

## On the Concept of Manner and Its Visibility in Teaching Practice\*

Gary D Fenstermacher

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

What is manner, and how do you know it when you see it? Twenty years ago, when I began writing about the concept of manner,<sup>1</sup> I thought I knew the answers to these questions. Not to any level of certainty, of course, but with the reasonable assurance of one who believes he is arguing a worthwhile position, and doing so in a proper way. Now, after nearly two years of intense investigation of the concept in both philosophical and empirical contexts, I doubt that my early assurance was justified. In this paper, I explore the concept of manner and its manifestations in teacher conduct. The work reported here is part of a larger three year research effort to learn more about how teachers foster or impede the development of moral and intellectual virtues by their students.<sup>2</sup>

A bit of near-history sets the stage for the current analysis. Thirty years ago, many studies of classroom teaching were prompted by a desire to understand the relationship between how a teacher behaved in the classroom and what students learned from that teacher. The studies employed a distinctly behaviorist conception of teaching and learning, using quasi-experimental designs and methodologies with complex statistical analyses to search out compelling correlations between teacher behavior and student learning. As a philosopher skeptical of behaviorist notions of teaching and learning, I wondered how research might account for some of the more elusive, yet highly significant, aspects of teaching, such as the cultivation of highly regarded intellectual traits (e.g., critical thinking, regard for truth, and respect for evidence), as well as the development of moral virtue (e. g., fairness, courage, caring). I and others writing at the time wondered whether this juggernaut of correlational research was not leading educators and policy makers to form excessively simple ideas of both the purposes and practices of teaching. These simple ideas implied a conception of teaching method that was centered almost exclusively on what teacher behaviors most likely lead students to acquire prescribed subject matter knowledge.

---

\*A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 19, 1999 (session 2.54). The work leading to the development of the ideas reported in this paper would not have been possible without the generous support of the Spencer Foundation. The author also gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the project research team (Virginia Richardson, Todd Chow-Hoy, Catherine Fallona, Alexandra Miletta, Matthew Sanger, Jilo Williams, and Nicola Williams) and the 11 classroom teachers who are part of the research effort. Comments on this paper are welcome; forward to the author at [gfenster@umich.edu](mailto:gfenster@umich.edu).

In reaction to the attention being given to teaching method, I wondered whether it might be possible to develop a more robust conception of teaching by introducing a term that would serve as a contrast to method, at least to method as it was being interpreted by behavioral psychologists and learning theorists working at mid-century and the decades following. Enter the notion of manner. My intention at the time was to use the concept of manner to direct attention to the teacher's role in fostering the moral and intellectual development of the young. Other scholars were at work on similar objectives, although with different approaches. These efforts are summarized in excellent reviews by Linda Valli,<sup>3</sup> Kenneth Strike,<sup>4</sup> and David Hansen.<sup>5</sup> As I reflect on my own prior efforts, and examine the data collected in the course of studying the work of 11 teachers in two very different schools (a predominantly white middle class school in a small Midwestern city and an African-centered K-8 school in a large metropolitan area), it appears that a desire to draw attention away from method, directing it instead to manner, led to a far too rigid division between the two. As it now appears to those of us participating in the research, method is an extremely important means for fostering manner in students. However, I am getting ahead of the story.

My initial efforts to expound on manner were grounded in what I regarded as highly appealing moral theory. From Plato's *Meno* to Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*, it has been generally accepted in Anglo-American philosophy that virtue cannot be taught, at least not as one teaches table manners or arithmetic. Instead, virtue is acquired or "picked up" by association with people who are themselves virtuous. In compliance with this generally accepted view, I fully incorporated into my own analysis of manner the notion that virtue is not conveyed in the way academic content is conveyed, but rather is acquired as a result of being around virtuous people. The conclusion to this reasoning follows quite readily: Teachers must themselves be virtuous persons if they are to foster the virtues in their students.

Viewed in this way, the manner of the teacher is paramount if the teacher is to be successful in cultivating the moral and intellectual virtues of the students. In this case, manner is defined as conduct expressive of dispositions or traits of character that fall into a category of moral goods known as virtues. Among the virtues are honesty, compassion, truthfulness, fairness, courage, moderation, and generosity. (I leave open here the very important ethical issue of why these particular traits are to be regarded as virtues, doing so with the philosophically lame, but nevertheless empirically compelling, claim that the literature, customs, and norms of the vast majority of world cultures holds these traits in high regard.) Viewing manner in this way, students will acquire virtuous dispositions from a teacher only if that teacher is himself or herself a virtuous person. This rather straightforward view has long been honored in its contrary form, as when it was thought a grave error to place students with teachers who were not virtuous, since students might thereby be led to conclude that unvirtuous conduct was tolerable, perhaps even acceptable.

At the time I developed this view, borrowing heavily from the work of the British philosophers of education, R. F. Dearden, Paul Hirst, and R. S. Peters,<sup>6</sup> as well as from

Harvard philosopher, Israel Scheffler,<sup>7</sup> I was aware of holding a highly Aristotelean or aretaic view of moral goods. I knew there were other theoretical options for characterizing the moral conduct of teachers, such as consequentialism, or a Kantian deontological ethics, or an ethic of care, but at the time I opted for an aretaic ethics with little consideration for the alternatives.<sup>8</sup> Aristotelean ethics seemed to fit the context of teaching and learning with hardly any tinkering or adaptation required, thus giving it special appeal for the purpose of contrasting it to method. Method, given the spin I was seeking to place upon it, is the means used to impart knowledge and understanding of the various subject matters of the school, while manner is the means used to convey virtuous conduct. This rather rigid bifurcation seemed to work, at least so long as no one asked to be shown a case of teacher manner. If someone were to insist on being shown, the task would now be to make manner visible.<sup>9</sup> How might that be done?

One might think it a relatively easy task, to make manner visible. After all, we readily recognize acts of generosity, or caring, or fairmindedness, at least in their more common manifestations. Just look for these acts, isolate them, and you have a case of manner. Indeed, that does work. But what, if anything, do such acts have to do with fostering virtue in students? If you are of the same mind as Socrates and Ryle, you would answer quite a bit. Our own studies of teachers in classrooms lead us to a different response. Acting virtuously (also often referred to as modeling virtuous conduct) is but one of a number of means that teachers have for fostering virtue in students. What is more, it might not be the most powerful or compelling means that teachers have at their disposal. Our analysis of the data collected to date indicates that teachers employ a number of different ways to foster virtuous conduct in their students, with their own virtuous conduct being but one of a number of possibilities. Even more surprising to us is the extent to which teachers use these various approaches not only as a way to convey virtue, but to construct classroom settings that function optimally for the participants (this interesting connection among manner, method, and management is explored in another paper in this symposium by Virginia Richardson and Catherine Fallona<sup>10</sup>).

The upshot of discovering the importance of method in cultivating virtue is that the visibility of manner is no longer quite the interesting challenge it once seemed. So long as we thought that virtuous conduct in students was fostered exclusively by virtuous conduct in teachers, we tried to observe this conduct in order to learn more about it. However, the more we focused on the manner of the teacher, the more difficult it seemed to us to attend to what was being conveyed to students. To look only at whether or not the teacher's conduct is itself virtuous is to miss much of what the teacher is doing to foster virtuous conduct in students. As difficult as it was for me to back away from notions of manner as the central factor in cultivating virtue in students, the data before us demanded a different sense of how teachers sought to foster the moral and intellectual development of their students.

The argument at this point is best pursued by describing the various means we found teachers using as they attempt to advance the moral and intellectual capacities of

their students. These means or methods are what we see when we look for ways that teachers cultivate the moral and intellectual virtues in their students. We have thus far encountered six methods used by most or all of the 11 teachers in our study to foster improved intellectual dispositions and enhanced moral relationships (we exclude virtuous conduct by the teacher, which is often categorized as modeling, from among this list of six for reasons explored later in this paper). The six methods are: (1) construction of the classroom community, (2) didactic instruction, (3) design and execution of academic task structures, (4) calling out for conduct of a particular kind, (5) private conversations, and (6) showcasing specific students to illustrate preferred conduct. Each of these is briefly described below.

**1. Constructing classroom communities.** All of the teachers in our study have a vivid conception of the kind of place they want their classrooms to be.<sup>11</sup> Mutual respect, caring, sharing, tolerance, orderliness, and productive work place are the notions most often mentioned by the teachers when describing their aspirations for their classrooms. To accomplish these aspirations, the teachers set rules and expectations for student conduct in their classrooms. These rules and expectations create a classroom that is a normative community, a community that imposes rules and duties upon its members, presumably for their mutual benefit.

All the teachers in our study were adept at the creation of classroom communities, although the teachers at Highlands Academy, the African-centered school, jointly subscribed to the view that their classrooms are sites of what Thomas Green calls “strong normation.”<sup>12</sup> As such, they have no difficulty with the notion that their classrooms clearly reflect the strong, personal and professional beliefs they hold as teachers about the importance of education and the role their classrooms and their school plays in the lives of their students. Moreover, there is little grace shown for infractions of the rules and expectations; there is a pervasive attitude that is perhaps best captured by the expression, “shape up or ship out.”

The teachers at Jordan Elementary are no less desirous of having classrooms that reflect just and caring community, but their methods of attaining this end differ from those employed at Highlands. At Jordan the teachers are more likely to find the authority for constructing community in their personal relationships with each student, in contrast to the strong ideological commitment to the importance of community that characterizes both the mission of Highlands Academy and the personal philosophies of its teachers. That is, the teachers at Jordan are more likely to imply to their students that they need to behave in a particular way if they are to have a successful relationship to the teacher, or a successful experience in this teacher’s classroom. The Highlands teachers, in contrast, are more likely to insist that learning cannot go on unless the students behave in a certain way, thus the rules and norms of classroom conduct are defended on the basis of the point of purpose of the school as social unit. (An offshoot of this difference is that while the Highlands teachers may be quite sensitive to what the students think of them, they give the impression that it’s not about whether students like or enjoy a teacher so much as it is about whether you learn from the teacher).<sup>13</sup>

These observations about constructing community are further expanded in two other papers in this symposium. Matthew Sanger, in his study of two teacher's views of morality, shows how the meaning of and grounding for the construction of community differs depending on the moral starting points of the teacher (see his paper, "Inquiring into the Moral Dimensions of Teaching: Talking to Teachers and Looking at Practice"). Todd Chow-Hoy examines the school-level constructs that may lead to teachers at the two schools to frame different views about the nature of community. Chow-Hoy describes how both schools have mission statements and principals that stress a wide range of moral and intellectual virtues. Given the missions and principals of the two schools we studied, it should not come as a surprise to the reader that the 11 teachers in the study were quite conversant with talk about fostering virtue and the importance of becoming a morally good person.<sup>14</sup>

Constructing community turns out to involve more than laying down rules and building norms, as became apparent to us when we observe the physical differences between the two schools. How the teacher sets up the furniture and student access to supplies and materials in a room also signals appropriate and inappropriate conduct. At Highlands, the African-centered academy, for example, it is somewhat unusual to see small groups of students working independently. Whole class instruction, with all eyes on the teacher, is the dominant mode of instruction—even in the primary grades. At Jordan, in contrast, student desks are arranged in groups of two, four, or six, and small group or one-on-one teaching is more common than whole class, teacher-centered instruction. These room designs bear prominently on how the teachers construct community, for the whole-group setting in Highlands is in some sense made possible by the strong ideological orientation to the need for community, while the small-group settings at Jordan appear better managed by the teacher's tendency to "ground" the rules and norms in the relationship established between teacher and student. In addition, how a room is arranged affects the use of other methods for conveying the virtues, as noted below.

**2. Didactic instruction.** Didactic instruction, in the context of this study, is instruction that has as one of its primary purposes the direct presentation to the student of what is morally or intellectually desired by the teacher. Perhaps the most obvious example of this method in our study is the Life Skills Curriculum used at Jordan Elementary. This curriculum is a direct, specific effort to gain student allegiance to and compliance with approximately fifteen life skills that constitute this curriculum, including integrity, initiative, humor, patience, friendship, pride, courage, and common sense. Jordan teachers regularly discuss these life skills as part of the program of classroom instruction, and frequently refer to them in the course of teaching other subjects (e.g., a lesson on sustaining a healthy ecosystem, grounded primarily in general science, is an occasion for calling on students to see the importance of sharing the earth's resources, and of acting justly with respect to the development and distribution of these resources).

Highlands Academy has a different, but no less direct and didactic approach to the attainment of moral goods. The African-centered curriculum at Highlands places

extensive emphasis on such African-derived values as unity (Umoja), collective work and responsibility (Ujima), cooperative economics (Ujamaa), creativity (Kuumba), and faith (Imani) . In the classrooms of many of the Highlands teachers participating in the study, these values are cultivated quite directly, through the frequent telling of stories, through choral recitations of memorized songs and slogans, and through frequent references to these values when commenting on student conduct.

Teachers at both schools may be found providing lessons to the whole class on these ideals. These lessons are frequently grounded in recent actions by students or the teacher, and also are extended to how the students will behave later in life. At Highlands in particular, one finds teachers frequently discussing, as a planned lesson for the whole class, the futures of the students, referencing both scholastic attainment and moral goodness. These didactic lessons appear to be undertaken quite seriously by the teachers and the students at both schools, and their effectiveness shows up with remarkable clarity in the interviews we had with the students at each school.

**3. Design and execution of academic task structures.** Teachers have a broad range of choices in how they engage their students in the work required to gain mastery of a concept, topic, or lesson. This choice becomes manifest in how they set up the tasks students engage in as they progress through their academic work. Walter Doyle refers to these demands on students as “academic task structures,” and has written incisively on the power of such tasks.<sup>15</sup> Many of the teachers in our study construct these tasks so that they can analyze and assess the students’ work on the tasks in ways that extend the students’ ability to think more deeply or more imaginatively about the work, thereby fostering an enhanced range of intellectual virtue. Indeed, some teachers proved to be particularly adept at designing tasks so that they could gain ready access to the student’s work, and offer extensive commentary on that work.

For example, Cheryl teaches a seventh grade English class at Highlands. For a lesson on punctuation, she writes a number of unpunctuated sentences on the chalkboard, then asks various students to go the board to insert the correct punctuation. After Sheila inserts a semicolon in a particular sentence, Cheryl says to the class, “Sheila put a semicolon in that sentence. I would like to know who agrees with her?” After a show of hands, Cheryl asks, “Now who disagrees with her?” Another show of hands, this time far fewer, and Cheryl says that it is not enough to just agree or disagree, you have to have reasons to support your position. Then she turns to Mindy and asks her to go to the board to insert her correction. Mindy does so, substituting a colon for the semicolon. Cheryl asks her why, and Mindy is able only to say it seems right. Cheryl turns to Jamal and asks him if he can explain the difference between a colon and semicolon, and offer a good reason why one is better in this sentence than the other. Jamal offers an explanation, and Cheryl’s speech brightens as she says, “You’re absolutely correct.”

The lesson to be gained here is difficult to miss: Cheryl's interest is in the explanation or argument for the decision about punctuation; Mindy inserted the correct punctuation, but went unpraised by Cheryl for her inability to provide a justifying rationale. What Cheryl does so often and so well is set up academic task structures that engage the full class in the activity. She is then able to publicly comment on performance, frequently signaling to the entire class what kind of thinking she is seeking and the form she wants it take as students respond to her questions. An observer has the sense that tasks are structured to permit an increase in the time provided for didactic instruction, as well as for what we have labeled "call-outs." Task structuring of this kind is in marked contrast to providing assessment in private asides with students or in the grading of individual student assignments.

**4. Calling out for conduct of a particular kind.** One of the most frequently observed techniques for cultivating student conduct was what we refer to as the call-out. It is simply the teacher saying something to the student that indicates to the student and all others within earshot how the student ought to behave. Cal-outs typically consist of friendly reminders about deportment or outright censure for inappropriate conduct. Margaret, a Jordan Elementary teacher, has students working independently and in small groups. She is assisting a student who has been working alone, when upon looking up and over the full class, she calls out across the room, "Soosun, how does what you are doing now help your team to complete it's work?" The question is rhetorical, for the student is aware that he is being disruptive, and refocuses on the task at hand. This call-out signals the expectation for non-disruptive, cooperative effort, and is, of course, heard by many other students in the class.

In a different Jordan classroom, Hannah convenes her class in the form of a circle, with many students sitting on the floor. The topic of discussion is caring for the environment. As she is preparing the ground for soliciting their views on issues explored in a prior assignment, one student loudly exclaims his view. Hannah says, "Goodness, Jason, you're anxious to participate today. But isn't it polite to wait until the person speaking is finished, then raise your hand?" Jason nods, and sits back on his heels. Hannah follows with, "It's also a fair way to bring others into the conversation, isn't it?" This comment is addressed not so much to Jason as to the group as whole (Jason does not acknowledge this second comment, and the teacher does not appear to expect him to do so). The message of this call-out to Jason is that we do not get heard by being the quickest or the loudest, but by taking turns; taking turns is the fair way to have a conversation. A great deal of moral freight seems to be carried by so modest a move.

Call-outs are frequently reminders to students of the rules and expectations for good deportment in the classroom. They are teacher-to-student communications, done within view and earshot of most or all of the class. They serve not only to call the non-obedient student to account, but to refresh everyone else's memory of what is desired in

this setting. We found call-outs to be one of the most obvious and frequently used ways teachers signal their expectations for student conduct, particularly in moral domains involving cooperation, fairness, and regard for others.

An interesting aspect of call-outs is that we almost missed them on our first pass through the data. There is a tendency to see them as demands for order, or quiet, or mere compliance to what some might regard as arbitrary rules. And indeed there are call-outs of this kind. But there are also call-outs directed quite specifically to the cultivation and encouragement of virtuous conduct. At least in the case of the teachers participating in our study, the call-outs were, in the main, far from simple demands for compliance or order, but the expression of a very genuine interest in helping the student to become a good person (this observation is based on listening to the comments the teachers made as they viewed video tape of their own teaching and shared their reactions with us).

**5. Private conversations.** Didactic instruction and call-outs are public, visible means of cultivating the moral and intellectual dispositions of students. Private conversations are another method of doing so. They typically occur when a teacher takes a student aside for a “chat,” but may also occur as students enter the room at the beginning of the day, or at other times when the chance arises for a teacher to direct his or attention to a single student. And while many private conversations are intended to be corrective (i.e., the teacher is seeking to correct conduct that is harmful to the student or to the group or both), many are highly affirmative and nurturing.

For example, Darlene greets many of students personally as they enter her classroom in the morning, seeking to have a private talk with as many of them as possible. Her purpose, she says, is to help the students make the transition from home to school, particularly in the case of students for whom the home experience is troubling at this time in their lives. Darlene indicates that these exchanges with students are rooted in a profound concern for the welfare of her students; she is especially concerned that her students mentally ready themselves for life in the classroom that day, setting aside worries they may have about matters beyond the school.

Letti, a teacher at Jordan Elementary, is often engaged in private conversations with students throughout the school day. The frequency of private conversations in the classroom may be related to the fact that it adjoins a special education classroom, and students from both rooms frequently intermingle as a means of ensuring inclusion of the special students. As a result, Letti is not always able to manage her class as a single large group, nor is clear that she would prefer to do so even if the opportunity were more available, for she is a person who makes deep, personal connections to her students. As such, she handles initial flare-ups with call-outs, but quickly shifts to private conversation if the matter is not soon resolved. Taking students aside, she tries to reflect their conduct back to them, in an apparent effort to make them aware of just what it is they are doing, and how it is affecting other class members and the teacher. In almost all instances of such private conversations that we observed, Letti’s



conversations focused on being cooperative, on respecting the needs of other students, and effecting moderation in one's behavior.

It is clear that teachers have many different kinds of private conversations with their students. Of interest in the context of manner are those directed at altering a student's conduct to make it more closely conform to a moral ideal, either by censure of unacceptable behavior or extended praise for appropriate conduct, or to elicit a deeper intellectual engagement in the topics of instruction. We witnessed a fair amount of this kind of private conferencing at Jordan, particularly in the classrooms with a higher concentration of special education students. The ways that Jordan teachers design the physical environment makes it more conducive to private conferencing, because the other students have independent tasks or small group work to keep them engaged while the teacher is having a private conference. We observed fewer private conferences at Highlands, at least during the regularly schedule class times. That there are fewer such conferences at Highlands may be due to the more extensive use of teacher-led, whole class instruction, and the greater likelihood that Highlands teachers will discipline, reprimand, or reward their students in a more public way (e.g., using a call-out). Moreover, it is difficult to have a private conversation during class time because the classrooms are generally too small to permit teacher and student to physically separate themselves from the other students. On the other hand, private conversations are not uncommon before classes begin for the day, at change-of-class times, and after the regular classes end for the day.

**6. Showcasing specific students.** From a philosophical point of view, showcasing may be among the most interesting techniques used by classroom teachers. It is interesting because the teacher is not featuring his or her own virtues, but those of the student. In a sense, the teacher is not modeling virtuous conduct for the students, but placing students in the role of modeling such conduct for their peers. A Jordan teacher asks a question about whether the group liked a lesson being taught by a student teacher. One of the students shakes her head from side to side, and the teacher asks why. The student explains, and the teacher says, "I like how Corinne is being honest. She's giving me an honest answer to my question, even though it may hurt a little bit. Thanks for being honest, Corinne."

The full group heard this praise for Corinne, and the message it contained about honesty. What we believe is taking place here is that the teacher is calling other students' attention to a virtue being displayed by one student, signaling the value of this virtue by showcasing this student. Of course there is the element of reinforcement for the virtue of honesty that Corinne displays, and that is certainly a means for the teacher to encourage honesty in Corinne. Yet we detect in our conversations with the teachers that they have more in mind when praising the good conduct of their students. The teacher is shifting the role modeling from himself or herself to a student, saying to other students something like, See, you don't have to be grown up like me to be able to act this way; here's one of your fellow students who is doing it quite well.

We know from our own experiences in school that there are risks here, for a teacher who praises a student may succeed in having that student identified as a teacher's pet or "brown noser," thereby reducing the student's impact as a model for other students. Yet we found that the teachers we observed navigated these potential problems with considerable facility. They may indeed have favorite students, but the technique of showcasing is distributed with apparent evenhandedness in the classrooms we observed. For example, Nandi, teaching an English lesson to eighth grade Highlands students, directs a question at Alfred, who she knows to be a marginal student. This time Alfred has the right answer. The teacher follows up with another question, and Alfred gets it right again. Nandi becomes effusive in her praise for Alfred, and encourages the class to commend his strong performance. They whistle and clap, and Alfred smiles broadly while holding his hands aloft with the victory sign on each hand. When this incident was explored with Nandi, she indicated that Alfred had a difficult time with this material, and she wanted him to feel proud of the progress he was making with it. She also wanted his classmates to honor his accomplishment, a trait she signaled as an important one by showcasing Alfred as she did.

Teachers appear to have multiple reasons for showcasing, ranging from reinforcement to a positive object lesson for all who are in view or earshot. Whatever the reason, showcasing seems a prominent method for signaling praiseworthy conduct, and for informing the group that it is within their grasp to exhibit similar conduct.

Earlier in this paper I mentioned modeling, and noted that members of the research team are unsure of its status as a means of fostering virtuous conduct in students. As such, it was excluded from the list of six methods just described. It cannot, however, be ignored in any discussion of how moral and intellectual goods are conveyed to students by their teachers.

### The Status of Modeling

There is a sense in which modeling is manner. That's too restrictive a claim, but it is not far off the mark. Manner, for purposes of this paper (and the larger study we are engaged in), is conduct that expresses highly regarded moral and intellectual traits. Thus when we speak of a person as fairminded, caring, thoughtful, generous, honest, brave, and so on, we are describing the manner of that person. A person's manner could be morally unacceptable, too, as when he or she is described as mean, unfair, cowardly, lying, and so forth. However, in the context of our work, we have used the term 'manner' only to pick out conduct that evidences the various virtues. Hence, for us, manner picks out what is good, moral, sound, and defensible about persons, rather than what is bad, immoral, silly or stupid about them. Yet in a frame larger than ours, manner could point to conduct that is good, bad or both.

The manner of a teacher takes on particular importance insofar as it serves as model for the students. That is, the manner of the teacher would not likely be of much concern to us if it were not for its serving as a model, as something the student will see

and believe proper, or imitate, or accept as a standard for how things should be. Yet it is not quite so clear when manner is modeled. For example, is a teacher modeling some virtue only when he or she intends that it be observed or imitated? Or does modeling occur whenever the teacher displays a virtue, whether or not she intends to have it observed or noted by another? If modeling falls into the former category, it might be a kind of method. If it falls into the latter category, it appears to be the case that the teacher is acting without instructional intent or purpose. If there is no intent to have the manner observed with a measure of regard by the student, then it seems a stretch to think of modeling as a method employed by the teacher.

There is more at issue here than the teacher's instructional purpose or intent. One can try to model, but fail, in the sense that persons nearby pay no attention to person modeling. If no one pays attention, is the teacher modeling (a variation on the common riddle, if a tree falls in the woods with no one near, is there any sound?). Does one need an attentive listener or viewer in order to properly be said to be modeling? What if the viewer is attentive, but fails to properly pick up on what is being modeled; did the person then model for the viewer? These modest conundrums can be resolved with precise, stipulative definitions, but their existence reveals some of the challenges to clear deployment of the concept of modeling.

Because of this confusion, we think it is wise to give modeling separate standing in the repertoire of ways to cultivate the moral and intellectual virtues in students. We find ourselves undecided on just how tightly linked manner and modeling are, and under what circumstances modeling may be said to be among the methods a teacher might use to foster virtue. We know that modeling takes place, and that teachers place considerable stock in it, but our excursions through our data lead us to wonder about its precise status. Consider the intriguing possibility, as we are in the midst of doing, that a teacher whose manner could be viewed as somewhat deficient could employ the six methods described above with remarkable finesse. Entertaining this possibility leads us to wonder about the possibility that teachers may adopt persona on entering their classrooms, and that these persona may perform in roles more morally and intellectually powerful than is the case for the teacher as person outside the classroom. In other words, who are we looking at when we look at teachers: Are we looking at a person who possesses a manner, which is somehow made manifest in the practice of teaching; or are we seeing someone in a role, who might perform with remarkable moral and intellectual acuity in that role—perhaps because the role demands acuity of this kind—but is something less a paragon on virtue when the teaching mask is off?

Nothing in our experience with the 11 teachers with whom we are working prompts us to ask these questions. That is to say, we have not found some of our teachers to be less moral or less intellectually sophisticated outside their classrooms than they are inside them, thus leading us to wonder whether the role of teacher alters the moral and intellectual character of the one teaching. Rather, this puzzlement about persona and role arises from seeking to frame the analysis of our data in the context of the intriguing philosophical questions about moral agency and moral development.

Moral agency is that quality possessed by a person to act morally. Moral development is the bringing about in others of moral agency. Breaking these concepts apart permits us to ask some vexing—but exciting—questions about how fully developed a moral agent must be in order to be good at moral development. Put another way: How much manner is required to engage effectively in methods for moral development?

#### Returning to the Nexus of Manner and Method

The preceding question sets us upon a conceptually slippery surface, inasmuch as it prompts us to ask how morally good need a person be in order to be good at cultivating moral goodness in students. Some of our evidence to date suggests that having a well-wrought moral point of view, and well-developed intellectual capacities, make a considerable difference in how the six methods above are deployed. Indeed, as Richardson and Fallona suggest in their paper, one's facility with the methods of moral development may be intimately connected to the depth and sophistication of one's moral agency.

Yet there are other possibilities. In strong normative communities, it is possible that teachers may experience more success in fostering moral development in others without having to depend so extensively on their own moral agency to do so. Their success in moral development is more a matter of carefully and thoughtfully employing the methods described above. Of course, it may indeed be the case that such methods for moral development cannot be well deployed by those who are morally deficient in their own agency. There certainly seems to be some sort of requirement for moral agency on the teacher's part in order to be well and effectively engaged in moral development of students. But how much of a requirement? As high as I once thought, with my early notions of manner? It seems not. On the other hand, we have only begun to ponder these questions. Perhaps next year, at A.E.R.A. in New Orleans, we will be able to report some ground gained on these vexing matters.

In the meantime, our progress to date indicates that a quagmire awaits those who draw too strong a distinction between the manner and methods of teachers (as I once did), especially if the point of such a distinction is to restrict manner to matters moral and method to matters epistemic. In addition, if one does succeed in making manner visible, particularly in the form of modeling, its place in fostering moral and intellectual virtue in the young may not be quite so substantial as earlier supposed. There are a number of methods teachers use to cultivate the moral and intellectual capabilities of their students, and these methods appear to have considerable force for the moral and intellectual development of students. In isolating and analyzing these methods, and deliberating upon them in relation to modeling, moral agency, and moral development, we find ourselves peering across conceptual vistas unimagined just a year ago. In exploring these vistas, we, project researchers and participating teachers, hope to add just a bit more understanding to how moral education and development takes place in teachers' classrooms.

### Endnotes

1. My writing on manner began with an AERA paper in 1980 ("The Value of Research on Teaching for Teaching Skill and Teaching Manner," American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April 10, 1980, Boston, MA). I again picked up the topic in "Philosophy of Research on Teaching: Three Aspects," in Merlin C. Wittrock, Ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Third Edition), (New York: Macmillan, 1986), pp. 37-49. A more extensive discussion of the concept appeared in "The Concepts of Method and Manner in Teaching," in Fritz Oser, Andreas Dick, & Jean-Luc Patry, Eds., *Effective and Responsible Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992), pp. 95-108.
2. Known as The Manner in Teaching Project, this initiative is funded by the Spencer Foundation, and is co-directed by Virginia Richardson and Gary Fenstermacher, with extensive contributions from five doctoral students at the University of Michigan and a former doctoral student now on the faculty at the University of Georgia.
3. Linda Valli, Moral Approaches to Reflective Practice, in R. T. Clift, W. R. Houston, & M. C. Pugach, Eds., *Encouraging Reflective Practice in Education* (pp. 39-56). New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.
4. Kenneth Strike, The Moral Responsibilities of Educators, in John Sikula, Thomas J. Buttery, & Edith Guyton, Eds., *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 869-892). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1996).
5. David Hansen, Teaching as a Moral Activity, in Virginia Richardson, Ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), in press.
6. Their work appears in many different publications. Perhaps the best single volume source is R. F. Dearden, P. H. Hirst, & R. S. Peters, Eds., *Education and the Development of Reason*, which appears as three paperbacks in the International Library of the Philosophy of Education, published by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1975.
7. Israel Scheffler, *Of Human Potential*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
8. Even though I was conscious at the time of adopting a particular ethical theory as the basis for the concept of manner, this move became quite blurred over time. My thanks to Matt Sanger for reminding me, in the form a compelling second year paper for his doctorate, that there are quite a few theoretical alternatives for the ethical grounding of teacher manner.
9. The expression "making manner visible" was first heard among our project staff when voiced by Catherine Fallona, who in the course of preparing her doctoral dissertation on manner in teaching was faced with determining how to observe the manner of teachers. In struggling with this problem, she asked how she might make manner visible. When it became clear that there was no easy answer to this question, the question became one of the most important undertakings for the research project. See the unpublished Ph. D. dissertation by Catherine Fallona ("Manner in Teaching: A Study of Moral Virtue," University of Arizona, 1998).

10. Virginia Richardson and Catherine Fallona, *Classroom Management as Method and Manner*, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 19, 1999, Montreal, Canada.

11. Perhaps the exception here is the physical education teacher at Highlands, who has many fewer degrees of freedom for what takes place in his gymnasium, which is sometimes a site for physical education, but at other times serves as the cafeteria, the overflow area for school-wide events, and the assembly point for all students entering the school.

12. Thomas F. Green, *The Formation of Conscience in an Age of Technology* (The 1984 John Dewey Lecture). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University School of Education, 1984.

13. On this point about the teacher's sensitivities to the views of the students, an incident at Highlands offers a revealing insight. Due to a confused communication between the school and the research team, some members of the Highlands staff who are not participating in the study were surprised to learn that members of the project research team were interviewing students, asking the students for their impressions of their teachers. Despite the fact that the interview protocol had been jointly constructed with and approved by the teachers participating in the project, other Highlands staff expressed consternation at asking students what they thought about their teachers and classrooms; the sense was that students really are not in a position to answer such questions, and that asking them sends the wrong message about what they (the students) are in school to do. Students are not to judge teachers or the school; teachers and school judge the students.

14. We did not set out to select schools that had mission statements or principals that placed such emphasis on moral ideals. Jordan Elementary became a candidate as a result of an acquaintance between a project staff member and the building principal. Highlands became a site on the urging of one of the project graduate students who urged our consideration of a minority school in an inner city setting. It was only later that we realized that we had two schools that placed very strong emphases, but in quite different ways, on moral development.

15. Walter Doyle, "Classroom Tasks: The Core of Learning from Teaching," in Michael S. Knapp and Patrick M. Shields, eds., *Better Schooling for the Children of Poverty: Alternatives to Conventional Wisdom* (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1991), p.237. See also Walter Doyle, "Academic Work," *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 1983, pp. 159-199; and "Classroom Organization and Management," in Merlin C. Wittrock, ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Third Edition (New York: Macmillan, 1986), pp. 392-431.