CHAPTER 3

Insights From the Past

A work of art must balance three elements: Does it understand the past? Does it elucidate the present? Does it reflect a personal vision?

—Jake Biddington

It was also very helpful to work closely with the school system where I planned to do the research. In the end, we formed an excellent match for doing qualitative research. The school system has a very comprehensive mentoring program for beginning teachers. They had substantial survey data, given annually to all mentors and beginning teachers, which documents the value of this program. However, there had been no inquiry into how the mentor/mentee relationships are operating at the local school level. This helped to solidify the research questions.

—Judy Smith

In this chapter I set the stage for the field of qualitative research. I begin with a discussion of educational research in general. Then I include a history of how the field of qualitative research developed. Emphasis is on the last century and in particular on the burgeoning growth and changes in the field since the 1980s. I conclude with speculations on the future of qualitative research in various fields.

The education of teachers in the United States began with teacher training and normal schools designed to teach young women how to work with children of elementary school age. They received training in psychology and pedagogy. Universities were not involved in teacher training until around the turn of the last century. It was only when graduate programs began to be developed in the 1920s that educators recognized the need to conduct research about education and to train future educators in methods of conducting research.
From the scientific movement and testing that began in the 1920s, educational research adopted a stance that was scientific, objective, and rigorous. Breuer et al. (2002) remind us that "the (social) sciences usually try to create the impression that the results of their research have objective character" (¶ 1). There was little room for other disciplines that seemed to be "soft" or "subjective." Thus, anthropology, sociology (unless it was statistical), phenomenology, or other approaches to answering questions were seen as somewhat lesser. These would not be approaches that could be used to answer important questions in education or to provide us with pure factual information. At least until the 1980s, it was accepted practice to conduct educational research using the scientific method. Experimental designs and statistics were emphasized. Hypothesis testing was expected. Objectivity and rigor were considered critical. The field was dominated by men who valued the approach of the natural scientists.

You might be interested to know that other fields also have a hierarchy. For example, for many years, most European artists and their audiences valued historical or mythological paintings as the highest form of art followed by portraits, genre paintings, landscapes, and still lifes. It was not until the center of the artistic community moved from Europe to New York and abstract painters took hold that this hierarchy was called into question. One reason that such a hierarchy was established is that it was thought that a historical or mythological painting was more complex and thus more difficult to accomplish. Its scope and size were usually larger than other types of paintings.

By the 1980s, the scientific method was no longer considered to be the only way to conduct research. Other voices began to be heard. Women were crying out for an opportunity to influence what was studied and what methods were being used. Anthropologists, phenomenologists, and others wanted their views heard.

I can remember back in my graduate school days (in the mid-1960s) I was a firm believer in a traditionalist viewpoint. I did not question why; I seemed to just follow along. I never really thought about issues raised by some that the field was dominated by European white men. What did I know? I was learning but not really questioning. It seemed like a status thing to me. If we could get the "real" or "true" data we could find the answers. This view was fueled by the increasing availability of computer programs and advanced statistical techniques. More numbers, better answers. We felt so good about things. I have to say that I bought into this completely. Now I ask myself what I was thinking about. But then it was really different. In the sections that follow, I discuss these changes in greater depth.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH PRIOR TO THE 1980S

Imagine that it is one hundred years ago. You are working in the schools as a teacher. At that time teachers were trained in teacher training or normal schools. The first state supported normal school opened in Massachusetts in 1839. Since women were excluded from preparatory schools, this was the only form of advanced education they could receive. The psychology of child development was emphasized and the curriculum did not include anything about research. By the turn of the last century, many normal schools had become four-year teachers colleges. The first graduate program was established at New York University in 1887 and Teachers College at Columbia University opened its doors the following year. So it is not surprising that research was not a topic of much interest. It was not until the late 1920s when the scientific movement became popular that universities recognized that the discipline of education
could be enhanced with more rigorous and systematic study. One of the first institutions to do so was Teachers College at Columbia University.

I suspect that there was not too much discussion about what kind of research approach to use since the scientific movement favored by the natural sciences was seen as the highest form of research. Educators were quick to follow in the footsteps of those disciplines that were considered more rigorous. Thus, they were strongly influenced by psychology and the testing movement, which, too, had adopted the scientific method.

I think it is interesting that in these early years there was quite a bit of collaboration between school administrators and professors. Topics of interest generally came from needs and concerns of the schools. As I researched this early literature, I came across one topic that both groups found important. Given that there were so many small high schools, the question on the minds of some was the adequacy of education offered by these small high schools. Administrators, principals, and teachers were concerned that students were not receiving proper training to enter college. One idea was to offer students correspondence courses through universities. You might find yourself asking the question that these educators posed: Do students who take correspondence courses learn at the same level as those exposed to regular classes? If the answer was yes, then educators could avoid closing small schools without jeopardizing students.

In 1926, Rufi wrote his dissertation on the inadequacy of the small high school. Influenced by his findings, Wooden and Mort (1929) conducted a study on the question of supervised correspondence study for high school pupils. Wooden was a superintendent of schools and Mort was a professor of education at Columbia. This is one of the earliest published research studies in education. Wooden and Mort took a real problem that had surfaced in other research and attempted to conduct a systematic investigation. By today’s standards, one might not say that their study constituted experimental research since it is basically a description of how a small high school can make course material available to its students. But I think this study is important for two reasons. It demonstrates that school and university people can work together on problems of common interest. Second, it shows that decisions in education can be based on systematic investigation and study.

Very little of this early research was experimental in nature, although Crump (1928) wrote about correspondence and class extension work in Oklahoma for his doctoral research at Teachers College. He concluded that there were no significant differences between those studying in regular classrooms and those who studied by correspondence. This is one of the earliest experimental research studies conducted in the United States. On a national scale, one of the first major educational studies was begun in 1930. It involved 30 secondary schools and 300 colleges. Known as the Eight Year Study, it was designed to examine how high schools prepared students for college. It was led by Ralph Tyler, who was considered one of the strongest advocates of the scientific study of education. Unfortunately, World War II minimized the impact of the study. Tyler (who received his Ph.D. in educational psychology) returned from Ohio State to the University of Chicago where he became head of the Department of Education and then the Division of Social Sciences. The University of Chicago also had strong influences in research in the sociology department. This type of research was more similar to qualitative research than Tyler’s experimental work. Known as the Chicago School, these researchers emphasized going out into the field and collecting data about life in the city. Because there were so many immigrants to the United States during the early years of the 20th century, these researchers became vitally interested in studying their behaviors.
They also relied on in-depth interviews and life histories to collect data. I know firsthand about various immigrant groups, such as the Polish, because I grew up in Chicago. Chicago was one of the great cities with immigrant populations who lived in virtual ghettos throughout the city. To this day, you can find many ethnic restaurants reflecting these groups.

I suspect that you will find other studies addressing problems facing the schools in this early time period. But you need to remember that very few educators were trained to design and conduct research. The majority of the professors were trained as psychologists or measurement specialists. I want to stress how important the scientific movement and scientific thinking was to this newly emerging discipline of education. Educators adopted the method of science as a method that was suitable to the study of education. After all, this method had been used by psychologists such as B. F. Skinner, who contributed so much to our thinking about teaching and learning. Although Skinner studied rats and pigeons, his conclusions were widely applied to teaching. He was a behaviorist and believed that children could be conditioned to learn a certain way through operant conditioning. You may not be aware that one of Skinner’s first books on how organisms behaved became the model for experimental research. As recently as 2001, Bissell suggested that the theoretical constructs and experimental results presented by Skinner had a critical influence on education and teaching. Today almost no undergraduate student in education is exposed to research design and practice. Many graduate students receive a research methods course, but overwhelmingly the emphasis is on traditional research paradigms. Increasingly, these courses are expanding to include work in qualitative research methods.

I planned to provide you the names of those leaders and innovators who became synonymous with educational research. This turned into a much more difficult task than I had envisioned. I finally came to accept the fact that although I wanted to tell you who the father of educational research was, I was not able to find anyone who was clearly acknowledged as such. As I said earlier, I think that is because much of research was intertwined with testing and psychology. If you are interested, you can read about the father of modern testing, of the testing movement, of creativity, and of educational psychology.

I think it would be fair to conclude that the discipline of educational research developed after universities became involved in advanced training of those going into education. Psychology and the testing movement played a pivotal role in guiding what should be studied and how it should be studied. The field was completely dominated by men and the scientific movement was the preferred, if not the only, mode of investigation. As more universities developed doctoral programs in education, this view permeated approaches to the conduct and training of research. Few women studied research methods or made contributions to the field.

You cannot ignore the impact of World War II. Thousands of men inducted into the military needed to be tested, and test development became highly specialized. Educators addressed these issues. By the 1950s, the era of Sputnik, American educators moved even more rapidly into a scientific stance. Federal funding for research in the 1960s also encouraged and stressed scientific approaches to the field of research. The widespread use of computers by the 1970s enabled advanced statistical analyses to be conducted, which also reinforced this scientific bent. So you should not be surprised that there was little room for a discipline that seemed antithetical to what so many believed.

Applying ethnographic methods to the study of educational topics has existed for a long time. In my experience, however, these studies were conducted by anthropologists trained as ethnographers who found their way to a study of education rather than by educational
researchers who were steeped in the traditions of the scientific method. In many universities, educational ethnographers were not in departments of educational research whose domain was statistics and experimental design. Yon (2003) reviews the growth of educational ethnography as a subset of anthropology. In particular, he speaks about a movement toward reflexivity.

I do not think there is a single event that we could point to that led to an opening up of research methods to move beyond the positivism and postpositivism that pervaded the field. But it is clear that things were brewing. Qualitative research as a field or separate discipline did not exist in education until the mid 1980s. The Qualitative Interest Group (QUIG) at the University of Georgia was one of the first groups devoted primarily to qualitative research. Its inception in 1985 and its sponsorship of an Annual Conference (the first one in 1988) support the timeline I describe. In addition to QUIG, Qualitative Research for the Human Sciences, a Listserv operating on the Internet (QUALRS-L), began in 1991. (See QUIG archives for details on this and related history.) As I mentioned, prior to that time educational research was guided by research from the natural sciences. Students learned experimental design and statistics. Faculty wrote articles that were of an experimental nature. Sometimes surveys were conducted, but since they were not about hypothesis testing and generalizing, they were not seen to be as high quality as those that were experimental. Students across the country were trained to conduct scientific experiments and to think about hypothesis testing and generalization. The professional organizations, like the American Educational Research Association (founded in 1916), did not have a special interest group that was interested in qualitative research. Little was available in terms of textbooks or printed material. Most publishers were not interested in publishing books about qualitative research.

I do not mean to suggest that there was no research that could be characterized as qualitative prior to the 1980s. Ethnographies became popular. Some researchers came to the field of education from an anthropological background and began to conduct ethnographies in schools and classrooms. Often these individuals were not part of departments of educational research and were seen by some as outside of “real” research. These early ethnographies were typically designed to address issues of credibility and respectability. Although the ethnographies were often on topics of interest to educators, few were specifically about education. Ethnographers tended to study whole cultures and immerse themselves in the topic for extended time periods. As an adaptation and recognition of the difficulties of conducting such ethnographies, some researchers adopted a case study approach. Thus by looking at a smaller part of an entire culture, an ethnographic stance could be adopted yet made manageable. Denny (1978) suggests that the case study in education was growing in popularity.

While Bogdan and Biklen (1992) agree that the dominant paradigm was hypothesis testing and measurement, they acknowledge that prior to 1980 there were other traditions that influenced the development of research methods in education. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) characterize the time period from the early 1900s until the end of World War II as a traditional period. They say that those individuals who were conducting qualitative research wrote “objective” accounts and were practicing in a positivist mode. In spite of these modest attempts to introduce alternative research approaches, they did not catch on to any great extent, and the field continued to be dominated by the traditional paradigm.

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) speak about how the “modernist ethnographer and sociological participant observer attempted rigorous qualitative studies of important social processes” (p. 14). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) suggest that although not in a central position, these methods that are labeled qualitative could no longer be labeled fringe efforts. And Denzin and
Lincoln speak of the golden age of rigorous qualitative analysis. As I see it, qualitative research until the late 1980s was striving to fit into a traditional, quantitative paradigm. I am not sure that they actually recognized that they were trying to put a square peg into a round hole. I would disagree with the view offered by some that qualitative approaches mushroomed in education. Eisner and Peshkin (1990) echo my sentiments: “To conduct experiments and surveys was to be scientific; to do otherwise ... was to be soft-, wrong- or muddle-headed” (p. 1). In my own experience, those who were involved in qualitative research were often discounted and seen as soft or aberrant. I remember one colleague who asked me whether I had lost my mind when I said I was interested in research methods that were qualitative.

THE 1980S TO 2000

By the 1980s, many more people were being trained as educational researchers. Some were beginning to question the dominant traditional paradigms of experimental research and hypothesis testing. Ethnographers were increasingly making their presence felt in the field of education. Rist (1980) writes of blitzkrieg ethnography: the transformation of a method into a movement. Many researchers equated qualitative and ethnographic.7 By the middle of the 1980s, approaches other than ethnographic began to take hold in the educational community. It was no longer sufficient to say that qualitative research was the same as doing ethnography or a modified ethnography/case study. The idea of doing research in a naturalistic setting began to surface (Custer, 1996; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) although, as Custer acknowledges, it by no means was accepted as a better alternative to traditional work. Voices of feminists began to be heard as well (Harding, 1987; Reinharz, 1992; Roman & Apple, 1990).

This was a time when researchers tried to clarify what research approaches to take and how to legitimize their alternative ways of thinking, and the road was somewhat rocky. I agree with Eisner and Peshkin (1990) when they state that “there were no accepted models to which educational researchers with a qualitative bent could turn for direction” (p. 1). Crabtree and Miller (1992) concur that “no prepackaged designs exist from which to choose” (p. xiv). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) see this period as a time of blurred genres. It seemed as though almost anything fit. They acknowledge that the “naturalistic, postpositivist, and constructionist” paradigms gained power during this time period. During the mid 1980s they speak about the crisis of representation and suggest that in the 1990s “the ethnographer’s authority remains under assault” (p. 17). Yon (2003) maps the transition from modernist formulations of the field in its formative days, when ethnographies laid claim to being sealed and scientific texts, to the more recent formulations shaped by postmodern and poststructural ideas that undermine earlier meanings of culture and call attention to the explanatory limits of ethnography.

According to Campbell (n.d.),

the research paradigm shift has to do with major shifts in the way knowledge is constructed and created. Associated with this is the further question of whose interests are served by the dominant paradigm? Research has been dominated in the last hundred years or more by what is commonly known as the scientific method. Also known as positivist or quantitative research, its emphasis is on objectivity, neutrality, measurement, and validity. To live in the scientific method means to live within an understanding of the beliefs, values, and
techniques that guide scientific inquiry (Lather, 1991). Those working within the scientific framework also accept the conventions, language, and methods of carrying out research in this way. Those living within the scientific paradigm judge other ways of carrying out investigations as too open to multiple interpretation, too biased, too subjective, simply not scientific or rigorous enough. (¶ 5)

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) characterize this latter period as a time of crisis. One crisis is what they refer to as the representational crisis. As such, they question the assumption that qualitative researchers can capture lived experience. They argue that such experience is created in the “social text written by the researcher” (p. 17). For them, this is the crisis of representation. The other crisis they pose is the question of legitimating. They suggest that traditional criteria for evaluating and interpreting qualitative research need to be rethought. They also briefly mention new ways of writing and representing information. They suggest that “fictional ethnographies, ethnographic poetry, and multimedia texts are today taken for granted” (p. 17).

At the end of the one hundred years or so during which education training moved from being dominated by the training of women teachers, through the adoption of the scientific method to lend an air of legitimacy to research, to a questioning of traditional approaches, educational researchers and those who describe themselves as qualitative researchers find themselves in somewhat of a dilemma. No longer are the rules clear. No longer can they feel secure in how to conduct research. No longer do they know how to evaluate research. They have opened themselves to new ideas, to new paradigms, to new ways of thinking, and to the creativity of those who follow.

2000 AND BEYOND

As I write this book in the year 2004, I find myself wondering what I should tell you about the state of qualitative research today. I recognize that by the time you read this material, “today” may be quite different from what we know now. This is interesting because for many years educational research was fairly predictable and consistent. We knew what to do and how to do it. And now I am not sure what we know except that we don’t agree on what to do and how to do it. I speculate on some ideas here and rely on recent writings of others.

Things have flipped almost 180 degrees in a very short time. It has become almost impossible to keep up with the writing and publishing in the field. No longer is qualitative research dominated by the anthropologists and ethnographers. Many disciplines and subdisciplines inform the field. Creswell (1997) singles out five traditions to discuss, although he acknowledges others as well. More recently, Creswell (2003) has emphasized also looking at a mixed methods approach in which elements of both qualitative and quantitative research are combined to enlarge an investigation. Merriam (2002) and Patton (2002) also acknowledge various approaches and methodologies. The Handbook of Qualitative Research, first published in 1994, adds other ideas. The second edition of the Handbook, issued in 2000, introduces still more ideas, and the third edition, published in 2005, expands our horizons even further. Now it seems that almost anything can be labeled qualitative research. I will talk later about how this is confusing for you as a student and how you can begin to make judgments about which way works for you.
SPECULATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

I have been in the field for a long time. I have seen many things become popular. Education is a discipline replete with fads. We tend to react and are often driven by forces beyond our immediate range. I suspect this will be true for qualitative research as well, but here are some trends that I see.

Greater Diversity and Creativity. This new millennium will be a time for greater diversity and creativity in answering questions about human interaction and in representing information. The doors have been opened, and I believe we will see creativity unlike anything we can imagine. I know the art and music worlds have gone in directions we could not expect. Why not the world of research and education?

I think we have just begun to scratch the surface in terms of our thinking about how research will be done and who will be doing it. The field has opened up dramatically since the 1980s. Women have taken leadership roles in all aspects of the profession. I remember clearly back in the mid-1970s when I was interviewed for a position at a university in a department of educational research. The chairman of the search committee called me and invited me to come for an interview. He said he was especially pleased that I was a woman; I would be joining a department of almost a dozen men. In 2005 that department is almost exclusively women. People of color have made contributions to the field and heightened awareness of issues. These voices were not heard in the past. Now they are heard.

How research will be done and how it will be transmitted will continue to be examined. Representations will not be strictly textual. I hope we will move more toward the visual because it is well known that so many gain their information through television, the Internet, DVDs, and other visual media. I wonder why we think it is important to convey our information solely through words and traditional text?

Greater Access and Availability. The revolution of the Internet has affected all aspects of our lives. Instantaneous communication around the world is now available to almost everyone. One way this will continue to affect qualitative research is to make information readily available through online journals and discussion groups. No longer do we have to wait until a journal is published in hard copy. This means what you read is current, not a year old or more. Another fact of instant worldwide communication is worldwide influence. No longer will the U.S. or Europe be the dominant force. I suspect we will see new ideas from Asia, Africa, and South America. At the time of this writing, we already see influences from Asia and much greater impact from Europe.

More Voices Heard. Educational research began with voices of men. They were remote, objective, and scientific. You may know that research in the medical field began the same way. In fact, in medicine, much of the research was done on white men (usually doctors) and extrapolated to other groups. Once women became a greater force, they began to design studies and conduct them on women. The qualitative research field has opened up to many voices. But, although we have a greater representation of women and minorities than ever before, we still hear from those with more education and traditional schooling. Since much research emanates from universities—either by professors or by students—this is not surprising. But I wonder if there is not a way to include a broader perspective of education and experience in
the planning and design of our research. I predict that this will be so and in ways we can’t now imagine.

**Creative Flow That Does Not Follow Any One Pattern.** If we look at the field of art, we have seen a variety of movements since the center of art moved from Paris to New York. Just as in research, art was initially dominated by men. Now we see women and minorities making enormous contributions. Their creative ideas are astounding. In the year 2004, for example, I visited an exhibit at the Saatchi Gallery in London of Richard Wilson’s 20:50, which is an installation of a lake of sump oil that reflects the ceiling and completely disorients the viewer. It was quite fantastic. Some would probably say this is not art, but I do not agree. Installation art is not new, but reusing oil probably is. What else can we expect of qualitative researchers? We have performance art, dance, play reading, and blogs. I believe that multimedia is an area that will be used to a much greater extent. Chenail speaks about a research park similar to Disneyland (Lichtman, 2004). Without rules and restrictions, who knows where we will go.

**Is It Good Enough?** As researchers grapple with what qualitative research is, what it should be, how it should be done, and what it should look like, I suspect we might see conservatives moving to more traditional approaches. Some will ask what the rules are and begin to set rules that will follow a traditional paradigm. Davis (2002), in an editorial in the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, speaks about the future of educational research:

> It seeks new ends, for example, reliable research conclusions, causal relationships, and replicable “best practices.” At first blush, its aim appears to represent a political “back to the future” policy in which a “new educational scientism” will flourish. This educational research policy, however, differs profoundly from the multiple approaches, even the “scientific” rationale, used by researchers during most of the 20th century. In the past, educational researchers adopted and shifted their research paradigms and techniques on the bases of scholarly exposition, demonstration, and persuasion. In the current scene, on the other hand, bureaucratic mandates supersede the reasonableness of research options. (¶ 2)

From Davis’ viewpoint, bureaucracy and politics take a more prominent role in determining research agendas. I, for one, hope he is in error.

A related issue is a concern by some that research will not be taken seriously because the rules are not hard and fast and therefore it is difficult to judge what is “good” or of high “quality.” I think there will still be those who are of this view.

**Keeping Up With the Explosion.** Information access and retrieval is a challenging pursuit. I suspect that by the time you read this document you will be able to access an enormous amount of material on the Internet. Some of it will be scholarly; some of it will be personal and specific to an individual. I don’t hold to the admonition that the only good material needs to be peer-reviewed. I know there are politics that affect much of what we hear and say and what gets printed. It will be your challenge to locate information, judge its merit, and integrate it with what you already know. This will be a greater challenge than ever before because the Internet makes so much material instantly available and retrievable. This is true for you and for the students you might teach and for their parents. Ten years ago Denzin and Lincoln (1994) wrote about the concept of the qualitative researcher as a bricoleur. A French term, this
concept suggests someone who has the tools to get the job done. According to McLeod (2000), a bricoleur’s image is a tension between creativity and conformity. He sees creativity as one of the core characteristics of a good qualitative researcher. How the new qualitative researcher will be creative is a matter of speculation. I believe we will continue to see creativity and resourcefulness, and those characteristics will overcome the need by some to move into a more traditional and conservative posture.

SUMMARY

In 1934, Cole Porter’s Anything Goes opened in New York. The screen version appeared in 1936. A revival appeared in 1987. In 2004, the film De-Lovely portrayed the life of Cole Porter. I think of this music when I think about the field of qualitative research. It is rich, long lasting, and ever fresh. It is as good today as it was when it was first written. Qualitative research is a field with a long tradition. It is rich, long lasting, and ever fresh. I hope as you continue to read this book you will be open to these new ideas, to new ways of doing things. At the same time you will look for quality, integrity, and value. You should find yourself on a new pathway. It is time to jump in and learn how to do it.

GROUP ACTIVITY

**Purpose:** To identify the latest trends in the field.

**Activity:** Join a team of two other students. Identify possible new trends—I suggest many will involve technology and the Internet. Prepare a brief one page synopsis of what you think you know about the topic. Now you are going to find out what else is out there. Use a search engine (e.g., Google) to search the Internet. Allow at least two hours for your search. Save your information online and be prepared to send it to your other teammates online. You may engage in a discussion online before your next class meeting. Prepare a summary to send to each other and other class members.

**Evaluation:** Determine whether you have located new information that supports, adds to, or contradicts what you know so far.

INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITY

**Purpose:** To examine your own views on the appropriateness of qualitative research as a tool for answering questions in education.

**Activity:** This is a self-reflexive, introspective activity in which you will write in your qualitative research journal. The topic to think about is how you view the field based on what you know so far and how it fits with your own belief system.

**Evaluation:** Determine to what extent you are able to examine your own motivations and thoughts. Decide what additional information you need to obtain a clearer understanding.
NOTES

1. I had the good fortune to attend The Laboratory School at the University of Chicago while Tyler and others were conducting research on the students. We used to move to the “Experimental Lab—Room 400” during certain periods of each week. We were told they were studying us. I think most of us tried to mug for the cameras as pictures were taken. You can read more about the Eight Year Study at http://fcis.oise.utoronto.ca/~daniel_schugurensky/assignment1/1930eight.html or http://www.coe.uh.edu/courses/cuin6373/idhistory/8year.html.

2. You can read more about Skinner in his 1938 work *The Behavior of Organisms*. Skinner died in 1990 after a long career at the University of Minnesota, Indiana University, and Harvard. Skinner also studied his daughter, whom he raised for a time in a box called the Skinner box.

3. Frederic Lord, who died at age 87 in 2000, is said to be the father of modern testing. G. Stanley Hall (1844–1924) was an American psychologist and founder of the testing movement. He also founded the American Psychological Association and *The American Journal of Psychology*. E. Paul Torrance, who died at age 87 in 2003, is said to be the father of creativity. E. L. Thorndike, who died at age 98 in 1998, was known as the father of educational psychology. But no one was named the father of educational research. Lewis Terman, a professor of education and psychology at Stanford between 1910 and 1946, was instrumental in bringing the scientific approach both to research studies and to the training of researchers. He became president of the American Psychological Association in 1923.

4. How ironic, though, that in 2004, the majority of the more than 20,000 members of the American Educational Research Association are female. The president of the organization is female as well.

5. See Becker’s (1976) study of medical students, Liebow’s (1967) study of street corner men in Washington, D.C., and Agar’s (1973) study of urban heroin addicts.

6. For an excellent account of the history, read Chapter 1 in Bogdan and Biklen’s 1992 *Foundations of Qualitative Research in Education*.

7. You can read many ethnographies on such topics as drug dealing, girl gangs, or psychiatric clients. Few ethnographies were actually conducted in schools.