INTRODUCTION

Foxes (the great ones, not the shallow or showy grazers) owe their reputations to a light (but truly enlightening) spread of real genius across many fields of study, applying their varied skills to introduce a key and novel fruit for other scholars to gather and seed in a thoroughly different kind of field. Hedgehogs (the great ones, not the pedants) locate one vitally important mine, where their particular and truly special gifts cannot be matched. They then stay at the site all their lives, digging deeper (because no one else can) into richer and richer stores from a mother lode whose full generosity has never been so well recognized or exploited.

—Stephen Jay Gould (2003, p. 5)

STEPHEN JAY GOULD is extending a contrast between the hedgehog and the fox made by Isaiah Berlin, who, in turn, perhaps borrowed it from Erasmus. Single-minded hedgehogs go deep; cunning foxes range. At first blush, the career of Lee S. Shulman most certainly seems like that of an intellectual fox. The titles of the essays included in this volume touch on educational psychology, medical problem solving, teacher knowledge, performance assessment, higher education, the scholarship of teaching and learning, the characteristics and pedagogies of the professions, and the liberal arts.

His interests have been as far-ranging as his collaborations: the Institute for Research on Teaching (a federally funded research center that explored teaching and teacher thinking) at Michigan State University, followed by the Knowledge Growth in a Profession Project (funded by the Spencer Foundation and focused on tracking how the subject matter knowledge of prospective secondary school teachers shaped and was shaped by their learning to teach), the Teacher Assessment Project (a project funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which explored various forms of performance assessment for teachers, laying the foundations for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards), and the Communities of Learners Project (funded by the Mellon Foundation) while at Stanford University. And now, as president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, his projects include—among other things—investigations of the pedagogies of the professions, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and cultivating civic responsibility. A fox, no doubt, spreading real genius across many fields.

But we live in a postmodern world, where one particularly popular sport is deconstructing our own categories. So I begin this introduction by making an argument that will become obvious to readers as they peruse, chronologically, the full range of essays in this volume (and its companion, *Teaching as Community Property*): over the course of his career, Shulman has been burrowing while ranging, a powerful combination. Indeed, Gould argues for integrating the best qualities of the fox and the hedgehog: "What can be more powerful than combining the virtue of a clear goal pursued relentlessly and without compromise (the way of the hedgehog), and the flexibility of a wide range of clever and distinct strategies for getting to the appointed place . . . (the way of the fox)" (Gould, 2003, p. 262).

Hedgehogs are persistent; they know what interests them, and they stay the course. If Shulman has been burrowing, into what mine has he been persistently digging? The answer is simple: teaching. Long fascinated with medical practice, Shulman has consistently argued that teaching is a profession more complex than medicine. The regular classroom teacher

> is confronted, not with a single patient, but with a classroom filled with 25 to 35 youngsters. The teacher's goals are multiple; the school's obligations far from unitary. Even in the ubiquitous primary reading group, the teacher must simultaneously be concerned with the learning of decoding skills as well as comprehension, with motivation and love of reading as well as word-attack, and must both monitor the performance of the six or eight students in front of her while not losing

> touch with the other two dozen in the room. . . . The only time a physician could possibly encounter a situation of comparable complexity would be in the emergency room of a hospital during or after a natural disaster ["The Wisdom of Practice"].

Moreover, Shulman believes that teachers are critical to the education enterprise—irreplaceable, in fact. "We will sooner de-school society than de-teacher it" ("The Psychology of School Subjects"). "No microcomputer will replace them, no television system will clone and distribute them, no scripted lessons will direct and control them, no voucher system will bypass them" ("Autonomy and Obligation").

Shulman's interests in teaching of all sorts—in K–12 schools, in teacher education, in graduate programs for educational researchers, in liberal education—are diverse. Four focal interests are clear, each of which has entailed extensive hedgehog-like explorations: teachers' professional knowledge and judgment; the pedagogies of the professions (most centrally, the pedagogy of teacher education); the assessment of teaching; and the content and character of education research. These ideas have not sprung fully formed in Shulman's writing; rather, they have evolved gradually over time. (That evolution is seen in the brief introductions that precede each essay.) As a preface to the collection that follows, I consider each of these themes briefly.

Shulman's interest in professional knowledge began with inquiries into professional reasoning. In his work with Arthur Elstein, he investigated the nature of medical problem solving and documented and described how diagnosticians reasoned through the symptoms presented by patients (Shulman and Elstein, 1979; Elstein, Shulman, and Sprafka, 1978). In this work, the researchers found that problem formulation and hypothesis generation were critical to effective diagnoses and that a physician's substantive knowledge and prior experience played an important role in reasoning.

Simultaneously, Shulman, in his collaborations with a broad array of colleagues at Michigan State University, began studying the nature of reasoning required in teaching. In fact, the Institute for Research on Teaching (which he codirected with Judith Lanier)—anticipating the cognitive revolution in psychology—held as a central principle that it was critical for researchers to understand teachers' thinking (as well as teachers' behaviors and characteristics). Burrowing away, Shulman's excursions into professional thinking in medicine and teaching led him deeper into the area of professional reasoning and knowledge. After moving to Stanford, a new question emerged: What kinds of knowledge do teachers use as they reason? Asking this question about teaching, Shulman and his colleagues

began with some obvious candidates—subject matter knowledge, knowledge of students, knowledge of teaching techniques, among them—and then hypothesized that teaching perhaps also involved a specialized kind of knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge (dubbed "PCK" by some). Pedagogical content knowledge was a "particular form of content knowledge that embodies the aspects of content most germane to its teachability . . . the most useful forms of representation . . . the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations—in a word, the ways of formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others" ("Those Who Understand"). This knowledge, critical to teaching, represents the most profound understanding of subject matter, Shulman claimed: "Aristotle had it right, the deepest understanding one can have of any field is an understanding of its pedagogy, because pedagogy is predicated on the kind of multiple readings, the kind of contingent understandings that reflect the deep objectives of a liberal education" ("Aristotle Had It Right").

Like Gould's hedgehog, Shulman continued tunneling in the area of teacher reasoning and knowledge as he inquired into the forms in which professional knowledge is held. His work with physicians suggested that diagnosticians drew both on substantive knowledge from research and on case knowledge from personal experience. Shulman proposed that teachers might also draw on multiple forms of knowledge: using strategies, applying principles, and reasoning from cases. In particular, Shulman was taken with the idea of cases—"the children born of a liaison between design and chance" ("Just in Case"). "An educative case," he claims, "is a form of communication that places intention and chance into the context of a lived and reflected experience. A case doesn't just happen; it creates conditions that demand of its narrator (or protagonist) that she both render judgments among alternative tacks and act on those judgments" ("Just in Case"). His work on cases highlighted for Shulman the centrality of judgment under uncertainty in teaching. This emphasis on judgment led him to additional questions about how such judgment might be characteristic of all professions.

In short, Shulman's contributions in the realm of teachers' professional knowledge and reasoning have been considerable. He delineated a knowledge base of teaching (including the introduction of key terms such as pedagogical content knowledge) and described teacher reasoning first as a process of managing complexity, shifting later in his career to thinking of teacher reasoning as entailing judgment under uncertainty. Finally, he argued for the creation of a knowledge base of teaching that included both principles or strategies generated through research and cases generated through experience and reflection.

Shulman's interest in cases is intimately tied to the second domain in which he has done considerable tunneling: the pedagogies for preparing professionals. If professional work is uncertain, he wondered, and requires both drawing on deep knowledge and making judgments, how do we prepare new generations of professionals? How do we teach both the knowledge necessary to teach well, while also creating opportunities for new teachers/professionals to learn how to make sound judgments? His work in this area began as a modest enterprise. Based on the studies he conducted about medical problem solving, he and his colleagues wondered how to prepare medical students to generate hypotheses quickly and effectively. At the same time, he wondered about the pedagogy of teacher education. In "The Practical and the Eclectic," his commentary on an essay by his teacher and friend, Joseph Schwab, Shulman proposed that teaching requires various kinds of knowledge, including knowledge of rules, knowledge of particular cases, and knowledge of how to apply those rules to cases. "Where," Shulman asks, in teacher education is "the opportunity to learn of particular cases and ways of applying rules to cases?"

As he further developed his ideas about the professional knowledge base of teaching, in essays like "Those Who Understand" and "Knowledge and Teaching," Shulman dug deeper into the implications of case knowledge for the pedagogy of teacher education. He argued that the "case method," well established in the teaching of law, was particularly valuable in teaching teachers about theory, for "to call something a case is to make a theoretical claim" ("Those Who Understand"). He continues, "I envision the use of case method in teacher education, whether in our classrooms or in special laboratories with simulations, videodisks and annotated scripts, as a means for developing strategic understanding, for extending capacities toward professional judgment and decision-making. These methods of instruction would involve the careful confrontation of principles with cases, of general rules with concrete documented events—a dialectic of the general with the particular in which the limits of the former and the boundaries of the latter are explored" ("Those Who Understand").

Shulman both wrote about such case teaching while also experimenting with it in his own teacher education classes. He read, interpreted, and deliberated about cases with his teacher education students, and he asked them to write their own cases, comment on each other's cases, and participate in case conferences. Simultaneously, he inspired and conspired with numerous colleagues (including, perhaps most notably, his wife, Judith Shulman) interested in creating such a case-based pedagogy of teacher education and professional development. In his current work, Shulman continues to play with ideas of cases as pedagogy, developing the argument that liberal education needs to tie itself to practice in order to make it

more meaningful and more liberal. Cases and a case pedagogy might serve this end:

> If we were to actively connect learning with service, with practice, with application, and were further to capture that practice in a kind of pedagogy that uses cases and case methods in ways analogous to some of the ways we use them for professional preparation, we would not only achieve the moral ends of service, we would very likely do better at overcoming the challenges to liberal learning. Through service, through application, through rendering their learning far more active, reflective, and collaborative, students would actually learn more liberally, understand what they have learned more deeply, and develop the capacity to use what they have learned in the service of their communities ["Professing the Liberal Arts"].

Shulman's most recent work as hedgehog in this second domain of the pedagogies of the professions resonates with his early cross-professional investigations comparing teaching and medicine. Since all professions face the same intractable problem—"How do we prepare people for uncertain work?"—Shulman and his colleagues are inquiring into the pedagogies of multiple professions: the clergy, engineering, the law, teacher education, medicine, and nursing.

Shulman's work is dialectical: explorations of pedagogies circle back to conceptions of professional knowledge and judgment. In returning to his interest in professional knowledge, he continues to tunnel further, proposing core characteristics of professional work (obligation and moral vision, substantive knowledge, a practice, judgment under uncertainty, learning from experience, and community membership) that include his earlier work on professional knowledge and judgment but subsume them under a more expansive theoretical umbrella.

A third interest that Shulman has mined is the assessment of professional knowledge. One critical characteristic of professions is that members both monitor their own ranks and take responsibility for preparing and assessing the quality of all members of the profession. Another critical characteristic, as already noted, is that professional work requires judgment. Shulman became intrigued with how might we create assessments—to be used by professionals themselves—that get to the core of professional work: judgment under uncertainty. Shulman's initial foray into this arena involved the Teacher Assessment Project, a project that explored the potential for performance assessments for K–12 teachers. Initially conceptualized in a white paper he wrote with his colleague Gary Sykes (Shulman and Sykes, 1986), Shulman's work—both in the theoretical domain of teacher knowl-

edge and the technical domain of performance assessments—played an important role in laying the foundations for both the standards and the assessments of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The Teacher Assessment Project staff developed a normative framework for teacher knowledge that influenced the NBPTS's later work of "What Teachers Need to Know and Be Able to Do." They developed performance assessments for high school history teaching and elementary mathematics teaching, and administered them in an assessment center in the summer of 1987. They then went on to explore the potential for portfolios in teacher assessment in elementary literacy and secondary science teaching. In a world in which most teacher tests took the form of standardized, multiple choice, generic questions, this work on teacher assessment was groundbreaking, exciting, and threatening. Eventually, that work led to a reconceptualization of what it meant to be an accomplished teacher, with subject matter at the core.

But teaching is not the sole purview of K–12 schools, and Shulman's empirical and theoretical work in teacher assessment began to influence his work as a faculty member in higher education as well. As a member of Stanford University's Advisory Board, which reviewed every appointment or promotion to tenure in the university, Shulman began to wonder about how those of us in higher education document and assess an individual's capacity to teach. At the same time, Shulman's ideas about professional teaching knowledge began to capture the interest of leaders in higher education. He dug further still, collaborating with colleagues on the Peer Review of Teaching Project sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, which supported faculty across the country as they created course portfolios, offered pedagogical colloquia, and wrote analyses of their students' learning. This project evolved into his current work, which extends and elaborates on Ernest Boyer's (1997) conception of a "scholarship of teaching" through the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). The CASTL program works with educators at all levels—K–12 teachers, teacher educators, and professors from a range of fields (chemistry, mathematics, pharmacology, literature, among them)—and aims to make the intellectual work of teaching a recognized, respected aspect of the profession. As Shulman notes: "Colleges and universities have always taken justifiable pride in their commitment to inquiry and criticism in all fields, even those where dogma and habit make real scrutiny uncomfortable. Now we must turn this tough scrutiny on our own practices, traditions, and culture. Only by doing so will we make teaching truly central to higher education" (Shulman, 1993, p. 7).

While Shulman, the hedgehog, has burrowed into these three interests concerning teaching—professional knowledge and reasoning, the pedagogies of the professions, and the assessment of teaching knowledge—he has also consistently dug into the question, What forms should educational research take? Early on in his career, he argued that educational research needed to be reconstructed, to develop more sophisticated and nuanced measures of the environments in which students learn and teachers teach. This work anticipated the later shift in psychology and other fields to an emphasis on the situated and social nature of knowledge and action. He argued, too, against a narrow range of methodologies, and for a "methodological mosaic" ("Disciplines of Inquiry in Education") and encouraged education researchers to use multiple methods that drew upon the work of myriad disciplines—anthropology, sociology, history, linguistics, psychology, and the like. Long before the explosion of method the field of education witnessed in the 1980s, Shulman imagined new methodologies: "epidemiological" research strategies inspired by research in public health, "grammar of behavior" strategies based on work done by linguists:

> We must be prepared to broaden the range of methods we employ in our research, as we reformulate the questions we propose to raise. Although good experimental and correlational investigations will continue to be useful, we need add more varied kinds of studies—longitudinal case studies, anthropological analyses of classrooms and teachers, information-processing modelings of the thought processes of teachers and learners using methods of controlled introspection and retrospection, investigations of basic phenomena, such as transfer, under conditions varying subject matter, to name but a few ["The Psychology of School Subjects"].

He also urged education researchers to heed both—equally important—meanings of "discipline," namely discipline as "the management of impulse and the control of intellectual caprice" ("The Practical and the Eclectic") and discipline as a community of scholars with shared knowledge, questions, substantive interests, and methods for constructing, testing, and verifying knowledge. I return to this second meaning of discipline momentarily.

While writing about this disciplined eclectic in research, Shulman also enacted it in his own work as researcher and teacher. He co-taught a research course with two Stanford colleagues—Milbrey McLaughlin (a policy analyst) and Shirley Brice Heath (an anthropologist)—whose epistemological, methodological, and pedagogical perspectives were quite different from his own. On his research projects, he consistently invites both

graduate students and faculty with different disciplinary perspectives—ranging from measurement to philosophy—to deliberate with him, challenge his ideas, and extend the work.

In sum, Shulman and his colleagues have delved persistently into these four lines of work—professional knowledge and reasoning, the pedagogies of the professions, the assessment of professional knowledge and skill, and the nature of educational research—for close to thirty years now. Clearly, these lines of work are far from distinct, as I have already noted. His first fully elaborated thesis on teacher knowledge—"Those Who Understand"—uses teacher tests as a site for exploring those issues. The portfolios developed by hundreds of teachers who have applied for National Board of Professional Teaching Standards Certification (an assessment what was heavily influenced by Shulman's empirical and theoretical work) now constitute a case knowledge of teaching. Similarly, the products of the K–12 CASTL fellows' scholarship of teaching and learning projects at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching are now being used by teacher educators to support a case-based pedagogy in teacher education.

Yet naming these foci alone does not explain Shulman's career, for equally important have been the fox-like strategies he has employed along the way. A critical strategy of Shulman's has entailed looking across contrasting cases. As he tried to understand professional reasoning, Shulman began in medicine and teaching, using both their similarities and differences to understand professional reasoning in a generic sense, as well as those aspects that are specific to particular professions. In his current work at the Carnegie Foundation, he has expanded that pool of professions and has projects looking across fields as diverse as nursing, teaching, and the clergy. In a similar fashion, when his attention turned to the subject-specific aspects of teaching, Shulman collaborated with colleagues who examined this issue across school subjects—mathematics, English, history and the social studies, science. Current Foundation projects continue this tradition: the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate includes collaborations with departments of mathematics, English, education, chemistry, history, and neuroscience.

And so we return to the central role that discipline has played in Shulman's career, for this focus on cross-field comparisons is not simply a methodological strategy. It is also a substantive belief that knowledge varies in important ways across fields and that we ought to attend to those differences in our research and teaching. For many educational scholars, Shulman's most important contribution to the field has been his insistence that subject matter matters. Well into the 1980s, educational research was still

dominated by educational psychologists who presumed a generic approach to teaching and learning—teaching and learning mathematics was comparable to teaching and learning history or English or biology. Their generic conception of teaching led to generic research questions and methods, which, in turn, led to generic conclusions. Shulman (1986) argued against that trend, calling for a reconsideration of the role that subject matter played in teaching and learning (what he called the "missing paradigm" in educational research):

> Where the teacher cognition program has clearly fallen short is in the elucidation of teachers' cognitive understanding of subject matter and the relationships between such understanding and the instruction that teachers provide for students. . . . The general public and those who set educational policy are in general agreement that teachers' competence in the subjects they teach is a central criterion of teacher quality. They remain remarkably vague, however, in defining what sort of subject-matter knowledge they have in mind—basic skills, broad factual knowledge, scholarly depth—and the research-on-teaching community has been of little help with this matter [pp. 25–26].

This attention to subject-specific aspects of knowing was at the core of his early work on medical problem solving, and appeared and reappeared in his work on the knowledge growth of new teachers, the wisdom of practice of experienced teachers, teacher assessment, and continues in his CASTL work. More than anyone else, Shulman has bridged the content-free tradition of educational research with the discipline-specific nature of higher education and disciplinary work. For many, this is his sine qua non.

Yet another strategy Shulman has used involves working between theory, research, and practice. Consider the idea of cases. Shulman developed the theoretical notion of teaching involving a case knowledge in his presidential address to the American Educational Research Association in 1985. At the same time, doctoral students working with him were busily using cases as a research method to document new teachers' learning and the role of their subject matter knowledge in that learning, as well as cases to document experienced teachers' wisdom of practice in the Teacher Assessment Project. Gradually, he also began using cases as a pedagogical tool, by asking that the prospective teachers in his teacher education classes write and share cases of their own teaching. By constantly moving back and forth between theory (Shulman has always had a predilection toward Robert Merton's theories of the middle range), research, and practice, Shulman's work has produced both practical tools (prototypes for the assessments used by the NBPTS, for example) and inspiring theoretical constructs (pedagogical content knowledge, for another).

A third strategy has been his own disciplined eclecticism, the legacy of his work with Joseph Schwab, and resonating with his hedgehog interests in the qualities and character of educational research. As I have already noted, Shulman has long argued for eclecticism in education research, both in terms of the approaches that we use and the theories that we build or borrow to explain our results. (Here, again, he was heavily influenced by Robert Merton, as well as by Lee J. Cronbach.) In his writing on educational research, he makes a case for eclecticism of methods—and the need to educate future educational researchers in multiple methods (see, for example, "Reconstruction of Educational Research," "The Psychology of School Subjects," and "Disciplines of Inquiry in Education"). One sees this disciplined eclecticism emerge again in his work on assessment. In both the Teacher Assessment Project and the Peer Review of Teaching Project, Shulman argued persuasively that no single form of assessment would do, and we would be wise to aim for a "union of insufficiencies," rather than rely on a necessarily narrow measure of teaching knowledge and skill: "What we need, therefore, is a union of insufficiencies, a marriage of complements, in which the flaws of individual approaches to assessment are offset by the virtues of their fellows" ("A Union of Insufficiencies").

A final strategy may be obscured by the fact that, in this volume, Shulman is the sole author of each essay. For while he often writes alone, Shulman learns together, first, as a student of his teachers—Joseph Schwab (and by association due to his significant influence on Schwab, John Dewey) and Benjamin Bloom, as well as others at the University of Chicago. In particular, he was significantly influenced by his experiences as a student both in Schwab's seminars ("his directness to the point of insult, his commitment to doubt as a source of wisdom, and his devotion to the 'other view' as the key to the growth of understanding" (["Joseph Jackson Schwab"] and in his classes in the Hutchins' College, founded on a commitment to all students learning the Great Books. He went on to learn with and from his colleagues both at Michigan State and Stanford University, including Arthur Elstein, Judy Lanier, Bob Floden, Susan Florio Ruane, Lee Cronbach, Milbrey McLaughlin, Shirley Brice Heath, Joan Talbert, Ed Haertel, and Denis Phillips. He also learned alongside a long line of students, on whose work he draws extensively and generously in his essays. His learning continues in collaboration with colleagues who work at the Carnegie Foundation.

Throughout his writing, both on teacher learning and on the character of educational research, Shulman has argued for the importance of community, a value he learned as a student at the University of Chicago and an important forum for taking advantage of eclectic views: "Collegiality

is needed to overcome the limitations of individual rationality. If any individual actor's capacity to learn is bounded, if human reasoning of all kinds—theoretical, practical, or moral—remains restricted when pursued alone or without access to a competing point of view, then the collegium is indispensable" ("Teaching Alone, Learning Together"). Shulman has consistently created collegiums throughout his career. He invited Joseph Schwab to lead a faculty seminar in the Institute for Research on Teaching, where faculty and students read and deliberated collectively. He invited colleagues at Stanford—including Lee Cronbach, Denis Phillips, and Ed Haertel—to collaborate on the Knowledge Growth in a Profession Project and the Teacher Assessment Project. He co-taught with a number of colleagues at Stanford, including Denis Phillips, Larry Cuban, John Baugh, Nate Gage, Milbrey McLaughlin, Shirley Brice Heath, Teresa Laframboise, and Linda Darling-Hammond. The entire staff of the Carnegie Foundation meets regularly to listen to speakers and to discuss work in progress.

Gould's point in arguing for the power of the combination of hedgehog and fox was not to persuade us all to become hedgehog-foxes, for we need to hold on to our differences in order to stimulate the best possible work. In some important ways, Shulman has remained a fox. Gould writes that foxes apply "their varied skills to introduce a key and novel fruit for other scholars to gather and improve in a particular orchard" (Gould, 2003, p. 5). Indeed, Shulman has consistently demonstrated a gift for sparking new lines of work with imagination and intelligence, often accompanied by a felicitous use of language. Without introducing unnecessary jargon, he has a gift for coining phrases that are at once lyrical and intellectually provocative.[1]

His argument in that subject matter was that the "missing paradigm" in research on teaching led to major initiatives in research on the subject-specific aspects of teaching, including the work of Sam Wineberg in high school history, Pamela Grossman in high school English, and Deborah Ball in elementary mathematics. The concept of "pedagogical content knowledge" became an inspiration for research on teaching, the redesign of teacher education programs, and the design of teacher assessment systems. University faculty were also taken with the idea, and it has found its way into numerous discussions concerning the knowledge base for teaching in higher education. Higher education has long presumed that teaching comes naturally to scholars; that Shulman's notion of pedagogical con-

1. The exception here is "pedagogical content knowledge," which may lack lyricism but has more than made up for that with its conceptual power.

tent knowledge has captured the attention of those in higher education is no small feat.

Other ideas he has borrowed from others and extended in important ways. His work on the "wisdom of practice" was launched by an idea of David Hawkins (1966). His substantial contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning—by writing about such a scholarship, by working with myriad institutions of higher education to create centers or programs for the scholarship of teaching, and by supporting the work of generations of CASTL fellows through The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—picked up an idea introduced by Ernest Boyer (1997) and remodeled it for new use.

In sum, across all of this work, Shulman has been the consummate fox, introducing interesting ideas, offering those ideas generously to the people of like and different mind and disposition, and learning—with interest and genuine pleasure—from the inquiries of his colleagues. He has also been a hedgehog, for his passion for teaching is clear. His belief that some aspects of teaching as subject-specific is equally clear. For all the twists and turns in his career, his driving commitment has been to understand teaching, specifically the teaching of subject matter.

I close this introduction on a more personal note, for I have been Lee's student and collaborator. More than any interest or strategy, I have always been most taken with Lee's humanity. Lee has explored this medley of ideas about teaching and learning, disciplines and eclecticism, knowledge and assessment, professionalism and higher education, and educational research with passion and warmth, offering them to the rest of us with an intellectual generosity that has enriched both his writing and ourselves. Our field is richer for his ideas. Our lives are richer for his grace.

Suzanne M. Wilson
Michigan State University
October 2003

REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Elstein, A. S., Shulman, L. S., and Sprafka, S. A. *Medical Problem Solving: An Analysis of Clinical Reasoning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Gould, S. J. *The Hedgehog, the Fox, and the Magister's Pox: Ending the False War Between Science and the Humanities.* New York: Harmony, 2003.

Hawkins, D. "Learning the Unteachable." In L. S. Shulman and E. R. Keislar (eds.), *Learning by Discovery: A Critical Appraisal.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Shulman, L. S. "Paradigms and Research Programs for the Study of Teaching." In M. C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Shulman, L. S. "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude." *Change,* 1993, November/December, 6–7.

Shulman, L. S., and Elstein, A. S. "Studies of Problem Solving, Judgment, and Decision Making: Implications for Educational Research." In F. N. Kerlinger (ed.), *Review of Research in Education,* Vol. 3. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1979.

Shulman, L. S., and Sykes, G. *A National Board for Teaching? In Search of a Bold Standard.* Paper commissioned by Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.