent, intelligent people. They are not more prone to delusion than teachers of other subjects, nor are they less intelligent or less well-informed. How to explain this peculiar persistence in error? Our history accounts in large measure for the persistence of the belief that formal grammar is the route to good writing. In our distant past we have the trivium of the medieval academies; one-third of this trivium is still to be found in the generic term *grammar school,* an institution that might prepare a student to enter a school with a name like Boston Latin High School. In a time of inflation-fueled nostalgia and national insecurity, the myth of the golden age becomes overwhelmingly powerful. The operative word in the Back-to-Basics movement is *back:* we want to return to a golden time when men rode the range, women kept house, prices were lower, and teachers taught Latin grammar. In addition, our colonial beginnings survive in an exaggerated concern for correctness. We still believe that if we do not speak and write according to the rules, we will not pass. And, despite evidence to the contrary, in many quraters we still believe that the study of formal grammar is the most direct route to correctness in speech and writing. So it is that the study of grammar moves toward the center of the writing curriculum, particularly if the course is thought to be remedial or basic.

Another cause for our teachers' persistence in error is a fact of the American economy: it is possible to make a profit selling books, programs, and worksheets; it is much more difficult to make a profit without a tangible product. Teachers and their administrators are beseiged by textbook salespeople who bring apparent security and the promise of a quick fix for a quick buck. And the textbooks and programs are founded upon assumptions that we know to be unsound: that writing is a subject, that one can teach writing by presenting a description of good writing; that one can usefully give the same advice to hundreds of writers at the same time; and that the acquisition of writing skill is a linear process that moves from sentence to paragraph to essay, or from description through narration to exposition. James Moffett, Peter Elbow, and Richard Lanham, to name just a few, have made the case against textbooks.[1] Yet, as the displays at any professional conference make clear, the textbook is still here.

---

[1] James Moffett, *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968), pp. 200-210; Peter Elbow, *Writing Without Teachers* (Oxford University Press, 1973); Richard A. Lanham, *Style: An Anti-Textbook* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

American history and the power of the profit motive would be enough to explain the behavior we observe, but there is yet another cause to be found in the conditions in which our teachers work. It is the extraordinary writing teacher who writes regularly or at all. Teaching writing develops the critical faculty, perhaps at the expense of the creative. When I ask a physics teacher to write, I generally feel little resistance. When I ask an English teacher to write, there is typically great resistance. As the writing teacher loses contact with his or her own writing processes, this teacher becomes less able to test a textbook or program-suggested procedure against experience and thus becomes more open to the sorts of malpractice I have described. Two further aspects of the teachers' working conditions, the class schedule and the design of the classroom, also help move the writing teacher toward the textbook or program. Writing teachers find themselves in a schedule that brings writing students to them in blocks of twenty-five, all at once. The classroom has chairs or student desks in it, generally in rows facing the front of the room, the front defined by the presence of the teacher's desk or lectern and by the configuration of the blackboards. Both the schedule and the classroom encourage the writing teacher to treat writing as if it were a subject, not an activity, and to give grammar lessons, or diagram sentences.

This begins to sound like rant, and I do not mean it to. I do want to suggest the magnitude of the task that confronts the teacher-training program in our field, however. Given the powerful forces that drive writing teachers toward poor teaching methods, the program that changes the teachers' behavior will have to be designed to effect change in conditions that make this change most difficult. And this brings me to our second assumption: that if we are to alter our teachers' behavior as radically as we believe we must, and if in attempting to make this change we face formidable opposition from forces originating in our history, our economy, and our profession, the change we desire will occur only if it is brought about during action. If the teachers are to change their assumptions about writing and its teaching, they will do so only as they act—and for our purposes this action takes the form of *writing* and *teaching*. The change that we hope to bring about will not take place as the teachers listen to lectures about teaching even if, as the Bay Area Writing Project seems to assume, the lectures and demonstrations are delivered by fellow teachers. Here I find myself agreeing with Paulo Freire: if we hope to bring about real and lasting change, we must make it possible for this change to occur as the teachers are active as teachers and/or writers. As the teachers write, they will arrive at a new

understanding of their own composing processes; as they teach, they will arrive at a new understanding of their students' composing processes.

Given our assumptions about writing, about teaching writing, and about teacher training in this field, our goals become clear. We intend to help teachers develop a deeper and more accurate understanding of themselves and others as writers. We believe that if a teacher acquires this new knowledge and keeps it current, this teacher will not again readily adopt goals or strategies that are inappropriate to the nature of the activity being taught. In all our sessions, therefore, the teachers spend much of their time writing. They also spend as much time as possible teaching real students in controlled writing-laboratory classes. We believe that these two activities have approximately equal value, and we put them both at the center of our several teacher-training programs. If time permits, we will include as a third element reading and talk about topics in the field: heuristics, models of the composing process, the history of the discipline, peer-group dynamics, writing across the curriculum, contexts for writing, grammars and their relationship to composition, and so forth. The choices that we have made in designing our teacher-training activities and the steadiness of our principles in designing these activities, will become more clear as I describe the actual work that we do, beginning with the smallest complete unit, the one-shot, two-hour workshop, and concluding with the largest complete unit, the eighteen-month Institute.

The one-shot workshop creates the most difficult design problem because so much has to be left out. Agreeing to do such a workshop, however, forces me to make the final choice. If I can do only one of the activities possible in the range of teacher-training strategies, which one will I choose? After some unsuccessful experiments, I now regularly choose writing. In the single-session workshops the teachers spend all of their time writing and talking with each other about this writing. My objective in these workshops is to help the teachers discover through their own experience the fact that the writer is an active human being who actively chooses among alternatives and is then limited by these choices.

At the beginning of the single workshop, I ask the teachers to write for half an hour on the topic "Describe a Person." The topic is deliberately open-ended, one that forces the writers to choose a subject, attitude, strategies, structures, language. In addition, this topic allows the writers to choose a topic that is both meaningful and readily available to them. After I give the assignment, I am almost always asked, "Mr. Moran, what do you want in these essays?" I do not answer the question, but file it away for future use. The teachers talk for a few minutes—I will remind them of this at the end of the workshop and call it *avoidance behavior,*

perfectly normal, for all of us—and then settle down to work. After several teachers have clearly finished their writing, I ask one of them for permission to photocopy and distribute the freshly written essay. I am always given this permission. I distribute the photocopied essay and ask the author to read it aloud. I ask the teachers this question: "What has the writer decided to do, or not to do, in this essay?" I ask the author to read the essay again, and then repeat the question. "What choices has the writer made?" The writer has, it appears, chosen not to use the first person. Fine. Why? Would the essay be different if the writer had used the first person, and if so, how different? What problems would the use of the first person have created? What problems has the use of the third person created? The writer has, it appears, concentrated upon physical detail, rather than character, history, or behavior. Why? What does this choice make possible? Prevent? In the actual case that I have in mind the writer had chosen to describe her mother. Since she felt strongly about her mother, she wanted to achieve the distance possible with the third person. The lesson thus learned: choice of subject will influence other choices further down the line. The writer works in a fruitful tension between the power to choose and the factors that tend to limit that choice. After we have finished with this essay, I ask the teachers for their reaction to the exercise they have just completed. This gives them a chance to ventilate and recognize anger, anxiety, joy, or whatever the writing situation has produced. If it seems necessary and appropriate, I remind them of their initial reluctance to become active writers. Instead of making their own choices, they wanted me, through an assignment or through post-assignment coaching, to make their choices for them.

At this point in the workshop we break for coffee, and I have five copies made of each of the teachers' essays. After the break we divide into groups of five. Each group is instructed to proceed as we have just proceeded: each teacher reads his or her essay and then, with the group, examines the choices made. This part of the workshop takes approximately one hour. After the groups have finished their work I bring them together and ask them what they have learned. They usually tell me that they have discovered the variety of possible responses to the assignment "Describe a Person." They have also discovered that they, and their colleagues, are remarkably good writers.

The problem with the single workshop is that it leaves the teachers with an understanding of the writer's process that may not fit into their next-day's classes. In addition to their new sense of themselves as writers, they need classroom strategies that allow them to bring this knowledge to bear upon their students' writing. Moreover, the teachers may not extend their

sense of themselves as writers to a sense of the student as writer. Given more time in a series of workshops, I try to fill these needs by adding the following elements: group diagnoses of actual student writing taken from the teachers' classes, and a demonstration of writing laboratory techniques.

The group diagnosing sessions are as close as I can bring the teachers to actual teaching in the after-school workshop situation. In the group diagnostic sessions the teachers confront their student writers indirectly, through the written work. In these sessions I distribute one student essay which we handle in the same way we did the teachers' essays: I ask the teachers to talk about the choices that the student writer has made. This part of the session moves along predictably and smoothly. Then we begin a second activity that is more dangerous because it opens the possibility that the teachers will return to their definition of the student as a maker of error. I divide the teachers into groups of five and ask each group to list in order of importance the three most evident problems in the piece of student writing before them. I ask each group to appoint a recorder who will writer down the group's collective response. This statement must be signed by each member of the group. I do this because I find that teachers are unwilling and/or unable to give specific diagnoses of student writing, and when and if this is so, they, and I, need to know that it is so.

After the groups have completed their statements, their recorders present their positions to the group as a whole. I take notes, summarize, and comment sparingly as seems appropriate. In this part of the workshop series, I almost always discover that the teachers are not able to do accurate or creative diagnoses of student writing. Even given the most explicit instructions, as above, a group will more often than not report, "This student needs work on grammar." I point out that this is not a diagnosis, but a presciption. In talking with Charles K. Smith, colleague and author of *Styles and Structures,* I remarked once that writing teachers seem strangely unable, or reluctant, to do a real diagnosis of a piece of student writing. He suggested, and I think that he is right, that teachers tend to proceed from a general, unstated diagnosis: "This writing is not good." They then move from this general diagnosis to a general prescription: "This student needs work on 'X'." In this process, the teachers follow textbooks and workbooks which also must proceed from general diagnoses—"Readers of this book need help in general with their writing"—to one of a number of all-purpose prescriptions: work in formal grammar, sentence combining, paragraph building, or free-writing exercises. In designing our training programs, however, we assume, and the world seems to be swinging our way, that there are no universal or

even general writer problems, no wide-wasting disease that can be cured by a single prescription. Writer 'A' may be blocked one day and glib the next, careful in the treatment of one subject and careless with the next, able to discover voice in one situation and not in another. Writers are different; individual writers change. A diagnosis must be made of one writer's performance on a particular day, written in response to a particular subject and audience.

In my participation in the discussion, I try as best I can to extend the teachers' sense of the range of possible diagnoses. Is there anything in the nature of the subject that will cause particular kinds of problems for the writer? Does the handwriting tell us anything? Is it significant that the essay is exactly one page long? I try to introduce the notion of *genre,* avoiding as best I can the Scylla of absolute relativity and the Charybdis of the single standard. I suggest that there are formal and informal essays, personal and impersonal, essays written to teachers, peers, and to the self, essays evocative, narrative, meditative, descriptive, and persuasive, and that each of these genres has its appropriate characteristics. If I am successful, the teachers will substitute for the word "correct" the word "appropriate." I hope that the teachers will approach student writing with these kinds of questions: Is the structure, tone, voice, choice of sentence type, diction, metaphor appropriate to the writer's subject, audience, and situation? Given what the student writer has apparently set out to do, has the performance been successful? How might it be made still more successful?

At the risk of seeming self-serving, I want to point out again the magnitude of the change that I hope will take place. I want the teachers to put aside the single standard, the Ur-essay, a standard that is easy to apply, and adopt in its stead a multiple, flexible standard, which is difficult to apply. That I do not always succeed should not be surprising. But writing taught to a single standard is destructive and unpleasant for the learner. If a writer is simply following the teacher's paradigm, why bother? The motive for writing is, after all, to express the self, to compose—not irresponsibly, but responsibly, within the constraints of the writer's situation and of the choices the writer has made.

When time permits, I add to this workshop series a third element, an explanation and short demonstration of a writing laboratory class. In the sessions I have described, I have tried to bring the teachers to an understanding of themselves, and of their students, as writers. If the teachers are to act on what they have learned, they need a classroom management system that will allow them to treat student writers as individuals, twenty-five at a time. Here the work of Roger Garrison has

been most helpful.[2] We have adapted his description of a writing laboratory class to the exigencies of the high school and college classroom, and it is this adaptation that I present. At the end of this workshop, the picture is complete, although, like a hologram with half a target, the picture may be somewhat faint. The teachers should have an understanding of the writer's process, an understanding of the student writer's process, and a class format that will allow the teachers to bring this new knowledge directly to bear in their work with student writers.

As will be abundantly clear, our English Department graduate course, "Writing and the Teaching of Writing," is built upon the same foundation as the workshop series just described. In this graduate course, however, we have our students for fourteen weeks: a weekly seminar and about eight hours preparation time. Given the new dimension, there is time to work toward a new goal, knowledge of the field, and to proceed in a more satisfactory way toward the attainment of the goals that informed the workshop series; development of the teacher's sense of self, and of student, as writer. The graduate course has a syllabus—a list of readings and discussion topics—that is the "knowledge of the field" component. This syllabus is the least important part of the course, however. More important are the components of the course in which the students write and teach.

During the semester, each student works steadily and continuously on a writing project or series of projects. I stipulate that each student must spend at least three hours each week on this task. Every third week they will come to a thirty minute writing tutorial with me, bringing with them all drafts, notes, scratch sheets, and doodles, or, if they have been unable to write, an account of the time spent trying to write. The writing is to be expository—no novels, plays, or poems. Anything else goes, and the responsibility for discovering topics is theirs alone. I may help them find topics, if they are desperate, by asking questions, or by suggesting that they try a few of the heuristics that we have read about, if we have passed this point in the syllabus.

During the writing tutorials I try to be as non-directive as possible. I try to listen, and not talk, to the extent that my nature permits. I have found much useful information about tutoring writing in Don Murray's book, *A Writer Teaches Writing,* and his many articles, and Alfred Benjamin's

---

[2]Roger H. Garrison, *Teaching Writing: An Approach to Tutorial Instruction in Freshman Composition,* unpublished manuscript.

The Helping Interview.[3] At the beginning of the tutorial I will ask a question like this one: "Well, how has the writing been going since I saw you last?" Whatever happens after this question dictates the shape and direction of the tutorial. I may make the occasional connection between the writer's work and subjects treated in the reading. If the writer is having a difficult time getting started, I may suggest that he try prewriting techniques as described by Peter Elbow in *Writing Without Teachers.* Occasionally, I will bring materials from the tutorials back to the graduate seminar. In general, however, the tutorial stands alone, an adjunct to the graduate student's writing.

The graduate students in English 712 write, and they also teach. Attached to the course is a laboratory class, a section of English 350, "Advanced Expository Writing." Despite the word *advanced* in the course title, English 350 attracts student writers of every sort, from severe remedial cases to glib, hyper-verbal writers who need to learn to edit. The course is taught entirely by tutorial. I give the tutorials in the first two and the last three weeks; for the nine week balance of the semester, the graduate students from English 712 do the tutoring. Each graduate student is given full charge of one undergraduate writer. The graduate students hold weekly tutorials with their undergraduates, following closely the procedures that I have established in my tutorials with them. I require the graduate students to keep full records of their teaching, and at the end of the semester I require a full protocol, a careful record and analysis of the nine weeks of teaching. The protocol must include a diagnosis of the student's most important writing problems, referenced to photocopies of the student's writing; a list of strategies used to deal with one or more of these problems; and documented evidence of the progress, or lack of progress, toward the stipulated goals. In a final section, the graduate student must speculate, as responsibly as possible, on the reasons for the outcome of this teaching effort. The success of the teaching, I tell the graduate students, is not as important, for their purposes, as careful analysis of the success or the failure, and an honest attempt to account for the outcome.

The laboratory class is perhaps the most important component of this graduate course. Indeed, after years of teaching without such a laboratory, I cannot imagine teaching teachers without a laboratory

---

[3] Donald Murray, *A Writer Teaches Writing* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968); Alfred Benjamin, *The Helping Interview* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974).

experience of some sort available to me. In my teacher-training I frequently encounter the "teacher-fiction," a powerful and pervasive genre in which the teacher's class is always successful, the teacher always the hero, the student always improved and appreciative. The forces that drive these fictions are obvious: the tale-tellers' poor working conditions, low status and pay, and the fact that teachers, almost unique in the world of work, perform alone, not observed by other professionals. The teacher-fiction begins with "What these kids need is..." or "But the students in my class...." To the extent that these fictions justify present practice, they inhibit change. Without a laboratory class, there is no way of keeping these fictions in check, because the experience being described is in another country and, however much I may believe the fiction to be a fiction, I can not demolish it by calling it a lie. With a laboratory class, I can say, after the fiction has been spoken, "Fine, but what we are talking about now is not your class but this particular student whose writing is now before us and whom you will meet again next Tuesday."

When I first introduced the laboratory component into the graduate course, I worried about the teaching that the undergraduates would receive. They were, after all, my responsibility, for I was their teacher of record. After three years of experience, I no longer worry. To the extent that the graduate students are teachers, they replace me, and that's fine. To the extent that they are peers, they offer peer criticism, and *that's* fine. The evaluations of the undergraduate course tell me that the undergraduates are pleased with the level and intensity of the instruction they receive. Indeed, the experiment has proved so successful that I have added a freshman laboratory class to English 290, the undergraduate "Writing and Teaching of Writing" course, with equally positive results.

The final and, I believe, least critical component of the graduate course is its syllabus—the reading list and sequence of topics. It has two distinct and incompatible functions: it is designed to give early support to the graduate students in their laboratory teaching, and it is designed to cover topics that I consider important in the field. I begin with Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* largely because the graduate students will soon be tutoring my English 350 students. From this reading they get what the title promises: a redefinition of error and a recalibration of their expectations in the area of observed writing improvement. They learn that error is a part of learning, and that increments of improvement in their students' work will most often be small, even undetectable. The graduate students are invariably intimidated by the grammatical terminology that they find in this book, and the early concentration on error tends to inhibit their own writing. So in the second week, I assign

Constance Weaver's *Grammar for Teachers.* Shaughnessy assumes that knowledge of grammatical terminology is a necessary precondition to improvement in writing; Weaver waffles a bit but finally maintains that grammar, while it may be useful for teachers, is not useful for students. In this second seminar, then, we have joined in the great grammar debate, and I bring in Braddock and Lloyd-Jones' summary of the Harris study and its conclusion: that the study of formal grammar, insofar as this replaces actual writing, is at best useless, and perhaps harmful, to a student's writing.[4] At this time also I bring in sentence-combining materials and introduce the controversy that now exists about this subject.

In the third week, partly to undo what has been done by our work on grammar, we read Peter Elbow's *Writing Without Teachers* and do pre-writing exercises that he describes. I do this early in the semester again because the graduate students soon begin to teach, and they should have some strategies ready for helping blocked writers. Elbow's assumption, that for some people some of the time writing is its own heuristic leads us naturally into other heuristics, the topic for the fourth week. We read, in W. Ross Winterowd's *Contemporary Rhetoric,* essays by Richard Young and Alton Becker, Janice Lauer, Ann Berthoff, Richard Larson, and Janet Emig. Any heuristic contains this useful and positive assumption: that people can be taught to discover, or create, interesting and complicated thoughts. From this perspective, a student who has not enough to say is neither stupid nor ill-formed. This student can be helped to think creatively. Most of my graduate students, although they would not put it this way, believe that some students can think and some can not—the old faculty psychology. They believe this not because they have a low estimate of human potential but because they have no alternative to the "some can, and some just can't" position. The work in heuristics gives them this alternative. We then spend the next two weeks working through Parts II, III, and IV of Charles K. Smith's *Styles and Structures,* the Norton freshman text. Smith demonstrates and teaches the use of definitions, assumptions, and criteria as heuristic probes, and to good effect. As the graduate students work through Smith's materials and exercises, they learn something of the old rhetoric and something of the new, and they experience the difficulty and the delight of the heuristic.

---

[4] Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer, *Research in Written Composition* (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1963), pp. 70-83.

After this section of the syllabus, which I am pleased with and will repeat, we move on to topics that seem to me to be important at that particular time. Since the discipline is evolving rapidly, this part of the syllabus will change, indeed has changed, radically, and so I will not rehearse it here. We keep busy with reading and discussion, and as the semester progresses the graduate students report on the progress of their laboratory teaching, bringing partial protocols into the seminar for discussion.

The principles that directed our work in this graduate course, and in the workshops and workshop series that I have described, also governed the design of the two eighteen-month teacher-training institutes. These institutes have been fully described in an article forthcoming in *College Composition and Communication,* so I need describe them only briefly here. The essential difference between the fourteen-week graduate course and the eighteen-month institute is that in the institute we have more time and can therefore do more thoroughly and effectively what I attempt to do in the graduate course. As in the graduate course, institute teachers write and bring their writing to tutorials with us. During the six-week summer session in Amherst they have a weekly tutorial, and we expect them to bring the fruits of their six- to eight-hour writing time to the tutorial. We publish their work regularly, in-house. And as in the graduate course, the teachers teach. We have arranged with the Springfield school system to have ninety writing students made available to us for the six weeks of the institute. Our teachers travel to Springfield and tutor these students in laboratory classes, each teacher working for two weeks with six tenth grade writers. With the aid of extensive photocopying, the teachers discuss their day's work after the laboratory class in an hour long seminar. As they teach, they compile full protocols on two of their writing students, diagnosing, setting goals, choosing strategies, and measuring progress.

In addition to the teaching and to the writing, which are, as they have been in the other expressions of our model, absolutely central, the institute teachers cover the ground covered in the graduate course, but more thoroughly. Given the fact that the institute teachers are secondary level, the readings are somewhat different. As in the graduate course, we read Shaughnessy and Elbow and Weaver and Smith. Other readings are drawn from periodicals like *English Journal,* rather than from *College Composition and Communication.* We make these readings available to the teachers as weaponry: if the teachers need support for what they want

to do when they return to their schools, they can use the authorities found in the reading.

In the academic year that follows the summer session, the Institute moves to the teachers' schools in a follow-up program that uses the teachers' own classes as a laboratory. In this part of the Institute, the teachers implement the approaches and principles they have absorbed during the summer. Institute faculty visit the schools, visit the teachers' classes, and run after-school Institute seminars in which the teachers analyze and evaluate their own work. What are they doing that seems effective? Can they measure or document this effectiveness? What news do they bring of their students' writing process? Progress or lack of progress? What success have they had in passing on what they know to other teachers? The follow-up seminars give us a chance to see our teachers at work in their own schools and to estimate the effectiveness of our training techniques. In addition, our presence in the schools gives the teachers important support in their attempt to change their own, and perhaps other teachers', methods of teaching writing.

So there it is, a teacher-training model that can be expressed as a two-hour workshop or as an eighteen-month institute. The model seems to us to be effective. From my observation, the effectiveness of the program is a function of its length: the more full the program, the more effective it can be. The one-session workshops that I give receive positive evaluations from the participants. The teachers have had a good time, and they feel as if they have learned something. In a few remarkable cases where a teacher was at that moment particularly open to change, these workshops have made a difference. Aside from these isolated successes, however, I believe that the one-session workshop leaves teacher behavior largely unchanged. The multiple-session workshop can be more effective, particularly when it gives the teachers the writing laboratory techniques they need to utilize, in classroom practice, their new knowledge of the writer's process. The semester-long graduate course is still more effective. I know this because many of the alumni of the course teach at the University with me, and we engage in frequent, informal shoptalk. We have reasonably hard evidence for the effectiveness of our institutes. An outside evaluator found that the 1977-8 Institute had significantly changed the teachers' behavior in the area of the teaching of writing. After the Institute, teachers taught much more writing in their classes. Better still, they taught writing differently after the Institute, approaching the students less often as critics, more often as editors.

The evidence that we have, then, suggests that the model we have developed is effective. I want to conclude, however, with a caveat. It is not at all clear to me that the design of the program is primarily responsible for its effectiveness. It may well be that the assumptions that provide the program's conceptual framework are more critical than the design. We believe that writing is an activity, and that the writer is an individual actively engaged in making decisions and choices; we believe that the writing teacher is most effective as an in-process editor; and we believe that the facts of our history, economy, and profession make it necessary that our teachers learn as they write and as they teach. It is possible that in teacher training, as in other spheres of activity, what we believe is more important than what we do.