

Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness.

Linda Darling-Hammond, Deborah Holtzman, Su Jin Gatlin, Julian Vasquez Heilig

<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n42.2005>

DEPTH	EXPERTISE	VOICE	GENERATED
Overview (10-15 min)	Balanced	Alloy	July 04, 2026

At the center of American education policy for the past two decades has been a deceptively simple question with enormous consequences: does formal teacher preparation actually matter for student learning, or can raw academic ability and subject knowledge substitute for professional training? That question drove real battles. The No Child Left Behind Act's "highly qualified teacher" requirement, the rise of alternative certification routes, and the cultural moment of Teach for America — all of these were, at bottom, arguments about whether credentials and coursework matter, or whether bright, motivated people can simply walk into a classroom and teach. The U.S. Department of Education's 2002 report even argued for redefining teacher qualifications to emphasize verbal ability and content knowledge while dismissing education coursework as "burdensome." Linda Darling-Hammond, Deborah Holtzman, Su Jin Gatlin, and Julian Vasquez Heilig set out to answer the question empirically, with data large enough to cut through the ideology.

Their study uses a student-level longitudinal dataset from the Houston Independent School District, covering the years from 1995 through 2002. Student-level longitudinal means they could follow the same children across years and match each child to the specific teacher in each grade. The full dataset covered more than two hundred seventy thousand students and over fifteen thousand teachers. The focused fourth- and fifth-grade analysis linked one hundred thirty-two thousand seventy-one students to four thousand four hundred eight teachers. Achievement was measured on six outcomes: reading and mathematics from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, reported as the Texas Learning Index; the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth

Edition; and the Aprenda, a Spanish-language assessment. Three tests, two subjects each.

To isolate the effect of certification, the team ran student-level regression models — statistical tools that hold other factors constant so you can see the contribution of the variable you care about. Their models controlled for students' prior-year test scores, race and ethnicity, free and reduced-price lunch eligibility, limited English proficiency, teacher experience, teacher degree level, class size, the average prior score in each classroom, and school demographics. They also ran hierarchical linear models — a more sophisticated approach that accounts for students being nested within classrooms and classrooms within schools. Both methods pointed in the same direction.

The core finding is this: certified teachers consistently produced stronger student achievement gains than uncertified teachers, across all six tests and across the full six-year span. The pooled regression coefficients for uncertified teachers relative to standard-certified teachers were negative on five of the six outcome measures and statistically significant on most. For Texas Assessment of Academic Skills math, the coefficient was negative zero point five three, significant at a p-value below zero point zero zero one. For reading, negative zero point five eight. For Stanford Achievement Test math and reading, negative zero point four one and negative zero point five two respectively. For Aprenda math, negative one point four one. Only Aprenda reading fell short of significance. These aren't just statistically meaningful — they represent real gaps in how much students learned in a year. And crucially, these differences held even after controlling for teacher experience and degree level. So it's not simply that certified teachers happen to be more experienced or more educated. Certification itself is carrying independent weight.

Now, Teach for America — TFA — is where the findings get culturally pointed. TFA recruits — recent graduates of selective universities, several weeks of summer training, then placed on emergency permits in high-need schools — were presented by advocates as proof that strong academic backgrounds and mission-driven commitment could substitute for traditional preparation. The Houston data tests that claim directly. Uncertified TFA recruits showed significant negative effects on student achievement gains relative to standard-certified teachers on five of six tests. In grade-equivalent terms, students taught by uncertified TFA teachers could expect to achieve between one-half month and three months less over the course of a year than students of standard-certified teachers. That's a meaningful gap for a child. Compared to other uncertified teachers, uncertified TFA recruits performed about the same — no better, no worse.

The one genuinely hopeful finding for TFA is also the most bittersweet. Recruits who completed their preparation and earned standard certification — typically by their second or third year — performed about as well as other certified teachers. On Texas Assessment of Academic Skills math, they actually outperformed other certified teachers by just over one month in grade-equivalent terms. So the certification effect holds for TFA too: preparation is what drives performance, not the program's selection advantage.

Here's where the irony lands. Most TFA teachers reached that certified, on-par level exactly when they were leaving. Across Houston cohorts, between fifty-seven and ninety percent of TFA recruits had left teaching after their second year. Between seventy-two and one hundred percent were gone after their third year — attrition rates roughly twice as high as for non-TFA beginning teachers. The recruits who developed into effective teachers — the ones who got certified, who learned the craft — were the ones cycling out just as their students started benefiting.

There's one more layer to the TFA findings worth sitting with. The effects weren't uniform across years. In the year from 1998 to 1999, when TFA candidates in Houston were more likely to be certified, their effects on student learning were most positive. In the years from 2001 to 2002, when they were less likely to be certified, they produced negative effects on five of six tests. The pattern runs in exactly the direction the broader finding predicts: certification tracks performance, year by year.

Darling-Hammond and colleagues are honest about the limits of what this study can claim. The results are specific to Houston between 1995 and 2002. The comparison group matters — the relative effectiveness of any teacher group, they write, "must be evaluated in a specific context at a particular point in time." They flag selection concerns: if stronger teachers are the ones who complete certification and stay, some of the certification effect might reflect who chooses to certify rather than what certification provides. They also flag open questions about cumulative effects on students who cycle through multiple uncertified teachers across several grades.

On that cumulative question, the paper offers a sobering projection: if the effects measured in fourth and fifth grade generalize across earlier grades, students in schools with the most uncertified teachers cycling through classrooms could lose roughly one to two years of academic ground between kindergarten and sixth grade. The authors present it carefully — it's an extrapolation, not a direct finding. But it frames what's at stake when staffing decisions become policy.

Two policy implications run through the discussion. First, recruiting and retaining fully prepared teachers produces the biggest immediate gains in student learning. Second, where districts rely on alternative pathways into teaching, those programs need close supervision, timely pathways to full certification, and real incentives for longer commitments — so the gains from training are realized in the same classrooms where the training happens. Darling-Hammond and colleagues point to Houston's own trajectory, where the share of fully certified teachers rose from about fifty-six percent in 1996 to sixty-seven percent in 2001, and to programs like the North Carolina Teaching Fellows, which retained more than seventy-five percent of participants after seven years.

This research landed in the middle of a heated national argument about who should teach America's children, and it produced an answer that cut against the policy mood of the moment. The argument then — and to some degree still — was that credentials are gatekeeping, that talented people are being kept out of classrooms by bureaucratic requirements, that what matters is who you are, not what courses you've taken. What Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, and Heilig found, across one hundred thirty-two thousand students and six years of data, is that preparation leaves a measurable trace in student learning. Not the program someone attended, not the prestige of their university, not their passion. The preparation itself.

This lecture was created by ennepō.

Go to <https://ennepo.ai> to Discover, Create and Follow the latest research in your field.

Read when you can. Listen when you want to.

CREDITS

AI-generated lecture by ennepō.ai, adapted from:

- “Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness.”, Linda Darling-Hammond, Deborah Holtzman, Su Jin Gatlin, Julian Vasquez Heilig (Education Policy Analysis Archives, 2005). doi:10.14507/epaa.v13n42.2005. CC-BY-SA (<https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/cclicenses/>)

Restructured, summarized and explained. Not endorsed by the authors.

This lecture (script and audio) is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

<https://ennepo.ai/lecture/6101cfa3-e432-46ce-94a3-fc3fce5a9e9d>

Generated by ennepō