

DAVID PERKINS

AUTHOR OF *THE EUREKA EFFECT*



MAKING LEARNING WHOLE

How SEVEN PRINCIPLES
of TEACHING *can*
TRANSFORM EDUCATION

“David Perkins’s *Making Learning Whole* is a highly creative book that gives us ways of achieving more—much more—from our schools. The book presents a fascinating rethinking about how education might take place—and already does for the fortunate few with the most insightful teachers. Perkins teaches us that what those rare teachers do can be learned by new teachers and promoted by thoughtful principals. The result is a practical guide for thinking about how to make our schools exciting for teachers and students, and more productive than ever. This book ought to be read by everyone who is concerned about improving curriculum and instruction.”

—David C. Berliner, Regents’ Professor,
Mary Lou Fulton College of Education, Arizona State University

“Only David Perkins, the inimitable master of the metaphor, can so patently explicate practical steps to transforming education. This book is essential reading for educators at all levels.”

—Rod Rock, director of Instructional Services,
Saginaw (Michigan) Intermediate School District

“David Perkins goes straight to the heart of the matter. His seven principles of teaching vividly explain how to organize learning in ways that allow people to *do* important things with what they know—which is, after all, the point. Every educator should read this book, and so should policymakers whose work influences whether and how we can finally make school learning whole.”

—Linda Darling-Hammond, Charles E.
Ducommun Professor of Education, Stanford University

“David Perkins brings one of the most creative and energetic minds in education to generate a coherent whole from the seeming cacophony of proposals to fix our schools. He shows in this book how a potent metaphor can shape and order seven potent teaching/learning principles for everyday practice, in an engaging and often entertaining narrative that will be of enormous practical importance to teachers, administrators, policymakers, and college and university instructors.”

—Kieran Egan, faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University;
Director, IERG (Imaginative Education Research Group)

“A must-read for those serious about transforming education to prepare our youth for success in a rapidly changing world.”

—Dr. Jayne H. Mohr, Associate Superintendent,
Traverse City (Michigan) Area Public Schools

“If educators, education scholars, and students want to delve into a refreshingly clear, overarching, and bold treatment of school-based learning, this is the book they are likely to enjoy and greatly benefit from. David Perkins, the well-known Harvard innovative intellectual, summarized years of synthesizing observations, reflections, and the accumulation of serious research, cutting through the Gordian Knot of learning theories, to yield this very well-written book, filled with penetrating wisdom—a must for all those interested in learning.”

—Gavriel Salomon, recipient of the Israel Award for
Scientific Achievements in Educational Research, Haifa University, Israel

“School administrators and policymakers need sturdy yet flexible ways to understand the complex and interdependent issues surrounding equitable learning. David Perkins provides such a framework through engaging metaphor and easily accessible prose. In Alameda County, we’ve benefited from his ideas for over five years in our work to engage the creativity of students, teachers, administrators, artists, families, and community members in making good on America’s promise of a high-quality education for every child.

We are fortunate to have found a scholar who speaks clearly and directly to practitioners about innovative theory and solid research. Such tools give us the support we need to develop and implement meaningful and relevant pedagogical strategies to grow the hearts and minds of the next generation of workers and citizens.”

—Sheila Jordan, superintendent, Alameda County Office
of Education (California)

“David Perkins is one of the great teachers of our time. In this insight-filled book, you can learn how he achieves his educational goals and how you can achieve yours as well.”

—Howard Gardner, Hobbs Professor of Cognition and
Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education;
author of *Five Minds for the Future*

Making Learning Whole

HOW SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF
TEACHING CAN TRANSFORM
EDUCATION

David N. Perkins

 **JOSSEY-BASS**
A Wiley Imprint
www.josseybass.com

Copyright © 2009 by David N. Perkins. All rights reserved.

Published by Jossey-Bass

A Wiley Imprint

989 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103-1741—www.josseybass.com

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400, fax 978-646-8600, or on the Web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, 201-748-6011, fax 201-748-6008, or online at www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

Readers should be aware that Internet Web sites offered as citations and/or sources for further information may have changed or disappeared between the time this was written and when it is read.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Jossey-Bass books and products are available through most bookstores. To contact Jossey-Bass directly call our Customer Care Department within the U.S. at 800-956-7739, outside the U.S. at 317-572-3986, or fax 317-572-4002.

Jossey-Bass also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Perkins, David N.

Making learning whole: how seven principles of teaching can transform education/David N. Perkins.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-470-38452-7 (cloth)

1. Learning. 2. Effective teaching. I. Title.

LB1060.P448 2009

371.102—dc22

2008036106

Printed in the United States of America

FIRST EDITION

HB Printing

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VII
	INTRODUCTION: A WHOLE NEW BALL GAME	I
I	PLAY THE WHOLE GAME	25
2	MAKE THE GAME WORTH PLAYING	53
3	WORK ON THE HARD PARTS	79
4	PLAY OUT OF TOWN	109
5	UNCOVER THE HIDDEN GAME	133
6	LEARN FROM THE TEAM	169
7	LEARN THE GAME OF LEARNING	193
	AFTERWORD: THE FUTURE OF LEARNING	213
	NOTES	227
	INDEX	243

To my father, who taught me how to play baseball and much more; and to my mother, who taught me how to be stoic and much more. I never achieved excellence in either one, but the lessons were important anyway.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A familiar saying recommends turning a problem into an opportunity. I suppose this book is an example of that, because its origins reflect what has been a perennial problem for me. These pages come from my own struggles to share ideas about learning with students at my home institution as well as teachers, educational administrators, mentors, organizational leaders, and even occasionally parents in a variety of settings. As I've pursued this mission over the years, I've striven to tell the whole story in a clear way.

The challenge is not one of arctic sparsity but rain forest abundance. There are too many ideas about learning that merit attention, too many from practical experience and too many from the research literature, ideas about human motivation, mastering difficult concepts, acquiring broad literacies, learning in groups, self-regulated learning, developing problem-solving and decision-making skills, and on and on. I've often felt frustrated about how to sort and bundle them into a coherent view that affords practical leverage. Until I sat down to write this book. The story told here certainly is not perfect, but I think at least it's an improvement on my scattered notes.

A little bit of digital archaeology in my computer files revealed this book's birthday: about four years ago. But for sure, the baby was not

born walking and talking. First there was the basic notion of learning by wholes and the metaphor of “playing the whole game,” with a few other concepts bundled loosely around it. Gradually the metaphor of the game expanded to “make the game worth playing,” “uncover the hidden game,” and other principles, eventually seven in all. Opportunities to share the story in various settings helped to expand and refine it. With considerably more thought and callused typing fingers, the results are before you today. I hope that you find them useful.

All this required a great deal of help. Appreciation goes to Piero Buscaglia, my administrative assistant at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, who assisted with reference work and some syntheses of relevant research. Thanks also to Lisa Frontado, my administrative assistant before Piero, who made similar contributions to the earlier stages. My wife and my youngest son, Tom, were victims of my efforts to try out possible titles and phrases for key concepts, so thanks to them as well.

Appreciation is also due to many colleagues at the Harvard Graduate School of Education with whom I’ve had conversations and collaborations over the years that feed into this volume, and to the sponsors of related research. Perhaps it is best here simply to recognize five principal lines of work. One is research on thinking and learning dispositions, where my principal colleagues over time have been Ron Ritchhart and Shari Tishman, with current sponsors Bialik College of Melbourne and the Abe and Vera Dorevitch Foundation, and earlier Peder Wallenberg and the Stiftelsen Carpe Vitam Foundation, and before that the MacArthur Foundation. Then there is research on teaching for understanding sponsored by the Spencer Foundation, with principal colleagues Howard Gardner, Vito Perrone, and Martha Stone Wiske. My principal colleagues for research on organizational learning and development have been Daniel Wilson and earlier Chris Unger, with current support by several corporate, nonprofit, and government affiliates and earlier by La Universidad de Bogotá Jorge Tadeo Lozano. Research on causality and understanding science, which began as a collaboration between Tina Grotzer and myself, has been taken much further by Tina, all with support from the National

Science Foundation. Finally, there is WIDE World, an initiative on widescale online teacher development, where my principal colleagues have been Martha Stone Wiske and David Zarowin, with invaluable support and counsel from Al and Kate Merck. I have learned from them all and from many others as well, and I have tried to identify specific contributions by appropriate references throughout the following pages.

Thanks are due to two academic institutions as well. Much of this book was completed during my sabbatical in calendar year 2007 from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, sabbaticals being one of the genuine and productive privileges of the academic life. Almost half of that was spent at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, where I was a fellow in spring 2007, joining a number of other scholars, most of them on sabbatical as well, for a mix of lively conversations and individual work.

Moving closer to the process of bringing these words to the world, I also want to thank my agent of many years, Faith Hamlin, and the firm of which she is a member, Sanford J. Greenburger Associates. Faith has long provided not only assistance in placing my writings but substantial counsel about content, organization, titles, and related matters. In the same breath, let me thank my editor at Jossey-Bass, Kate Bradford, for her close reading and helpful feedback toward the final version, as well as her confidence in the project in the first place.

So now, let the games begin . . .

Making Learning Whole

Introduction: A Whole New Ball Game

BASEBALL FOR ME WAS A TRIUMPH OF MEDIOCRITY. I WASN'T ESPECIALLY GOOD at it, but I wasn't awful either. This was an achievement because I didn't show much talent for sports in general. I was not bad at batting. A hit got this chunky child chugging around the bases, sometimes picked off but sometimes scoring. Perpetually assigned to the outfield because of my incompetence at catching, I would reliably miss the flies that came my way.

Maybe this mediocrity sounds dismal, but I was pleased with what I could do. I enjoyed playing baseball as one of a dozen ways I could spend a couple of hours on a summer afternoon. Moreover, in the years since those days I've come to an odd conclusion about those early learning experiences: The results were only so-so but the process was pretty good.

So what was the process? I remember my father teaching me to bat in our backyard. He showed me how to place my feet, how to hold the bat, how to swing. Keep your eye on the ball, he said—the familiar incantation! He pitched with a gentle underhand as I tried to get the hang of it all.

One summer I participated in Little League baseball. I didn't like the formality and elaborateness of it. Most people were taking the whole thing as seriously as a military campaign. Still, I did it: practiced catching, practiced batting, ran the bases, stood in the field, missed

the flies. With more fondness, I remember casual games in anybody's backyard, seven or eight kids, just two bases or maybe one, not bothering with nine innings, sometimes not even bothering to keep score, simply playing.

So why would I say the process was pretty good? In a gut sense it was pretty good because I enjoyed playing and learning. In a more analytical sense, it was pretty good because from the beginning I built up a feel for the whole game. I knew what hitting the ball or missing the ball got you. I knew about scoring runs and keeping score. I knew what I had to do to do well, even though I only pulled it off part of the time. I saw how it fit together.

All this sounds very ordinary, but I'm simply stunned when I think how rarely formal learning gives us a chance to learn the whole game from early on. When I and my buddies studied basic arithmetic, we had no real idea what the whole game of mathematics was about. (Maybe you're thinking: Well, how could you? You were just kids and mathematics is an elaborate technical discipline. But I'm not so sure that the basic shape of doing mathematics requires calculus or algebra or even fractions.) Or I think about learning the facts of the Civil War, without getting much of the sense of how anyone found out these facts or what one might do with them—say, compare them with other civil wars in other times and other nations. (Maybe you're thinking: Well, how else could one make a start for youngsters who don't know very much history to begin with. But I'm not so sure that one has to start in such a piecemeal manner.)

Put it this way: When I was playing baseball, most of the time I wasn't playing full-scale, four bases, nine innings. But I was playing a perfectly suitable junior version of the game. A junior version was just right for my size and stamina and the number of kids in the neighborhood. But when I was studying those shards of math and history, I wasn't playing a junior version of anything. It was kind of like batting practice without knowing the whole game. Why would anyone want to do that?

Of course, there was also a lot wrong with the way I learned baseball. For one thing, baseball wasn't a campaign for me, just a pastime, and really serious learning of almost anything has to be something of

a campaign. Even so, those sunny afternoons with the smell of grass and a bit of sweat and a cheap leather glove on my hand still linger in my mind. And today I wonder: Maybe learning most things should be more like learning how to play baseball.

Approaching Complexity

Some learning comes easy. You walk into a new shopping mall and quickly and almost automatically get oriented to the major landmarks: the bookstore, the department store, the electronics store, the food court. We soak up first languages quite spontaneously. The time-on-task is enormous, but the process is so programmed into human nature and so socially supported and so woven into the activities of everyday life that it happens with little deliberate attention.

However, much of what we need to learn poses significant challenges. Baseball is a complicated game, not at all like walking into a shopping mall and almost automatically getting oriented. So is basic arithmetic or algebra, reading, understanding literature, scientific inquiry and the scientific worldview, historical understanding and its relevance to current times. Also challenging are less academic areas, such as management and leadership, sustaining good relationships with other people, and social responsibility.

In all these cases education formal or informal faces its most fundamental and general problem: approaching complexity. Education aims to help people learn what they cannot simply pick up as they go along. Education always has to ask what can be done to make challenging knowledge and practices accessible.

This question becomes particularly acute in formal settings of learning such as schools and universities, with large numbers of people and vast amounts of content. Here are the two most popular answers to approaching complexity:

1. *Elements first.* Ramp into complexity gradually by learning elements now and putting them together later.

2. *Learning about.* Learn about something to start with, rather than learning to do it.

Let's look at them in turn.

Approaching complexity by way of elements has enormous appeal. Starting with elements first works quite well for producing cars on an assembly line out of drivetrains, engines, and tires. It works quite well for fashioning prefabricated houses out of walls and windows and roofs. The logic of assembly is so natural that one finds elements first in almost any niche of learning from kindergarten to corporate training. Students study elements of arithmetic such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, with the promise that eventually they will have a chance to put them together to solve meaningful problems. Students study the elements of grammar with the idea that the knowledge will later coalesce into comprehensive, compelling, and of course correct written and oral communications.

The problem is that elements don't make much sense in the absence of the whole game, and the whole game only shows up much later if at all. For instance, very little that schools ask youngsters to do around arithmetic is a good example of how arithmetic gets used in everyday life, and there is hardly anything early on worth calling mathematical thinking. Or take writing: I remember discovering with alarm that my youngest son had learned all the elements of writing, but his teachers rarely asked him or any of the other students in his classes to do much extended writing. So troubling is this trend of approaching things through elements with the whole game nowhere in sight or a minimal presence that I like to name it as a disease: *elementitis*.

I remember sharing some of these ideas with a group once, and a lady put up her hand with an interesting puzzle: "I have two daughters who are very different from one another. One likes just to dive in, but the other one likes to take things a piece at a time and feel well prepared before attempting 'the whole game.' Isn't that okay?"

Sure it is. *Elementitis* does not mean learning a few elements and putting them together into the whole game right away. Elements first can be a good short-term strategy. *Elementitis* means week after week,

even year after year of focusing on elements with very little of the whole game ever played.

It would be comforting to think of *elementitis* as a rare disease. Not so. Common experience testifies to its common character. So does hard evidence. In *The Right to Learn*, Stanford educator Linda Darling-Hammond logs how narrow curriculum standards, bloated textbooks, and the pressure for coverage have led to a piecemeal curriculum. Every conceivable topic gets its fifteen minutes of fame. In a 2007 *Educational Researcher* synthesis of multiple sources, Wayne Au reports how the influence of the U.S. No Child Left Behind policy has both narrowed and fractured the curriculum. What's not relevant to the test gets dumped and what is relevant gets chopped up into test-sized bites. This doesn't have to happen. Some schools manage the challenges of No Child Left Behind better, and some states test in more meaningful ways. It doesn't have to happen . . . but it's the trend.

Harvard psychologist Ellen Langer would characterize such education as *mindless*. For decades, Langer has sustained a rich line of research on mindfulness and mindlessness, demonstrating that in many ordinary circumstances people fall into blind and narrow patterns of thought and behavior, muddling up situations where they could proceed more thoughtfully. However, people can cultivate a more mindful flexible stance, open to new information and aware of multiple perspectives. In *The Power of Mindful Learning*, Langer warns of the general trend in education toward mindless patterns of learning and shows how it need not be that way. One particular hazard akin to *elementitis* is the idea that the basics must be mastered so well that they become second nature. Another is a culture of deferred gratification, with the rewards of actually "playing the game" always coming later.

Now let's consider the other almost universal strategy for approaching complexity, learning *about* something toward learning to do it. Reading and mathematics generally escape this, since students certainly learn to do, but learning *about* dominates early learning in disciplines such as history and science. Typical history instruction has been characterized as learning "other people's facts." It's acquiring information about a particular version of history, with very little thoughtful

interpretation or critical perspective. One might equally well describe the typical study of science as learning “someone else’s theories.” Students become familiar with Newton’s laws or the steps involved in mitosis to the point where they can perform well on the quiz or the problems at the end of the chapter. However, a huge body of research on science understanding demonstrates that learners show very limited understanding, bedeviled by a range of misconceptions about what the ideas really mean.

A certain amount of learning *about*, just like a certain amount of elements first, is fine. The problem is overdoing it. The problem is endless learning about something without ever getting better at doing it. So, to parallel *elementitis*, I like to call endless learning about *aboutitis*. Yes, it lets learners acquire some information about the French Revolution and the American Revolution, mitosis and meiosis, the positions of the planets, continental drift, and the tensions of race and status in *Othello*. But this only provides a kind of an informational backdrop rather than an empowering and enlightening body of understanding.

Nor is the problem of *aboutitis* limited to the earlier years of education. Professional education suffers enormously from *aboutitis*, including teacher education, where teachers sit through innumerable sessions concerning learning theory and classroom dynamics with a shockingly small percentage of their time spent playing the game of teaching in various practice roles in schools.

In case *elementitis* and *aboutitis* seem too harsh a characterization of the norms of formal learning, let me acknowledge that even *elementitis* and *aboutitis* can do good up to a point. In less-developed countries starting from hardly anything, traditional straightforward teaching can have quite an impact. Teachers with some measure of teacher education, textbooks in the classrooms, acquisition of basic literacy and numeracy, and general knowledge of the subject matters—all these can be important. The complaint about *elementitis* and *aboutitis* is not that they don’t accomplish anything but that we could accomplish so much more.

The natural question is how? The problem of approaching complexity is very real. What option is there besides either taking something

complicated element by element and putting it together much later or only learning about it for quite a while? What else can one do?

An attractive answer is already at hand. It's the notion of the junior version. Remember those simpler versions of baseball that my buddies and I played in backyards on summer afternoons: not element by element, not information about, but engaging junior versions. This is a fundamentally different way of conceptualizing how to approach complexity, and a fundamentally more powerful one. It lets learners in on the big picture, so that the challenges along the way become meaningful. And it gives learners a chance to develop the largely tacit knowledge involved in active engagement, the kind of knowledge we point to when we speak of having a sense of the game or getting the hang of the game.

It suggests a different way of thinking about teaching and learning. More on junior versions later, but let's jump in. Let's look at the entire concept in summary form.

Seven Principles of Learning

So, what if learning most things could be more like learning how to play baseball, or other activities we usually learn as wholes? Learning most other sports works the same way. Most games such as bridge or checkers or chess or backgammon are learned as wholes. And so are the arts: From the start, one spends much of the time crafting whole drawings or paintings or poems. Likewise with musical performance: From the very beginning, one sings entire songs and plays entire pieces. So let me try to outline a general way of thinking about good learning that follows the spirit of learning how to play baseball or play an instrument or paint a landscape.

By "general" I mean something that can work in just about any place and for just about anyone at all. I'm not only speaking of classrooms or church groups or on-the-job learning. And it can be applied to pretty much anything you might imagine—the theory of relativity, skating, calculus, making and keeping friends, business management,

the poetry of T. S. Eliot, speaking Mandarin, making beds or making quilts. It really doesn't matter, because the big principles are the same.

In the spirit of learning the whole game, we can call this broad view *learning by wholes* and divide it into seven principles. I will list these principles here, go over each of them briefly in this chapter, and then explore them more fully in the later chapters.

THE SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF LEARNING BY WHOLES

1. Play the whole game.
2. Make the game worth playing.
3. Work on the hard parts.
4. Play out of town.
5. Uncover the hidden game.
6. Learn from the team . . . and the other teams.
7. Learn the game of learning.

I. Play the Whole Game

Another thing my father taught me besides how to hold a bat was how to play checkers. We began with the whole game, and I won the first game I ever played. He explained the rules briefly, reminded me of them as we went along, let me take my time, and amazingly, I captured all his pieces!

A little too amazingly even for the young and naïve kid I was. "Did you let me win?" "Yes," my father confessed, honest to a fault as always.

"Don't do that!" I complained. "Okay," my father responded. He was a man with considerable quiet pride, and he could understand my pride too. From then on for two or three years, before the habit fell away as these things do, the two of us would play from time to time, but I never ever beat him again! Still, I got considerably better and I had fun anyway. I enjoyed the process of learning the whole game, whether I won or not.

We can ask ourselves when we begin to learn anything, do we engage some accessible version of the whole game early and often? When we do, we get what might be called a “threshold experience,” a learning experience that gets us past initial disorientation and into the game. From there it’s easier to move forward in a meaningful motivated way.

Much of formal education is short on threshold experiences. It feels like learning the pieces of a picture puzzle that never gets put together, or learning about the puzzle without being able to touch the pieces. In contrast, getting some version of a whole game close to the beginning makes sense because it gives the enterprise more meaning. You may not do it very well, but at least you know what you’re doing and why you’re doing it.

2. Make the Game Worth Playing

Schools and other settings of learning ask us to do many things that aren’t all that enthralling. We feel as though we are playing the school game and not the *real* game. We learn the ritual of inverting and multiplying to divide fractions, a numerical somersault with mysterious motives that hardly anyone understands . . . it’s just what you do. Or we memorize the dates of the presidents or the wives of Henry VIII, or we practice crafting paragraphs with good topic sentences.

Now and again some pushy student asks the deflating question, “Why are we studying this?” The answer forthcoming from the teacher or maybe anticipated by the text pretty much has to be something like this: “You’ll need to know it later.” “You need it for the test.” “It’s on the objectives for this unit.”

So what makes a game seem worth playing? In fact, we’ve already seen one of the simplest contributing factors: Play the *whole* game. Inverting and multiplying, memorizing names and dates, practicing paragraph structure, these are bits and pieces that make sense in the context of the whole game. But they don’t make sense unless the whole game of mathematical thinking or historical understanding or discursive and expressive writing gets played often enough in a junior

way to make it familiar. Playing the whole game clarifies what makes the game worth playing, because you see right away how things fit together.

To be sure, some whole games are not all that interesting to most learners and no one is going to be interested in everything. Even so, whole games help, and artful teachers use many other ways to connect learners with what's interesting about a topic. The full importance of a topic is not always going to be apparent at once. Even so, there are many honest ways to preview the importance of something instead of just saying, "You'll need to know it later."

3. Work on the Hard Parts

My parents played bridge regularly with another couple for many years. Eventually I learned to play bridge also and tag-teamed into the game sometimes, or my wife and I played with my parents. Only then did I become aware that my parents weren't getting any better. They were doing and doing, but not learning by doing.

Think about something that you've done for a number of years. Very often, you will find that you're not getting any better at it. The missing ingredient is usually our third principle: Work on the hard parts. At the very beginning of learning something this isn't as important as getting oriented to the whole enterprise. However, as the learner settles into the pattern of activity, the hard parts start to emerge.

The hard parts have an annoying characteristic: They do not always get better just through playing the whole game. Real improvement depends on deconstructing the game, singling out the hard parts for special attention, practicing them on the side, developing strategies to deal with them better, and reintegrating them soon into the whole game. Batting practice!

Normal schooling includes significant work on the hard parts. That's good. But there's usually not enough of this kind of work, and it's not individually targeted. As I think back on my schooling, all the way from kindergarten through university, it's amazing how rarely I had the chance to revise anything to strengthen the hard parts.

Shortly after handing something in, I would get a few corrections back with comments like “95 percent,” “70 percent,” “nice point,” “needs further evidence”—not enough information to diagnose effectively exactly what was hard about the hard parts and no chance to tune them up because we were already continuing on to the next topic.

4. Play Out of Town

Back to baseball: There’s the home-field advantage phenomenon. When the Boston Red Sox get to play in Boston’s Fenway Park, not only do they benefit from the support of an enthusiastic crowd, but also from familiarity with some very definite quirks of the stadium. You can talk about the home-field advantage for any sport, but it’s particularly significant in baseball, where various stadiums around the country have their own idiosyncratic layouts.

The dark side of home-field advantage is the away disadvantage. When the Boston Red Sox play out of town, it’s a problem, but it’s also a learning opportunity. The new setting challenges the players to stretch and adapt their skills and insights. They can find out how best to capitalize on a different circumstance, and maybe generalize what they learn so that the next away-from-home stadium after that becomes a little less of an away disadvantage.

Does a different setting matter that much? Looking across sports, this varies a lot. For sports played indoors on highly standardized courts it matters least. In contrast, football commonly brings traveling teams to weather they are not used to, say, playing in a blizzard. In tennis, differences between grass, clay, and hard courts influence considerably who has the best chance in a tournament. The extreme team sport of adventure racing deliberately places small teams in wilderness areas unfamiliar to them. They need to figure out their own routes between designated stations to cover long distances over dangerous terrain as quickly as possible. A systematic study of adventure racing conducted by my colleague Daniel Wilson reveals the remarkably complex and tricky interactions among team members as they cope and learn in the midst of races. Adventure racers are *always* playing out of town!

Beyond sports, the same out-of-town phenomenon applies in various degrees to learning anything. The whole point of formal education is to prepare for other times and other places, not just to get better in the classroom. What we learn today is not for today but for the day after tomorrow. Sometimes the day after tomorrow is pretty much the same as today, but it very often isn't.

The trouble is, in formal education usually no one sends us out of town to play and broaden our experience. The ideas and algorithms in mathematics are very general, but in practice students focus on a few stereotyped exercises about trains or sailboats or buying apples. The ideas about good citizenship are very general, but in practice students focus on a couple of stories about voting or community service. Even the classroom across the hall may be too far away. One of my favorite quips about learning, remembered for many years, came from a high school science teacher bemoaning his students' troubles applying mathematics to science along these lines: "It's as though walking across the hall from the math room to the science room, the students forget their math."

Researchers call this the problem of *transfer of learning*. Playing out of town well is not something that happens automatically. Like other facets of learning, it's something we have to work on.

5. Uncover the Hidden Game

Look up "baseball hidden game" on the Internet and one of the first hits you will see is *The Hidden Game of Baseball*, a 1984 book by John Thorn and Pete Palmer. In most people's minds, baseball and math probably do not sit in the same category, but *The Hidden Game of Baseball* brings them together. It's a statistical perspective on baseball, why baseball games and whole seasons play out the way they do, and what smart strategy looks like.

What is true for baseball is true for just about any endeavor—literary criticism, making and sustaining friends, mathematical modeling, playing the stock market, making peace, making war, making art—there is always the hidden game. In fact "the" hidden game understates the matter. Any complicated and challenging activity always has

multiple layers beneath the obvious. Baseball and physics both have their statistical sides, their strategic sides, and even their political sides. There is also a very interesting physics of baseball, although I'm not sure that there is a baseball of physics.

The hidden games are not only interesting but often important to doing well at the surface game. Coaches and managers have to pay attention to the statistical trends in batting and pitching and play the odds. In playing chess, it's essential to attend to broad strategic considerations such as control of the center. In learning science concepts, it's important to have some feel for the underlying principles of causality involved in various scientific theories. Often they are very different from everyday conceptions of causality. Without a sense of the hidden game, you are likely to misunderstand what's going on.

A great deal of learning proceeds as if there were no hidden games. But there always are. They need attention or the learners will always just be skating on the surface.

6. Learn from the Team . . . and the Other Teams

Do your own work! If there were Ten Commandments for the conduct of pupils, this is a pretty good candidate for the top of the list; good by the measure of common practice but odd by the measure of how society works. Hardly anything we do is done solo. No matter whether you are an athlete, a business person, a scientist, a trash collector, or a clerk, you are almost always coordinating with other people in a complex way. Human endeavor is deeply and intrinsically collective, except in schools.

That is why on this list of seven principles for learning we find "learn from the team . . . and the other teams." It's actually very hard to learn well from a single source, from a passive text or from a teacher who has many others to attend to besides yourself. Much better is a personal coach, but most individuals cannot afford that, nor can most societies afford to provide personal coaches for any process of wide-scale learning! And even that personal coach can only tell you about the art and craft of coordinating with others on whatever team you're on, not do it for you.