A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

By

JEANE WALKER YATES

Bachelor of Arts
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
1948

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1972

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1975

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

Thesis Approved:

Idella Lohmann
Thesis Adviser

Kenneth St. Clair

Larry M. Perkins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

How does one really say thanks and convey all the depth of meaning that wells up when facing the opportunity offered by this page? Words are inadequate but convention dictates acknowledging people directly involved and rightly so. The author is extremely grateful to the many friends who had consistent words of kindness and encouragement every step of the way.

To several who have given a particular part of their being to this study, may the following be extended:

To Dr. Idella Lohmann, chairman, thanks for a generous investment of time, guidance, support and interest;

To Dr. Robert Purvis, thanks for your gentle assistance;

To Dr. Bernie Belden, thanks for your sincerity and purpose;

To Dr. Larry Perkins, thanks for encouragement;

To Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, thanks for inspiration and for being you.

It would have been impossible to complete this study without the cooperation of personnel in Stillwater Public Schools and my special thanks goes to them. Special thanks also to you, Dr. Bill Elsom, for sharing your time and knowledge.

To my family members who have encouraged and supported me in a way that only love can, Thank you, Thank you. Peggy and John, you are beautiful. David, you are marvelous. Kyle, you are fantastic!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The concern for quality education has given rise to countless innovative endeavors over the last half century. Many of these endeavors, though noble in intent, have been shortlived and of questionable value. Nevertheless, the search continues. The increasing interest in teacher education centers reflects the continuing concern for quality education programs.

In a monograph published jointly by The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Leadership Training Institute on Educational Personnel Development and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, dated November 1974, Schmieder and Yarger make this commitment:

> Of all the new concepts in American education today, the teaching center is probably the most widely accepted as having significant promise for improving the quality of instruction in our schools.[1]

At least two reasons exist for the quick acceptance of the teacher education centers. This particular educational reform has been initiated jointly by two educational components that historically have had discordant constituencies--the public schools and the university. Secondly, being initiated jointly, "this is one movement in which the accent is on the positive--a welcome and much needed thrust in American education."[2]

Cooperation has long been considered a virtue. Further, in the

school setting cooperation is claimed as a professional goal of the education process.[3] Whether cooperation is a rational basis for quality education, however, may be a critical question. When people interrelate, especially in a joint endeavor, changes often occur. Attitudinal changes, as well as knowledge changes may affect the interpretation of both process and product. Teacher centering as a repository for bringing together theory and practice, preservice and inservice efforts and a general bridging of educational gaps, offers opportunity for significant observation.

The Problem

The problem with which this study deals grew out of planning in November 1973 to implement a teacher education center in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Although several thousand centers are currently known to be in existence, the very nature of centers defies exclusive or discrete definition.[4] Each teacher center in America is unique to the extent that it services a locally or territorially identified need. Generalizations regarding personnel and development therefore must be extracted for evaluation and professional assistance in other developmental programs.

The crucial issue concerning teacher education centers is whether they accomplish what they set out to accomplish. At the onset of the Stillwater experimental teacher center, it was noted by planners that systematic observations and records would be invaluable to developmental progress and the maximizing of program goals.[5] This descriptive study was primarily concerned with knowledge and attitudinal changes that occur in personnel from the two institutions

currently responsible for professional training--the university and the public schools--when they are brought together in a joint venture.

Background Material

In the spring of 1974 a steering committee was established to study the possible involvement of the Stillwater public school system and the Oklahoma State University College of Education in a cooperative program to provide better training of prospective elementary teachers. In the fall of 1974, after studying existing national programs with preservice and inservice components, Phase I (preservice education) of a teacher education center was begun in Stillwater, Oklahoma. The title selected by the steering committee for the program was ONSITE (Oklahoma Nucleus for School Involvement in Teacher Education).

According to Schmieder and Yarger, it normally takes about twenty years or more for a new innovation to work its way into the mainstream of American education.[6] However, this has not been true of teacher centers. A rough extrapolation of data gathered in a 1973 National Teaching Center Survey indicated that there could be as many as 4,500 sites perceived as being in some way associated with the teaching center movement.[7] One of the apparent reasons for its popularity is because teacher centers lack a specific definition.[8] Actually, a teacher center is limited only by the restrictions those involved want to place upon it. Often the words which frame the name indicate the main focus of that particular center. Other names commonly used for the teaching center are: teacher center, learning center, staff development center, teacher education center, educational cooperative and training complex. Besides these there are many unusual names such

as Master Inservice Plan, UNITE (United Neighborhoods in Teacher Education), and MEIL (Movement to Encourage Improved Learning). There are more than 200 different titles for the 600 sites studied in the 1973 Survey alone.[9] This pliant structure, of course, may eventuate as a strength or a weakness. The program may be designed to meet the needs of a particular community or situation. Therefore, teacher centering has been found to be desirable as a tool of education for teachers. The Stillwater, Oklahoma community, then is joining the many communities in America as well as communities in other countries such as England, Holland and Japan, in developing a teacher education center concept.[10]

Need for the Study

Personnel in teacher education at Oklahoma State University and in the Stillwater public schools recognized the need for field experiences in preservice training that would provide earlier contact with children in the classroom and extend the time in which university students work with children prior to student teaching. Thus the immediate research is significant to future planning in teacher education at Oklahoma State University. Nationally, there is a very heavy emphasis being placed on field education or on-site courses and experiences where use of resources can be maximized. Open philosophical stances are encouraging more practical and meaningful curriculum designs. Combs stresses that teacher education must be responsible for developing people who can both acquire and act upon knowledge. To effectively utilize learning theories, he says that we must involve students personally, in and out of the classroom. If learning is

mostly the responsibility of the student, then according to Combs, direct experience should increase the extent and retention of learning.[11]

For years complaints have filtered back and forth through educational channels concerning unrealistic approaches to teacher training. Public school administrators, classroom teachers, community members and educational technologists have all voiced serious doubt as to whether a single system can satisfactorily meet all the needs of teacher preparation. The NDEA Task Force publication, Teachers for the Real World, says that university personnel and facilities are not adequate to carry on the necessary training for school personnel.[12] Perhaps the consortium element incorporated in the teacher center concept will not only offer a means to bridge the gap between theoretical and clinical training of both preservice and inservice teachers, but might also offer a means to close the gap which has existed for so long between the university and the school system.

Although many affirmations are to be found in professional literature concerning the teacher center concept, many cautionary voices are also being raised from within the center movement, as well as from the outside. Judith Ruchkin, working at the University of Maryland, as late as summer 1974 reiterates the plea of many program designers for empirical findings rather than mere exhortations. Concerning research she states:

> While the efficacy of these efforts remains to be demonstrated, and the context and/or process variables responsible for differential outcomes remain largely unidentified, these shared endeavors are worthy of systematic inquiry. For those concerned with characteristics of education environments, a focus on the development and structure of a dual institutional venture is particularly illuminating.[13]

In drawing implications from an investigation called the Teacher Education Center for Urban Schools (TECUS), Ruchkin strongly urges:

> Those currently contemplating the initiation of interinstitutional professional training--or retraining--efforts would do well to insist upon the inclusion of a research and evaluation component in all phases of such projects. Constant program monitoring would serve to provide data for ongoing decision making as well as to determine eventual worth.[14]

Another pressure which has brought about positive action is the favorable view given to the center concept by Federal grants supporting innovative ideas in teacher preparation. A number of demonstration centers were started by Task Force '72 of the United States Office of Education.[15] In the past decade there has been much increased concern for and support of such ideas. Among those well publicized is the Ford Foundation's Comprehensive School Improvement Program which supported what have sometimes been referred to as "lighthouse schools".[16] Although the Stillwater/OSU venture is not funded federally, it is not beyond the hopes of those involved that successful experimentation coupled with an enthusiastic imaginative proposal might eventuate in some federal support.

Significance of the Investigation

Teacher centering as a well designed process for systemic educational improvement is well under way in America. According to a study by Emmitt D. Smith, coordinator of the Texas Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, "approximately one-third of the states have passed legislation and/or administrative regulations which . . . relate to the teacher center movement in the U. S." (18 out of 50).[17] He further states that the other two-thirds of the states consider

their involvement to be at the study level. Oklahoma has not been mandated to establish centers; but they have arisen from recognized needs within the profession. At this point in time, the immediate teacher education center, the Stillwater/OSU venture, is internally motivated by those involved in order to improve the student teacher program, to unite the preservice and inservice educational development programs more successfully, to renew the vigor and vision of educational personnel and to bring together local educational constituencies such as teachers, students, administrators, supervisors, university staff and interested community people for the purpose of sharing experiences and resources.

This particular study should add knowledge in the following areas:

1. Alternatives for effective programs for teachers
2. Role clarification of center participants
3. Identification of immediate problems in teacher education
4. Positive activities and experiences for preservice and inservice teachers
5. Attitudinal changes among personnel involved in a cooperative venture in teacher preparation and education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what changes occur in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers, professors, associate teachers and principals when they are involved in establishing and maintaining a teacher education center. Specifically, the focus of

this study was on the following questions:

Regarding the teachers:

1) What were the expressed attitudes of classroom teachers toward a teacher education center when the plan was first proposed?
2) What effect does the teacher education center have on teachers' attitudes toward educational theory?
3) How do teachers involved in the teacher education center feel about having professors in their immediate environment?
4) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the teacher?
5) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the teacher?

Regarding the professors:

1) What effect does the teacher education center have on the professors' attitude toward classroom teachers' ability to relate theory to practice?
2) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the professors?
3) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the professors?
4) How do methods taught in the regular sessions on campus for student teachers differ from methods taught at the teacher education center site for associate teachers?

Regarding the associate teachers:

1) In what activities do associate teachers engage in a teacher education center?
2) Do associate teachers feel confident in the areas of

instruction and classroom management as a result of involvement in the teacher education center? If so, how?

3) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the associate teachers?

4) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the associate teacher?

Regarding the principals:

1) To what degree do principals feel responsible for preservice and inservice education of teachers?

2) What role do principals take in the teacher education center?

3) What types of feedback do principals get from teachers involved in the teacher education center?

4) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the principals?

5) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the principals?

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study the following assumptions were posited:

1. That communication is one basis for attitude and knowledge change.

2. That the interview techniques used for data collection are valid for this particular study.

3. That personnel involved in the establishing of a teacher education center will respond to the study accurately since

they are volunteers.

4. That personnel interviewed will respond honestly to the questions since the interviewer assured them of anonymity.

5. That this teacher center is a cooperative venture.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are presented to provide the reader a point of reference for terms used in this study.

Teacher center concept. The teacher center concept consists of

> a place, in situ or in changing locations, which develops programs for the training and improvement of educational personnel (inservice teachers, preservice teachers, administrators, para-professionals, college teachers, etc.) in which the participating personnel have an opportunity to share successes, to utilize a wide range of education resources, and to receive training specifically related to their most pressing teaching problems.[18]

Teacher centering. This is another term which refers to the process of establishing teacher centers.

Teacher education center, ONSITE program. The local experimental program in Stillwater, Oklahoma utilizing the teaching center concept identified itself with the title, ONSITE program. The letters stand for Oklahoma Nucleus for School Involvement in Teacher Education. The teacher education center is a local adaptation of the overall center concept. The program is in Phase I with preservice in focus. This teacher education center consists of three cooperating public schools and one university.

ONSITE classroom. A specific room set aside in one school for use by center personnel (associate teachers, professors, teachers). Methods courses, educational psychology and audio-visual aids are taught in this room with easy access to elementary children. Adjacent to this room is an observation room so this room is also used for demonstration lessons and feedback by professors and teachers.

Associate teacher. This term is applied specifically to the university students involved in the ONSITE program. They take methods courses in the ONSITE classroom and are in a clinical setting in the classroom with the teacher one and a half hours, four days weekly for the entire year preceding their student teaching experience.

Student teacher. This is the student who is in the regular student teaching program on campus. His/her methods and student teaching experience are blocked into one semester, usually during the senior year at college.

Inservice program. This term refers to the instructional and professional development program designed to enrich teachers already certified and employed.

Preservice program. This is the instructional program developed for educational purposes to benefit future teachers or teachers in training.

Limitations of the Study

Though descriptive techniques were used throughout the study, it is necessary to describe the limitations which are inherent.

1. Reliability of the study was affected by the difficulty of recording and reporting responses to unstructured, non-directive questions.
2. A random sample of the population was not obtained. Because of uncontrolled factors, it should be apparent that the findings of this investigation can be generalized beyond the population from which the sample was selected only if the limitations are fully recognized.

Organization of the Study

This study is reported in five chapters. Chapter I is an introductory chapter stating the problem which establishes validity for the study. Theoretical foundations are asserted within the chapter subdivisions.

Chapter II represents a review of selected literature and research. A brief history of teacher centers is related and the typology and characteristics of teacher centers is reviewed. Selected demonstrative models are discussed.

Chapter III is a presentation of the research methodology utilized in this study. Procedures for data collection and the instrument are presented.

Chapter IV is a presentation of the analysis of the data and Chapter V includes a summarization of the study and presents conclusions and recommendations for further research, and further considerations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene," (Washington, D. C., November, 1974), p. ix.

[2] Ibid., p. ix.

[3] Judith Ruchkin, "Teacher Centers: How Does One School-College Collaboration Work?" Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Summer, 1974), p. 171.

[4] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), p. 5.

[5] Idella Lohmann and steering committee members, personal interviews, (April, 1974).

[6] Schmieder and Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, p. 5.

[7] Ibid., p. 9.

[8] William L. Smith, "A * by Any Other Name," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), p. 2.

[9] Schmieder and Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education XXV, p. 6.

[10] M. Vere DeVault, "Teacher Centers: An International Concept," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), pp. 37-39.

[11] Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers, (Boston, 1965).

[12] B. O. Smith, et al., Teachers for the Real World, (Washington, D. C., 1965), p. 95.

[13] Judith P. Ruchkin, p. 4.

[14] Ibid., p. 5.

[15] Task Force '72 demonstration centers are outlined in the chapter by Allen A. Schmieder and Stephen Holowenzak, "Consortia," in Competency-Based Teacher Education, ed. W. R. Houston and R. B. Howsam (Palo Alto, Calif., 1972), pp. 87-91.

[16] Edward J. Meade, Jr., "When a Foundation Goes to School", Today's Education, 62, No. 3 (March, 1973), pp. 22-24, 64.

[17] Emmitt D. Smith, "The State of the States in Teacher Centering", Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), p. 23.

[18] Schmieder and Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, p. 6.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Much has been written about teaching centers in professional literature but few statistical studies have been conducted which provide data on the effectiveness of such programs. The publication market is replete with documents stimulated by the U. S. Office of Education and articles by program sponsors dealing with or related to teacher centers in England, Holland, Russia and Japan as well as America. According to Joyce and Weil, the majority of literature which describes the potential operation of teacher centers comes from centers in all parts of the country which, for the most part, have been funded in some way by the U. S. Office of Education.[1] Although the teacher center concept is not new, its tenets being identifiable in this country as far back as the report of the Flowers Committee in 1948,[2] the movement per se is relatively new beginning with a few centers in 1960-61 to more than 4,500 in 1974.[3] As is normal with first stages in any movement, the literature is limited and somewhat flawed. The majority of the literature deals with problems of coordination and government rather than the more substantive focus of training and the training process.[4] Such emphasis is expected since nearly all the teacher centers in the United States have involved consortia of school districts, colleges, and community organizations. The Stillwater/Oklahoma State University teacher

center in its beginnings is no exception.

Consequently, the literature included in this review will be representative of that which is available rather than a comprehensive coverage. The review is organized by categories utilizing the following subheadings: (1) History of Teacher Centers (2) Typology of Teacher Centers (3) Characteristics of Teacher Centers and (4) Assorted Models of Teacher Centers.

History of Teacher Centers

For more tangible origins of the teacher center movement we must go outside the borders of this country. M. Vere DeVault says "Although the first experiences (in England) related directly to the curriculum project of the Nuffield Foundation, it soon became evident that the teacher center concept was an idea of wide utility."[5] The term, "teacher center" was first used in Great Britain to describe a sort of teachers' club, the purpose of which was to make it easier for teachers to get together and discuss education matters, watch demonstrations and examine new materials and attend seminars on educational improvement--or just socialize.[6] The Schools Council, an independent curriculum development organization, made the use of teacher centers a central part of their efforts and the movement in England has grown from a few centers in 1960 to more than 600 in 1974.[7] Vincent Rogers also points to the revolutionary action in schooling and teacher training in England as a part of the contagious movement.[8] The Plowden Report in 1967 entitled, Children and Their Primary Schools, called public attention to the educational philosophies and approaches being exercised in the British Primary

Schools.[9] Since then a Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science focused on teacher education and training in England.[10] The committee chaired by Lord James of Reisholm took an unusual approach to teacher education and considered it in reverse order to what is usually the process. Because general education has been the focus of undergraduate work, many inadequacies have been blatently present at the preservice and inservice levels of instructional programs. The James committee decided to attend to this need and constructed a matrix of teacher centers located within the schools which were to provide for the inservice needs of teachers first, then they considered what should be prerequisite or foundational to the teaching experience. The James report is explicit in spelling out the needs for teacher centers as well as defining the entities necessary to the centers. Lillian Weber further excited public interest with the publication of her book, The English Infant School and Informal Education in 1971.[11]

Harry Silberman brought to Americans an awareness of the potential for change with such books as Crisis in the Classroom.[12] B. O. Smith and others who prepared for the Task Force of the NDEA, the publication, Teachers for the Real World, continued the clarion cry for the establishment of centers for teacher education in the setting where the teachers work.[13] Hard on the heels of these and other NDEA publications came the big movement toward competency-based teacher education and certification.[14] This educational thrust has been more than supportive of the teacher center concept and according to the Final Report from the Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes, the people who were so active in earlier teacher

education projects are now the ones who are giving their time and talents to producing a variety of models for competency-based teacher centers.[15]

Typology of Teacher Centers

A recent research project which attempted to identify organization and function typology of teacher education centers was done by Sam Yarger of the Syracuse Teacher Center Project.[16] Although there are other concerns which are prominent in the teacher center movement, such as defining, Yarger felt that a prime concern had to be some form of type identification by which educators could communicate and through which comparative studies could be realized. With the explanation that at best typologies are little more than synthetic attempts to simplify rather complex phenomena, he gathered data and attempted to focus on major characteristics. No claim was or is made for coverage of all possible variables. Yarger surveyed over 200 teacher center sites in the United States and established several identifiable types of teacher centers. The results of his efforts have been distilled down to seven organizational types of teacher centers, none of which, of course, is pure. They are: (1) Independent type teacher center, (2) Quasi-independent type teacher center, (3) Professional organization type teacher center, (4) Single unit type teacher center, (5) Free local partnership type teacher center, (6) Free local consortium type teacher center, and (7) Legislative/political consortium type teacher center. These seven types were first published in 1973 and to date have had little refinement. In documents dated Spring 1974[17] and November 1974,[18] Yarger's

organizational types continue to contain the following identifying essential and common elements. The center examples listed were selected by Schmieder and Yarger as the best available to exemplify each type.[19]

Organizational Types

(1) Independent Teaching Center. This model is perhaps most closely related to its progenitor--the British model. The essential characteristic is that it is legally independent from any formal educational institution. The teacher is the center of the program and the focus is on her needs. Since teachers become involved voluntarily, this type of center generally has high teacher credibility. Financial support is usually supplied by private foundations. Directors and implementers in the independent teaching center enjoy a great deal of freedom and flexibility. Two excellent examples of this type of center are Teachers, Inc. of New York and The Teacher Works located in Portland, Oregon.

(2) Quasi-independent Teaching Center. The major difference between this type of teacher center and the independent type is that it is legally associated with a formal educational institution. This "almost" independent type does enjoy a high degree of autonomy, however, even though there is a formal institutional tie. The degree of autonomy is affected by the charisma of the director and program personnel. The major focus of the program is on teacher needs rather than institutional goals. Autonomy is the distinguishing element in this type of center. Some of the finest examples of this organizational type are the Workshop Center for Open Education in New York

under the guidance of Lillian Weber and the Teachers' Learning Center operating in San Francisco, California.

(3) Professional Organization Teaching Center. This type of center is somewhat rare but it is organized and operated exclusively by a professional teacher organization. There are two ways to go about having a professional organization teaching center. 1) A "negotiated" center is the result of bargaining and usually focuses on professional as well as educational problems. 2) "Subject area" centers usually arise out of subject-focused organizations and tend to emphasize a particular high priority classroom subject. Funds for this type center come from many sources but governance is kept exclusively in the hands of the professional organization. Identified examples of this type of teacher center include: Scarsdale Teaching Institute in New York, and the Boise Public Schools Teacher Center in Idaho.

(4) Single Unit Teaching Center. This type teacher center is probably an outgrowth of inservice programs. It is the most common type of center in America and its essential characteristic is that it is legally associated with and administered by a single educational institution. It often is difficult to distinguish between this type of center and an inservice program. The center, however, is usually more complex in both program and organizational structure. A low level of parity exists as this is a very authoritarian center in nature. External resources and funds are often tapped but the major responsibility lies with the institution and the program is usually slanted toward institutional needs and goals. Exemplary centers of this particular type are to be found in the Teacher Education Renewal

Program in Maine and also in the North Dallas Teacher Education Center.

(5) Free Partnership Teaching Center. This is the simplest form of organizational type center based on the consortium concept. Essentially it has a legal, formal or informal relationship between only two discrete institutions. The two institutions usually involved in this partnership are a school system and a university or college. There may be several systems and/or universities but only these two types of institutions are involved in this type center. Another prerequisite for this classification is that the partnership is freely entered rather than a response to a legal mandate. This partnership of two partners has become quite popular because it is easier to initiate and maintain a relationship between two partners rather than three or more. Usually the program shows evidence of efforts to incorporate concerns of both partners. Examples of this type are numerous. Outstanding centers that classify as free partnership teaching centers are Syracuse University--West Genessee Teaching Center and Minneapolis Teacher Center. It is also called to the reader's attention that the ONSITE program, a Stillwater public schools/ Oklahoma State University teacher education center (Phase I) would most logically be identified with this particular organizational structure.

(6) Free Consortium Teaching Center. The difference between the designation partnership and consortium is the number of involved institutions. An essential characteristic for the free consortium type is a legal, formal or informal relationship between three or more discrete institutions who have willingly become involved. Of necessity, all component parts of this consortium are more complex because of the

number involved. Progress is usually slower in that more needs and goals must be considered and the decision making process becomes more involved. Program emphasis must be more general in order to cover more territory. External support is often an underlying reason for involvement in this type of teacher center. The future of this type center may also rely on institutional ability to recognize personal benefits. Positive long range goals are essential to overcome short range inconveniences. Two urban centers are fine examples of this free consortium type teaching center: Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service and Houston Teacher Center.

(7) Legislative/Political Consortium Teaching Center. This type of center is highly visible because its organization and constituency are mandated by legislation or political criteria. Often the State education agency is charged with overseeing the process. In a way, participation is forced but participation by eligible members may be optional. Financial incentives are often available for participants. This type of center tends to involve larger numbers of participants than other consortia. Often this type of center is based on territorial boundaries. Many states are suggesting this type should also be charged with certification responsibilities. Many legislative/political consortium centers have become the standard place for implementing inservice programs. Rhode Island and Texas have mandated such centers. Their formal titles are Rhode Island Teacher Center located in Providence and Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems operating out of Austin.

In attempting to make teacher centers a more clearly understood concept, Yarger also developed functional types. In synthesizing this

part of the typology, he built upon previous works. The major portion of a report by Joyce and Weil was dedicated to a description of three styles of teacher center operation.[20] They laid the groundwork for what Yarger later expanded into his first functional type. Although centers are hard to classify, and it is admitted that often more than one style may be detected in a particular center, nevertheless there are enough distinguishing characteristics to make these divisions fairly discrete. The following four functional types are the results of Yarger's attempts to identify centers by function in addition to organization. Again the author has made every effort to be inclusive of all components identified by the original researcher.

Functional Types

(1) Facilitating Teaching Center. Originally Joyce and Weil called this type of center the informal "English" type. The thrust is toward having a place where teachers can freely explore materials, think out and share problems, and engage in generally colleagueal activities. The atmosphere is conducive to positive interaction with personnel, ideas and materials. Those who come to the center, do so on a volunteer basis and there is no formal program. Providing for the teacher's personal and professional growth and development are the prime functions. Examples of this functionary type center are The Greater Boston Teacher Center in Massachusetts and the Advisory and Learning Exchange in Washington, D. C.

(2) Advocacy Teaching Center. This second type of center has a highly visible thrust. It is characterized by a specific philosophical stance that is incorporated into the center as the focus of the

program. This type of center may advocate a concept such as humanism, open education, team teaching, accountability, etc. It is usually dedicated, however, to a single concept. Fine examples of this type of programmatic commitment are to be found in Project Change working out of SUNY in Cortland, New York and the College of Education Teacher Center at the University of Toledo in Ohio.

(3) Responsive Teaching Center. This type of center is non-directional in approach. Two kinds of responses are prevalent in this type of center. The focus of one type of response is to the needs of individual teachers and the other focus is on the needs of institutions. These two functions usually coordinate with two different organizational types. Either kind of responsive type of center is geared to help constituents identify needs and satisfy them. Programs are naturally diverse and funding usually comes from outside sources. Two American centers that conform to this particular functional design are Kanawha County Teacher Center in Charleston, West Virginia and Appalachian Training Complex in Boone, North Carolina.

(4) Functionally Unique Teaching Center. The fourth and last functional type of center is unique in that it is designed to meet a specific need that is not classifiable in any other category. It is quite limited in thrust. Often this type of center grows out of an experimental project or a single technique endeavor. This would be the case if a teacher or a school were utilizing the visual literacy approach to teaching lower socio-economic children to read. Other teachers might hear of the success and ask to observe. From that might come a request for instruction in technique. This type of center would be implemented to satisfy this identified need.

Flexibility is inherent in this design. Good examples of centers that function in this way are Appalachian Teacher Center located at the University of West Virginia in Morgantown and Children's Museum in Boston, Massachusetts.

Characteristics of Teacher Centers

Yarger and Schmieder say that if there is any one feature that characterizes American teaching centers, it is their diversity.[21] However, within that diversity there are certain thrusts that seem ever present regardless of shape or form. James Collins from Syracuse University notes in his article, "The Making of a Teaching Center", that

> ...regardless of the specific type of teaching center one wishes to develop, the issues are much the same. The questions of purpose, function, program, organization, financing, and governance have to be addressed.[22]

David Selden from American Federation of Teachers and Dave Darland from National Education Association concur with the above issues by addressing themselves to such considerations in a recent report entitled, "Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?" This report bears a 1972 dateline and was prepared for the Leadership Training Institute in Teaching of the U. S. Office of Education.[23]

Joyce and Weil identify three characteristics from the literature as being unique to most teacher centers:

> (1) Most teacher centers, if not all, are established by a consortia to provide education for preservice and/or inservice teachers.
> (2) The major focus of teacher centers is on clinical training. The teacher center is usually located in the schools where the teachers are.
> (3) A major objective of teacher centers is to bring about positive educational change by serving the felt needs of

> the teacher. By the same token, the center serves a school improvement thrust when it helps teachers acquire the competency needed to implement new curricula or improve existing ones.[24]

Assorted Models of Teacher Centers

Because of the lack of a common definition, American teacher/teaching centers take a variety of foci. It would be inaccurate to offer samples as typical or representative; however, a selection of models is offered to demonstrate the uniqueness of direction and implementation of centers while simultaneously sharing the common aim of professional development of educational personnel.

Kansas University Alternative Teacher Education Program

This program deals almost exclusively with preservice teacher education. It is offered as an alternative program to the regular student teaching program with the intent of getting the student into the school setting earlier and for a more extended period of pre-student teaching classroom experiences. The writer selected this particular school for inclusion in the models because Phase I of the Stillwater/OSU teacher education center is also specifically designed for preservice teachers.

According to the Director of the Kansas University Alternative Teacher Education Program, Dr. Campbell, this program has several unique features as compared to their regular program. 1) The alternative program content includes a three semester course in "Human Relations for Teachers". 2) It also includes a two semester

sequence of learnings entitled "Generic Teaching Skills", and 3) modularized coursework in educational psychology, measurement, social and philosophical foundations and various subject level teaching methods courses. The additional unique feature of this program is the requirement that each student spend a minimum of one-half day per week in aiding assignment in the field during each of the first three semesters of the program. This Kansas University program is designed as competency/performance based experience for students who have volunteered and made a commitment to the concept. The staff has identified the competencies desired and the modular course where they are to be acquired. This is a feature that is often found in centers designated as preservice oriented.

Appalachian Training Complex

The Appalachian Training Complex is a federal project sponsored by Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. It was developed in cooperation with Task Force '72 of the U. S. Office of Education. The Complex is inclusive of several teaching centers (training centers or clusters). The original idea of training centers grew out of assessment of staff development needs. The first of several training centers which now exist was called the "Lighthouse Project" and was begun in 1970. The Triple T program at Appalachian State was the forerunner of the Training Complex and gave evidence of concern for "real world" involvement.

The Training Complex works with school systems in eight mountain counties serving fifty seven schools in the Appalachian region. This area is basically rural in nature although several large cities are

located within the project boundaries. The sponsoring institution is Appalachian State University but the Complex headquarters is located in Wilkes Community College in Wilkes County. Financing is shared cooperatively by a grant from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems of the United States Office of Education, by the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, nine school districts in the region, foundation grants, the regional junior colleges, and by Appalachian State University. This complicated consortia reinforces the belief that no longer does any one agency have responsibility for training educational personnel. This is a prime example of the cooperative thrust. All agencies are expected to work together to develop and produce competent teachers and administrators.

Beyond the federal project, Appalachian State University has made a commitment to draw upon the real experiences of the public schools for making their teacher preparation program more effective. They already offer ten additional field based alternatives to their standard student teaching program. Appalachian State University, like Oklahoma State University, is concerned that students have the option of an earlier and longer field experience. In an unpublished proposal for Teacher Education Centers dated as recently as January 10, 1975, Dr. Kenneth Jenkins, Assistant Dean, College of Education, Appalachian State University tentatively defined a center as follows:

> A Teaching Center is an organization that focuses its attention and energies to creating a symbiotic collaboration in teacher education between a sponsoring teacher preparation institution and the public schools. It is somewhat geographic in nature, but is primarily a coordinating, programming and liason unit. Its efforts are directed to the full range of delivery systems and services implicit

in full teacher education, both preservice and inservice.[25]

Jenkins points out that the most important single aspect of the definition implies a full collaborative thrust by both the school systems and the university. The proposal identifies five major center functions.

> 1) The Center will be a coordinating agency for more extensive and intensive field experiences for the preservice teacher.
> 2) The Center will become a coordinator of a better integrated inservice or staff development program.
> 3) The Center will act as an information exchange bank for promising and/or proven ideas, programs, strategies, techniques and gimmicks.
> 4) The Center will act as a follow-up and feedback mechanism for the impact and effectiveness of all aspects of the teacher preparation program.
> 5) The Center will act as a contracting agency for the identification of skills and attitudes deemed necessary by the profession and the subsequent development of learning modules to help achieve them.[26]

It is at the point of the first identified function relating to preservice responsibility that the aims and functions of the ONSITE program align forcefully with those projected by Appalachian State. If the center is the coordinating agency for an abundancy of experiences this would indeed "permit earlier identification of those students for whom education is not the best direction their lives can take; and it would tend to make the existing professional more responsible for the quality of the entering professional."[27]

Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC)

Kanawha Valley MITEC has been in operation since 1966. It is now independent of federal funds but is an outgrowth of a seven-state project known as M-STEP (Multi-State Teacher Education Project) and

the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V. MITEC claims to be a concept rather than a place. This concept is one of sharing resources--human, material, and financial--in a cooperative effort to upgrade teacher education. MITEC consists of a consortium of six colleges, four public school systems, state department, and professional organizations that work as partners. West Virginia now has teacher education centers established throughout the state. MITEC is only one that currently exists. This has been made possible through legislative funding. In 1971, the state legislature appropriated $125,000 to establish seven centers in West Virginia to serve each of the twenty-one teacher preparation institutions of higher education.

Another center that got its initial start by federal funding is the Dallas Teacher Education Center (DTEC). It was funded in 1970 by the U. S. Office of Education under the Education Professions Development Act. This center was established to effectively meet educational preservice and inservice personnel needs in an urban setting. Centers have been mandated into existence in Texas. New York has also responded to legislation requiring the implementation of teacher centers. Other centers in the form of consortia relationships have been legislatively prescribed in Florida.

Although the legislative involvement of these centers is one key to their particular uniqueness, the optional experiences offered to students of teaching is the attraction that MITEC has for impact upon the Stillwater/OSU consortia planning. Often even classroom experiences do not reflect the realities of teaching and many encounters in a variety of settings and under varying conditions, are

encouraged for inclusion in optional enrichment experiences for pre-service teachers at Oklahoma State University.

The Wednesday Program

This program is strictly an inservice program of the Princeton Regional Schools in Princeton, New Jersey. The school system has taken the responsibility for the professional development of the entire staff. The Wednesday Program is a regular released-time program designated to provide opportunities for personal competencies and the responsibility and power to exercise them. Every Wednesday, the regular school schedule is suspended and from 1:30-3:30 participants are free to create their own learning activities or select from a variety of offerings. The uniqueness of this program is attitudinal in nature. This school system is concerned enough about the professional growth and development of all involved in the learning process to invest salaried time. The task of the school, as they see it, is to enhance the ability of the individual to play a responsible and creative role in his society. This stance clearly infers that the learning process continues after graduation from college and that the role of the student is incorporated in the role of the teacher. Although Phase I of the Stillwater/OSU center has focused on the preservice growth and development, school personnel are voicing a desire to incorporate an inservice component next.

Conclusion

An increasing concern for professional growth and development within the ranks of educational circles is evidenced by the abundance

and diversity of efforts within the teacher/teaching center movement. In presenting a rationale for a study of the movement in America, Yarger and Leonard called attention to the lack of a generic concept.[28] Such a concept, inclusive of criteria by which a teacher center could be distinguished from other programs, would indeed be helpful; but none exists. Instead "it all too frequently elicits a very personalized definition depending on who hears the term."[29] The reasons they offer for this loose nomenclature are first, the concept is not unique to American education and second, the concept seemingly has a plurality of historical antecedents within American education.[30] Even a surface scanning of available literature would tend to support this conjecture.

The elusive nature of teacher centers may well be attacked as another "fly-by-night educational bandwagon". Nonetheless, the two year study by Yarger and Leonard highlighted several conclusions. After enumerating many conclusions, they ended by saying, "Probably the most important conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that teacher centering is happening!"[31] The uniqueness and individuality of each program does make them difficult to identify but this is also indicative of the localized focus on individual staff needs.

The freedom to design a program to improve the local teacher preparation program and yet draw from the embryonic efforts of others attending to identical needs, was the attraction the teacher center movement had for the Stillwater/OSU venture.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Bruce R. Joyce and Marsha Weil, Concepts of Teacher Centers (Washington, D. C., May 1973) p. 3.

[2] John Flowers, et al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Washington, D. C., 1948).

[3] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, p. 9.

[4] Joyce and Weil, p. 4.

[5] M. Vere DeVault, p. 37.

[6] David Selden and David Darland, "Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?" (January, 1972), p. 5.

[7] M. Vere DeVault, p. 37.

[8] Vincent R. Rogers, Teaching in the British Primary School (Toronto, Ontario, 1970).

[9] Bridget Plowden, Children and Their Primary Schools (London, 1967).

[10] Lord James of Reisholm, Teacher Education and Training (London, 1972).

[11] Lillian Weber, The English Infant School and Informal Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1971).

[12] Harry Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York, 1970).

[13] B. O. Smith, p. 67.

[14] Stanley Elam, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" (Washington, D. C., 1971).

[15] Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes, "Inventory of Training Complexes." (Worchester, Mass., June, 1970).

[16] Sam Yarger, "A Tool for the Analysis of Teacher Centers in American Education--A Working Paper" (Syracuse, N. Y., 1973).

[17] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, pp. 6-7.

[18] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene," pp. 28-30.

[19] Ibid. (In her interpretation the author made a studied attempt to include each component identified by the original researcher as distinguishing.)

[20] Joyce and Weil, p. 4-5.

[21] Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, p. 6.

[22] James F. Collins, "The Making of a Teacher Center," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), p. 13.

[23] Selden and Darland, p. 5.

[24] Joyce and Weil, p. 4-5.

[25] Kenneth Jenkins, "Proposal for Teacher Education Centers" (Boone, North Carolina, January 10, 1975), p. 5.

[26] Ibid., p. 7-13.

[27] Ibid., p. 8.

[28] Sam J. Yarger and Albert J. Leonard, "A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education" (Syracuse, N. Y., June, 1974), Appendix A, p. 104.

[29] Ibid., p. 104.

[30] Ibid., p. 3.

[31] Ibid., p. 100.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The investigator, using descriptive study techniques, sought to derive useful generalizations regarding the organization and implementation of a teacher education center in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

The investigator examined research and available literature relating to concepts of teacher education centers which had both preservice and inservice functions. The researcher also served as a member of a steering committee which was established to examine the feasibility of initiating a preservice phase of a teacher education center in Stillwater. As a member of the steering committee, the researcher attended weekly sessions, interacted, observed and recorded committee actions and decisions. The researcher was also in attendance at committee meetings of university personnel involved in staffing the center. The developmental processes are listed chronologically in Table I.

TABLE I

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF DEVELOPMENTAL STEPS

	Date
Initial meeting of university and public school personnel	Nov. 1973

TABLE I (Continued)

	Date
Exploratory visit to 2 out of state centers by 2 committees (1 principal and 1 professor; 1 teacher and 1 professor)	Feb. 1974
Schools selected by school superintendent for inclusion in experimental program	Feb. 1974
Acting director appointed by head of College of Education at the university	Feb. 1974
Steering committee established	Mar. 1974
Portions of weekly elementary staff meeting devoted to discussion of scheduling and staffing potential for center program	Mar. 1974
Interview schedule developed for teachers	Apr. 1974
First administration of interview schedule to cooperating teachers	May 1974
ONSITE program announced through public notices	May 1974
Selection of students by acting program director	May 1974
Phase I of ONSITE program implemented in center classroom in public school	Sept. 1974
Interview schedule developed and administed to professors teaching in the program	Sept. 1974
First unstructured written attitudinal report gathered from teacher associates	Oct. 1974
Second unstructured written attitudinal report gathered from teacher associates	Dec. 1974
Interview schedule developed and administered to principals of schools involved in the program	Jan. 1975
Third unstructured written attitudinal report gathered from teacher associates	Feb. 1975
Second administration of interview schedule to cooperating teachers	Apr. 1975
Second administration of interview schedule to professors	Apr. 1975

TABLE I (Continued)

	Date
Fourth unstructured written attitudinal report gathered from teacher associates	Apr. 1975
Second administration of interview schedule to principals	May 1975

The interview schedule (see Appendix A) was administered to cooperating teachers in participating schools before their entry into the experimental program and subsequently, near the end of the second semester in the program. Other interview schedules (see Appendix B) were developed and administered to university professors near the beginning of their active involvement in the program and again near the end of the school year. School principals were interviewed after one semester of involvement by their school in the program and again at the end of the first year. An interview schedule for principals is available in Appendix C. Teacher associates were given opportunity at regular intervals to express their feelings concerning the center concept. Excerpts from teacher associates are cited in chapter V and directed questions are listed in Appendix D. The final stage involved an analysis and reporting of these data.

The investigation was basically guided by these questions:

1) What were the expressed attitudes of classroom teachers toward a teacher education center when the plan was first proposed?

2) What effect does the teacher education center have on teachers' attitudes toward educational theory?

3) How do teachers involved in the center feel about having professors in their immediate environment?

4) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the teacher?

5) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the teacher?

6) What effect does the teacher education center have on the professors' attitude toward classroom teachers' ability to relate theory to practice?

7) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the professors?

8) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the professors?

9) How do methods taught in the regular sessions on campus for student teachers differ from methods taught at the teacher education center site?

10) In what activities do teacher associates engage in a teacher education center?

11) Do students feel confident in the areas of instruction and classroom management as a result of involvement in the teacher education center? If so, how?

12) What are some of the advantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of the associate teachers?

13) What are some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center from the point of view of associate teachers?

Selection of the Sample

Nineteen students who showed an expressed interest in teaching as a career were selected for participation in this program. A maximum limit of twenty was placed upon enrollment for the fall semester. The selection was based on the following criteria: (1) an academic standing of junior level or second semester sophomore; (2) a grade point average of at least 2.5; and (3) a commitment to the center concept. It was also desirable, but not mandatory, that these students not have had the educational psychology, history of education, audio-visual aids or observation courses offered at the sophomore level as these would be provided within the program. The selection was made by the director of the program on a first come-first serve basis. Students applied by written commitment and/or personal interview.

The three schools in the particular system under study were designated by the superintendent of public schools to meet the following criteria: a variety of different educational philosophies, organizational patterns, socio/economic background and academic approaches.

Teachers from each school were selected on a voluntary basis for participation. Thirty-one teachers were the initial volunteers to accept associate teachers.

Professors regularly involved in teaching methods in the five elementary curriculum areas: language arts, reading, science, math and social studies agreed to involvement in this project. Other professors selected for participation came from educational psychology, audio-

visual aids, measurement and history of education. Each subject area included in the regular student teaching program on campus was incorporated into the experimental program. No effort was made to diversify the sample beyond required curriculum. In essence, the same curricula was incorporated into the experimental program that exists in the regular student teaching program.

The director of the teacher education center was selected by the dean of the College of Education within the university and was mutually agreed upon by the university personnel and the public school personnel.

Description of the Sample

The nineteen students selected for participation in the program met the classification requirement. Seventeen of them were classified as first semester juniors and two were second semester sophomores planning to accelerate their program through summer school enrolment. Certification requirement was necessary in order for the students to be in the teacher education center for the entire year preceding their actual student teaching experience. The average age of these teacher associates was twenty-one. Only one student was well in excess of the average, a mother returning to school after raising her family. Generally, their age and classification were below that of the students in the regular teaching program, most of the regular student teachers being seniors.

All of the schools included in the center concept are located within the city limits. One school has the more traditional setting, being semi-departmentalized and having self contained classrooms.

The second school represents the lowest socio/economic position and the third school offers the open space education concept. The schools, of course, have many other foci, but these are fairly representative of the overall coverage within this particular school system. The center concept was inclusive of all schools participating; however, only one school was designated as the location of the center teaching site classroom. The school chosen was equipped with an observation room which made it particularly well adapted to demonstration lessons. Also being in an active elementary school, there was immediate access and availability of children. The room adjacent to the observation room was set aside for the teacher education center program.

The thirty-one classroom teachers who volunteered for this program came from varying educational backgrounds but none with actual experience in a teacher education center beyond a visit to one. Each teacher agreed to an interview to establish baseline knowledge and attitudes. Each of these teachers was a fulltime employee in one of the selected schools teaching at a grade level from first to fifth at the time of their initial involvement.

The professors entered the program with varying degrees of familiarity with the concept of teacher education centers. Two of the professors had been chosen for specific exploratory visits to centers in other parts of the country with active preservice programs. Two professors had visited centers outside this country, specifically Canada and England. Others relied on reading and conversation for baseline knowledge. The major thrust of their dedication to the preservice phase was a stated desire to improve the student teaching program.

The director of the center had personal contact with other centers and was deemed by both university and school sources to be particularly well suited to the position because of frequent contact and close acquaintance with public school personnel. There was no load adjustment for this added responsibility which required a high degree of commitment to the center concept.

Procedure for Gathering Data

After the sample schools were selected, a steering committee was established to study needs and plan a pilot program. The steering committee was composed of the principal and a teacher from each school, two student teachers, two university professors, a graduate assistant and the elementary curriculum supervisor from the city. Ex-officio members were the department head of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education at the university and the director of student teaching from the university.

The plan was that the schools were to be kept informed of progress by their representatives on the steering committee. It was felt, however, that the information flow was faulty and on two occasions the director of the program was asked to attend the public school faculty meeting and explain developments and answer questions posed by the faculty. The breakdown in communications was due mainly to irregular teacher attendance and failure to get apprised of interim activity. The requests appeared to be in honest search for clarification. The most problematic area for teachers in the beginning was defining the difference between the current program and the projected program.

Two months after the steering committee was set up, each of the participating schools was visited by this researcher and arrangements were made for administering the first interview schedule to the teachers. Before the end of the spring semester, 1974, the first interview schedule was administered to the teachers and all responses were recorded on tape.

In the fall, during the second month in the program, teacher associates were asked to record their feelings concerning the program. The request was unstructured and anonymity was assured in an attempt to get uninhibited responses.

The interview schedule that was developed for the professors was first administered near the beginning of their active involvement in the program. The time interval of the interview varied in that three professors were involved the first semester, three more were added the second semester and two others were integrated on a non-structured time schedule depending on the appropriateness of their subject to the integrated concept; (i.e., the audio-visual aids professor was scheduled on several occasions during the language arts sessions because the students had a definite need for media skills).

The Individual Interview

The investigator relied primarily on the personal interview as a source for data. However, information of a vital nature to this study was also gathered from steering committee reports, university committee reports and nonstructured attitudinal responses.

The problem of the interview technique, as pointed out by Thorndike and Hagan, "is to maintain the virtues of flexibility while

at the same time achieving a reasonable degree of uniformity."[1] In Interviewing in Social Research, Hyman says:

> Let it be noted that the demonstration of error marks an advanced stage of a science. All scientific inquiry is subject to error, and it is far better to be aware of this, to study the sources in an attempt to reduce it, and to estimate the magnitude of such errors in our findings, than to be ignorant of the errors concealed in the data.[2]

Hyman further suggests, since weaknesses and disadvantages do exist in other scientific methods for the collection of data, the use of the interview "must be weighed in relation to the gains to be derived through its employment."[3]

A study of the literature resulted in the investigator's decision to use personal interviews. In discussing methods of research, Good and Scates say:

> The depth interview and certain other clinical techniques, applied to selected individuals, provides a depth of insight and a picture of dynamic interrelationships that questionnaires alone could never give.[4]

The semi-standardized or semistructured interview was developed and demonstrated with teachers, professors and principals. A completely structured interview was not deemed advisable in a descriptive study where variables were being sought, rather than being tested. On the other hand, as Myers points out, a totally nondirective and unstructured interview would ignore pertinent data that might be available and should be included in the descriptive investigation.[5]

The interview schedule was inclusive of both open nondirective and closed directive questions. The questions were randomly applied within the interview schedule depending on the situational factors

present that made their use appropriate; i.e., a respondent often would offer extra information in the process of elaborating that normally would be covered in a later question. There was no correlation of the percentage of question types with status of respondents. Generally speaking, closed or directive questions were designed for use where there were a limited number of responses available to the respondent and where the data sought were factual and of a non-threatening nature.

The open nondirective questions were the designated component allowing for flexibility. The appropriateness of their use was based on situational factors. The injection of open ended questions allowed the interviewer to go beyond the mere classification of data. The interviewer wished to establish the baseline knowledge of respondents concerning the teacher education center movement and identify the source of their information. Further it was possible that many respondents had not formulated clear opinions at the time of the beginning of the study and by use of open ended questions the interviewer avoided biasing the direction of response. Open and nondirective questions were further designed, as Myers suggests, with the possibility of revealing to the interviewer variables not foreseen and simultaneously developing a flexibility that would offer opportunity for investigating inconsistencies and exploiting vague remarks.[6] Open and nondirective questions further made possible sub-questions and probes where additional information was desirable and available.

The cooperating teachers in the public schools were interviewed because in every case they were involved in the regular student

teaching program of the university. Their voluntary status with the experimental program indicated a desire to have an active part in improving both the program and the professional relationship between local schools and university. It was felt that these teachers were crucial to the program; they possessed reliable information concerning the potential success of such a cooperative venture between the public school personnel and the university personnel.

The principals of each of the three schools selected for the program were interviewed because their positions placed them in an advantageous position for observing and often influencing attitudes concerning school/university personnel relationships. Simultaneously, it was reasoned that the responses of principals might possibly be more reliable and uninhibited than teachers because principals do not believe that the success or failure of such a program is a reflection of their competence. Since teachers and principals were asked many of the same questions, their responses could be compared, thus strengthening the reliability of the results.

The university professors were interviewed because their involvement within the preservice phase of the ONSITE program was essential to the certification process and their attitudinal stance might well serve as an indicator of the extent to which the program might be implemented. The interview was administered at the beginning of their responsibility in the program and again near the completion of the first year.

Before constructing the interview schedule, the investigator examined the basic psychological and social principles of interviewing as described by Labovitz and Hagedorn, Good and Scates, and Hyman.[7]

Literature in the field and research studies utilizing interview techniques and procedures were also examined. Preparation for the interview was concentrated and try-out procedures were executed and refined. Teachers in a school not selected for initial incorporation into the program participated by responding for the expressed purpose of interview refinement. Factors in the success or failure of the interview, as set forth by Good and Scates (number and length of interviews, rapport and sensitivity to the interviewee, physical setting, interviewer's reputation and knowledge of problems under consideration) were studied.[8] The investigator arbitrarily decided on two administrations of the interview because one administration at the beginning of the program and one at the completion of the first year in the program would be adequate to obtain desired information. Arrangements for the personal interviews were established and held at a time and place convenient for the teachers. In all cases, uninterrupted interviews were conducted during the school hours, some extending a few minutes beyond. The interviews with professors were conducted at the university during convenient office hours. Interviewing the personnel at their own place of reponsibility was believed to be most desirable since there was an attempt to suit their convenience. The setting was congenial and friendly.

To keep interview bias as a constant, the investigator conducted every interview. The time span extending from the first round of interviews until the final round of interviews included in this study was approximately a year.

The length of time of the interviews was highly irregular, ranging from fifteen minutes to fifty-five minutes. The temporal

element was not a decisive factor in any of the three test groups; i.e., the quality of answer was not directly related to the amount of time consumed for any particular question by the respondent. In like manner, no group was consistently involved in either long answers or short answers. Responses to the interviews were tape recorded verbatim. Subjects were identified by number and were assured that the interview was confidential and that neither their name nor their school would be identifiable in the final report.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education (New York, 1969), p. 385.

[2] Herbert H. Hyman, et al., Interviewing in Social Research (Chicago, 1955), p. 4.

[3] Ibid., p. 14.

[4] Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research (New York, 1954), p. 643.

[5] Donald A. Myers, "Citizens Advisory Committees and Educational Policy Development" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962), p. 28.

[6] Ibid., p. 29.

[7] Sanford Labovitz and Robert Hagedorn, Introduction to Social Research (New York, 1971). Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research (New York, 1954) and Herbert H. Hyman, Interviewing in Social Research (Chicago, 1954) were major sources consulted.

[8] Good and Scates, p. 645.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the presentation of data and their analysis is reported as they pertain to research procedures described in Chapter III. The data are reported in a descriptive mode. These data are presented for each of the four personnel in categories involved in the implementation of the teacher education center and represented in the study: teachers, professors, principals and associate teachers. The intent of the tabulation is to condense and clarify materials; therefore whenever possible related information is reported together. Where the item respondent percentage falls below twenty per cent, the information is assigned to a special category and noted in the descriptive comments. The tabulated information procured from teachers, professors and principals includes both pretest and posttest frequencies. The tabulated information from associate teachers includes the frequency responses of a pretest and three consecutive posttests.

The data are presented with the intent of identifying any changes in knowledge and attitude which might have occurred during the first year of involvement and implementation of the alternate teacher preparation program entitled ONSITE. Descriptive techniques are used to describe the numerical data the researcher has gathered.

Teacher Responses

Thirty-one teachers were interviewed initially. There was an attrition rate of sixteen per cent (five) between the first and second interview. Five people were dropped from the program because four were transferred to schools not active in the experimental program and one retired. The total number of teachers represented in Tables II through XI is twenty-six. The column listed as "other" refers to any response using a single category or combination of categories not otherwise included in the discrete choices.

Table II indicates that before actual entrance into the program, the majority of the respondents reported that their baseline knowledge of the teacher education center concept could only be traced back to conversation.

TABLE II

BASIS OF TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

	A Hearsay	B Reading	C Participation as a cooperating teacher	D From steering committee member	E Other
pre-test	25	10	6	2	13
post-test	21	16	13	16	10

As shown in category B, 38% of the teachers had done some reading

and those who had, indicated that the reading material was extremely limited. Category C shows a 109% increase in teachers who said they gained knowledge by involvement as a cooperating teacher in the program. At the onset of the proposed program, very little information was dispensed by the steering committee representatives as shown in category D. The reason for the increase from 7.7% to 62% between pretest and posttest scores in category D is that before the program could be implemented, the steering committee was involved with the development of beliefs, assumptions and goals. In Table II, "other" includes three teachers who learned about teacher centers by visiting one in another location, six teachers who said they had gained knowledge by participating as steering committee members, and four who listed single sources such as handouts and workshops.

The posttest in category A indicates that many teachers still consider conversation a major source of their knowledge concerning centers, although there was an increase in those who had done some reading on the subject. It should also be noted that one teacher had developed a file on centers.

Within the realm of components to be included in the establishment of a teacher education center, data elicited from teachers fall into six categories as shown in Table III.

Staff, according to teachers, was expanded to include not only methods instructors but also a program director, a librarian, and resource persons from the community who have unique expertise to offer. This item was mentioned noticeably in the pretest and enlarged in the posttest. More materials and equipment with easy access was a fairly consistent notation as shown in category B, Table III.

TABLE III

TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF WHAT A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER SHOULD INCLUDE

	A Staff	B Materials and equipment	C Instructional methods	D Lab for experimentation	E Joint effort between schools and university	F Other
pre-test	17	13	9	33	8	6
post-test	25	11	16	33	26	3

After a year in the program, teachers increased their requests for inclusion of instructional methods for both student teacher and inservice teacher from a response rate of 34.6% to 61.5%. Several categories of responses were combined to form category D, (i.e. variety of schools available to associate teachers, and exposure to all levels of children). The area of most significant change within the temporal limits (an increase from 30.7% to 100%) was in the area of human relations identified as cooperative effort between the two organizational units, the public schools and the university. Included with the "other" were such items as academic rank for the cooperating teacher, specific guidelines for expectations, and those who had no idea concerning essential or desirable elements.

The ONSITE program was introduced as Phase I of a teacher education center. Teachers were invited to express their opinions as to whether the main focus should be on preservice training for student teachers or

on inservice training for teachers already employed or possibly both. Table IV displays their responses in four categories.

TABLE IV

TEACHERS' OPINIONS CONCERNING THE MAIN FOCUS OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

	A Preservice	B Both	C Add inservice component	D More inservice on school time
pretest	6	22	(DNA)	(DNA)
posttest	11	14	9	9

DNA= Does not apply

Category A of Table IV indicates an increase from 23% to 42% of the teachers who envision the main focus of a teacher center as limited to just a preservice focus. A majority expressed the desire for a dual focus in both pretest and posttest. Categories C and D were included in the Table because teachers were very appreciative of the one inservice course offered to cooperating teachers and were outspoken in their desire to have more inservice components offered. They were specific in stating the inservice should be implemented on school time. However, inservice was never mentioned by teachers as the main focus of the center. Rather inservice was mentioned mainly as a secondary or at most, part of a dual focus.

Table V is a condensation into four categories of the opinions of teachers concerning the nature and degree of cooperation in the teacher

education process.

TABLE V

TEACHERS' OPINIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF COOPERATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

	A Should be cooperative venture	B Is cooperative venture	C Cooperation is conditional	D More clearly defined responsibilities needed
pre-test	26	16	12	5
post-test	26	23	8	20

A unisonal response was given to the concept that teacher education should be a cooperative venture by the public schools and the university and 61.5% in the pretest and 88.4% in the posttest indicated that the teacher education is a cooperative venture. Considerable hesitancy entered into the understanding of "cooperative". Only two teachers specifically stated that cooperative should be interpreted as having equal responsibilities. All remaining responses in categories C and D indicate that teachers consider cooperative to include "more clearly defined responsibilities" or "conditional" involvement.

Another aspect of the ONSITE program is that of role perception. What role do teachers expect to take in the program and what role do they expect the university to take? These data are summarized in Tables VI and VII.

TABLE VI

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Cooperating teacher	B Inservice participant	C Committee worker	D Do demonstration lessons	E Other
pre-test	25	7	2	7	5
post-test	24	7	8	7	4

Table VI indicates that teachers perceive their role mainly as a cooperating teacher. Items B, C, and D are indicative of aggressive involvement levels of individual teachers. The "other" category is inclusive of such statements as team member, and program planner working with university personnel. In every case the follow up revealed each teacher filled the role she expected to fill.

TABLE VII

THE ROLE TEACHERS EXPECTED THE UNIVERSITY TO TAKE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Provide resources	B Give guidance and counseling	C Teach courses	D Provide leadership	E Take supportive role
pre-test	13	6	20	22	12
post-test	21	12	19	10	5

Table VII condenses into five categories the role expected of the university by the teachers. There is no frequency pattern; instead there is reversal in four of the five items between the pretest and the posttest. There is also a noticeable increase in the opinions and the verbosity of the respondents.

At the onset of the program, 50% of the teachers perceived the university as being the resource provider and 23% expected the university to give guidance and counseling. Posttest figures indicate a significant change, even a 100% increase in category B responses. Categories C and D indicate that before entry into the program the teachers were more willing to lean heavily upon the university to take the role customarily assigned in the regular student teaching program. The posttest shows a definite change in role expectation. It should be noted that the observation and supervisory duties were included in category E.

Data were also gathered concerning the location of the ONSITE classroom. Table VIII summarizes thse data, suggesting that teachers generally support the school setting as desirable for the classroom.

TABLE VIII

TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF THE ONSITE CLASSROOM LOCATION

	A In school building	B Any centrally located place	C Place does not matter	D Would want classroom in their building
pretest	22	5	4	26
posttest	18	10	9	22

During the first year, the ONSITE program has had available a stationary classroom designated for use of program personnel. This classroom is located in a public school mutually furnished by the school system and the university. The stated purpose of the location was multi-beneficial, offering immediate access to children, extra classroom assistance to teachers, and opportunity for renewed classroom exposure to professors. The data displayed in categories A and D indicate that teachers did not change their stance appreciably on this item during the first year of program implementation. However, both categories B and C do register an increase in respondents over the year's time and teacher comments suggest that easy transportability of both children and/or associate teachers could make another variable more desirable than the school setting if space becomes a problem.

Both projected and realized advantages of the program were prolifically identified by teachers. Table IX is a condensation into discrete categories exclusive of category F.

TABLE IX

ADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS

	A Student teacher better prepared	B School children get more individual attention	C More resources available	D Immediate curriculum test	E Better relations of schools	F Other
pre-test	25	14	4	1	6	22
post-test	23	16	7	7	21	29

No less than 88% of the teachers mentioned first that the associate teachers would come into their student teaching experience much better prepared than students from the regular program. Teachers were also quick to mention the benefits realized by their own students. A majority of the teachers (61.5%) considered it advantageous to their attempts at individualization to have teacher associates daily if even for a limited amount of time. The most significant difference in the pretest/posttest response came in noting the improved relations and more open communication lines between the public schools and the university. This response jumped from 23% to 80.8%. Included in the "other" category are such comments as: "Student teachers can decide earlier if teaching is really for them"; "This is an opportunity for professional growth"; "This provides a change of student teacher status"; and "This is a chance for self evaluation". Teachers generally considered the ONSITE concept to improve the quality of the teacher preparation program.

Disadvantages elicited from teachers are displayed in Table X.

TABLE X

DISADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS

	A Scheduling	B Personal inconveniences	C None	D Other
pretest	5	12	1	33
posttest	14	6	10	5

Scheduling evolved as the most problematic area of the program, although it was not anticipated as the greatest single disadvantage. Flexibility of curriculum and attitude facilitated eliminating the problems as they arose; however, this remains prominent in teacher comments. Personal inconveniences decreased appreciably (100%). Items which were most mentioned in this category were: lack of adequate parking space, eating space in teachers' lounge, and crowding of toilet facilities at break time. Teachers were also quick to mention that these were temporary and for the most part had been resolved. At the time of the pretest, only one teacher could not project possible disadvantages but it is important to note that after a year in the program and also after identifying possible disadvantages, ten teachers (38%) responded "None" when asked about disadvantages of the program. The "other" category includes such concerns as personality conflicts, amount of paper work, interruptions to flow of program, professional jealousy, lack of understanding of objectives, number of people involved too great, too many changes too fast, and lack of time to counsel with students. In general, before entry into the program, teachers were anxious about it and somewhat uncomfortable with their lack of knowledge, but willing to cooperate. The posttest revealed a relaxing of attitude and a noticeable failure of many anticipated disadvantages to materialize.

Teachers were asked what competencies they expected the associate teachers to have as a result of being trained in the ONSITE program. Table XI is a summarization of these data.

TABLE XI

TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS OF COMPETENCIES
GAINED BY ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

	A	B	C	D
	Will handle classroom with confidence and assurance	Will demonstrate more knowledge and skill in academic areas	Will demonstrate better understanding of human development	Will deal realistically with classroom procedures and problems
pretest	9	27	9	19
posttest	22	32	12	24

As displayed in Table XI, posttest scores reveal strong positive changes in the expectation level of associate teacher competencies. After observing and working with associate teachers, the respondent rate increased from 34.6% to 84.6% of the teachers who indicated they expected associate teachers to handle the classroom with confidence and assurance. Category B reveals a substantial impression with student ability to master academic knowledge and skills. In discussing the area of relationship with children, teachers indicated that the four different exposure levels should result in keener perception and better understanding of human development as reported in category C. The last area of condensed responses identifies realism as a program spin-off. In general, teachers expect associate teachers to be more familiar with the school setting and more realistic in their approach to the total picture of teachers' responsibilities and children's needs.

Professor Responses

Seven professors were interviewed initially. The results as displayed in Tables XII through XXII are responses from those seven professors whose methods or skills courses were implemented into the program the first year.

Data elicited from professors fall into five categories as presented in Table XII.

TABLE XII

BASIS OF PROFESSORS' KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

	A Visit to a center	B Hearsay	C Reading	D Involvement in program	E Steering committee member
pretest	5	3	5	5	2
posttest	5	2	6	7	2

Seventy-one percent of the Oklahoma State University college of education faculty referred to contact with primary sources as noted in category A. Before commitment to the experimental program, some professors had visited a variety of centers in Kansas, Florida, Arizona, Indiana and one had visited centers in England. During the first year, other centers were visited in Nebraska and Kansas. It should be noted that every methods professor had visited at least one other site identified as a part of the teacher center movement in

America (See previous reference to Syracuse Project by Yarger and Leonard, pp. 127-136). Centers visited had either or both preservice and inservice components available for observation.

Although conversation was the source of some information, it should also be noted that professors were aware of literature on the subject and category C shows an increase from 71% to 86% expanding their knowledge by reading. Professors interpreted their involvement in the ONSITE program to be an educational endeavor as cited in category D. Elaboration on this item by professors revealed that for the most part they examined and restructured their courses especially to fit the experimental program. Activity on the steering committee was not open to all and two represents 100% of those asked to serve in this capacity. Both of the professors involved in the steering committee visited centers in preparation for the implementation of the ONSITE program and during the first year of actual program implementation.

Because of the diversity of contact, there were numerous single items mentioned as desirable components for inclusion in long range plans. Table XIII is a refinement into collective categories of these responses.

Most professors (71%) expressed the opinion consistently that this endeavor should offer additional materials and equipment and immediate accessibility to teachers and children as noted in categories A and B. It would appear that professors became more aware and desirous of expanded opportunities for actual involvement by both associate teachers and inservice teachers during the first year (See categories C and D , Table XIII).

TABLE XIII

PROFESSORS' OPINIONS OF WHAT A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER SHOULD INCLUDE

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Variety of instructional resources and materials	Easy access to children and teachers	Gestalt experiences for associate teachers	Inservice components	Formal vehicle to relate classroom experience to ONSITE program	Other
pre-test	5	5	4	4	0	8
post-test	5	5	7	6	3	3

The one item which came into existence as a result of the experimental year is noted in category E. Three professors expressed a strong desire for a formal means of communication during the next session. It should also be noted that at the end of the first year, most professors (86%) expressed the need or desire to expand the inservice component although they generally agreed that preservice should continue to be the main focus of this particular program. The "other" category is inclusive of items such as the desire for a course in human relations and additional needed space in the ONSITE classroom.

Table XIV is a display of data collected from professors concerning their opinions of the nature and degree of cooperation in the teacher education process.

Like the teachers, the professors made a positive unisonal response to the question, "Should teacher education be a cooperative venture by university and public schools?" With one accord they

expressed the opinion that it should be, (category A, Table XIV). However, only 71% would assert that it is cooperative as shown in category B.

TABLE XIV

PROFESSORS' OPINIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF COOPERATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

	A Should be cooperative	B Is cooperative	C Should have equal responsibilities	D Need more clearly defined responsibilities
pretest	7	4	1	3
posttest	7	5	2	5

The difficulty with this question again was concluded to be the defining of "cooperative". With regard to categories C and D, one professor commented:

> Teacher education should be more cooperative than it is now. That is, teachers should be telling university people some kinds of courses they would like taught. This would help keep courses relevant to what is happening in the public school classrooms.

A condensation from another professorial response was:

> Yes, teacher education should be cooperative. The responsibilities need to be clearly defined. The professor must identify what the information base should be and the teacher's responsibility is clinical. The schools should provide the practicum and perhaps a follow-up on post student teaching. Both theoretical and clinical aspects are essential.

How professors perceive their role and how they perceive the roles of others involved in the ONSITE program is included in the study. Data were collected covering three role aspects and are displayed in Tables XV, XVI, and XVII.

TABLE XV

PROFESSORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Methods teacher	B Resource person	C Facilitator	D Technique demonstrator	E Other
pretest	5	6	2	3	2
posttest	7	0	0	2	3

Table XV indicates that professors perceived a greater variety of activities for themselves at the onset of the program than actually materialized. (Note pretest scores.) Their major role perception corresponded 100% with their university responsibility as displayed in category A. Twenty-nine percent of the professors planned and executed unusual techniques made possible by availability of children (category D). One professor is utilizing micro-teaching. The "other" category included roles such as steering committee member and program director.

TABLE XVI

THE ROLE PROFESSORS EXPECTED THE UNIVERSITY TO TAKE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Provide staff	B Prepare and offer inservice program	C Provide resources	D Provide opportunity for teacher involvement	E Provide demonstration lessons	F Other
pre-test	7	2	2	7	3	1
post-test	7	4	6	2	5	5

Table XVI indicates that the professors were unanimous in perceiving the university as providing the teaching staff for the center. Professors became progressively aware of the role they expected the university to take in offering inservice programs and providing resources (categories B and C). Category D indicates that all professors expected the university to take the initiative in providing opportunity for teachers' involvement at the onset of the program. It is of interest that after a year in the program, 71% of the professors relegated this initiative to the teachers. It is also of interest to note that although only 28.5% of the professors perceived their role to include demonstration lessons (see Table XV), 71.4% perceived the role of the university to include the provision of demonstration lessons! The "other" category includes such items as financial commitment and unique ideas for experimentation in class.

TABLE XVII

THE ROLE PROFESSORS EXPECTED THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO TAKE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A	B	C	D	E
	Provide practicum experience	Supervise associate teachers	Identify information base expected of associate teachers	Assist in planning program	Provide students
pre-test	7	7	4	4	5
post-test	7	7	3	5	6

Table XVII displays a 100% agreement by the professors concerning their perception of the public school's role in providing the practicum experience for the associate teachers and the supervision of these experiences (categories A and B). Fifty-seven percent of the professors expected the schools to identify the information base they expect the associate teachers to have acquired by the time they come to them. This dropped to 43% at posttest time. Seventy-one percent of the professors expected active assistance by the public schools in planning the program at posttest time. Professors were quick to say that they felt the schools should be more aggressively involved in all phases of the program. Eighty-five percent of the professors listed provision of students as an expected function of the schools at the time of the posttest. There was an increase of response in posttest of both categories D and E.

The ONSITE classroom was located in a public school approximately

one and a half miles from the university campus. The methods classes were taught in the public school setting and this necessitated travel to the schools by the professors and back on campus for other duties. Professors were asked several questions which relate to the school setting. How do professors feel about having to go to the school to teach? Do professors feel welcome in the school setting? Do professors teach their courses any differently in the public school than the same courses taught on campus? Table XVII displays professors' reactions to this innovation in their academic routine.

TABLE XVIII

PROFESSORS' REACTIONS TO GOING TO SCHOOLS

	A Inconvenienced by movement	B Like to go out to school	C Feel welcome in schools	D Course taught differently than on campus	E Other
pre-test	1	4	5	6	3
post-test	4	2	6	4	9

Generally professors feel welcome in the schools. Those that could not make a positive statement did say they have never felt unwelcome in the school setting. There is a noticeable increase from 14% to 57% in the professors who felt inconvenienced by this dimension of the program. The major reason cited for the inconvenience is the

amount of equipment required for the subject being taught. Some professors were simply forthright in their statement of inconvenience but were also quick to state they felt it was worth the inconvenience. In the pretest a large percentage (85%) of the professors expected to teach their course differently from the way they teach the students in the regular student teaching program on campus. In the posttest, only 57% actually followed through with their plans. Two professors adjusted their locale assignment. The audio-visual professor found much of his equipment too heavy to transport and the meeting times irregular. Another professor felt his particular approach and time assignment were not adaptable to the school setting. Most professors included projected plans in their statements gathered in "other" category. Areas such as plans to use teachers more, teach differently next session, provide modules and do more demonstrations were incorporated into the last category.

Advantages of the ONSITE program as identified by professors fall into five categories. Table XIX displays these data.

TABLE XIX

ADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY PROFESSORS

	A Students learn earlier if teaching is for them	B Better communications between university and public schools	C Students more realistic about teaching	D Teachers receive more help in class	E Other
pretest	5	1	5	3	9
posttest	6	4	7	3	4

Among the advantages of the program as identified by professors, the two categories which received the most response were A and C. Eighty-five percent of the professors mentioned that students being able to decide earlier either to enter or not to enter the profession was a distinct advantage. The majority of the professors also mentioned that associate teachers having a more realistic attitude about teaching was an advantage. At the time of the pretest only one professor anticipated any improved communications between the schools and the university. The posttest shows a change from 14% to 57% who listed better communication as an advantageous product of the program. Almost half (43%) of the professors identified in both pretest and posttest, the extra help given to classroom teachers as a direct advantage of the program. The "other" category is inclusive of notations such as getting the professors back in the classroom, stronger profession, sense of cohesiveness and comradeship among associate teachers and willingness of everyone to experiment.

Professors also identified disadvantages of the ONSITE program. These data are presented in Table XX.

TABLE XX

DISADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY PROFESSORS

	A Scheduling	B Personal inconvenience	C Inadequate materials and equipment	D Insufficient interaction with teachers	E Other
pretest	4	3	3	1	7
posttest	5	5	3	3	3

Scheduling was identified by both teachers and professors as problematic. However, more professors (57%) anticipated scheduling to be disadvantageous and so this group experienced less actual change on this item. Only 43% of the professors indicated on the pretest that they expected personal inconveniences to emerge as a disadvantage of the program. In the posttest, there was an increase to 71% who registered personal inconveniences as disadvantages of the program. Category C showed a constant or no change response among professors concerning inadequate materials and equipment. Another disadvantage which culminated in a discrete category was entitled insufficient interaction with teachers. Only one professor anticipated this in identified disadvantages but three out of seven noted it in the posttest. Percentagewise, the jump is from 14.2% to 42.8% which is significant. The "other" category is inclusive of such disadvantages as the unpredictable nature of any experimental program, less information base for associate teachers, and lack of proper inservice for cooperating teachers.

Another area in which information was solicited from professors concerns the overall effect which the ONSITE program will have on teacher education. Several questions were posed and the data are grouped and summarized in Table XXI.

Except for competencies expected in beginning teachers, no change occurred in professors' perceptions of effects of the experimental program on teacher education in general. The unusual element is that Table XXI is a composite.

TABLE XXI

PROFESSORS' PERCEPTION OF THE EFFECT OF THE ONSITE PROGRAM ON TEACHER EDUCATION

	A	B	C	D
	Will improve quality of teacher preparation program	Personal and professional improvement	Teaching load increased	Beginning teacher will be more competent
pre-test	5	6	4	6
post-test	5	6	4	3

When discussing the effect on the quality of the teacher preparation program, 71% of the professors noted that it would build in concrete experiences and also eliminate redundancy in courses. The remaining 29% noted there would be a sacrifice in human energy with the faculty being spread so thin. Also it was noted that extra clinical time might necessitate a trade off between skills and informational background for the associate teacher. As indicated by category B, a majority of the professors interpreted the ONSITE program as a positive personal and professional opportunity for growth and development. On the negative side, a majority also noted that their own teaching load would be increased significantly by the arrangement of the ONSITE schedule. In category D where there was a change of attitudinal stance from 85.7% down to 42.8%, there was registered a sensitivity to the word "competent". Three of the professors suggested that confident or comfortable might be more accurate.

As a follow up on the observation concerning associate teacher

competency, professors were asked to identify some competencies which might reasonably be expected in student teachers as a result of having been trained in the ONSITE program. Table XXII is a summarization of the data gathered.

TABLE XXII

PROFESSORS' EXPECTATIONS OF COMPETENCIES GAINED BY ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

	A	B	C	D
	Will handle classrooms with confidence and assurance	Will demonstrate more knowledge and skill in each academic area	Will demonstrate better understanding of human development	Will deal realistically with classroom procedures
pre-test	3	2	4	4
post-test	6	3	5	7

During the course of the first year, the response increased 100% from 3 to 6 professors who identified confidence and assurance in handling classrooms as an expected competency in associate teachers trained in the ONSITE program. Category B alludes to academic achievement. There was an increase from 28.5% to 42.8% of the professors who indicated that they expected the associate teacher to be able to demonstrate more knowledge and skill in each academic area. Category C inserts the human relations component. There was a percentage response increase from 57.1% to 71.4% who indicated that they

expected the associate teacher to demonstrate better understanding of human development; i.e., they will relate better to children at different levels. The responses collected in category D indicate an increase from 57.1% to 100% of the professors who stated they expected associate teachers to deal more realistically with classroom procedures. In essence, the associate teachers will know what to expect.

Principals' Responses

Four principals were interviewed for this study. Although three schools were selected for initial inclusion in the experimental program, four represents the totality of elementary principals located in the city of Stillwater. The researcher decided that any future expansion plans would make the opinions and attitudes of the remaining principal significant. There are five elementary schools in Stillwater but one principal serves two schools and one of his schools was included in Phase I of the ONSITE program. All principals were invited to have input in the planning stages of this program through participation on the steering committee. All principals were present at meetings but not with a patterned regularity.

Since principals were involved by virtue of academic relationship to their teachers rather than by responsibility for associate teachers or direct implementation of any teaching phase, the researcher decided a midpoint interview would be more valuable giving principals adequate time to observe actions and reactions of both university and public school personnel involved. Therefore, the first interview schedule was administered to principals near the beginning of the second semester and again at the completion of the first year in the program.

The data collected from the principals are displayed in Tables XXIII through XXXI.

TABLE XXIII

BASIS OF PRINCIPALS' KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

	A Hearsay	B Reading	C Visit	D Participation as a member of steering committee	E Other
pre-test	4	2	1	4	1
post-test	4	2	1	4	4

Table XXIII indicates that principals sought out few new sources of information concerning teacher centering. However, in response to a posttest probe question, "Do you feel you now know more about a teacher center then you did a year ago?", every principal answered affirmatively. Two principals continued reading, although admittedly not as much as they would have liked or felt they should. Category D indicates that 100% of the principals interpreted their activity and contact with the steering committee as educational. The "other" category includes coursework done by one principal and involvement by other principals with the program by virtue of having responsibility for cooperating teachers and associate teachers in their buildings.

Table XXIV displays principals' responses to what they thought should be included in a teacher education center.

TABLE XXIV

PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS OF WHAT A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER SHOULD INCLUDE

	A Facilities	B Staff	C Variety of experiences for students	D Materials and equipment for elementary classroom	E Other
pretest	2	4	2	3	3
posttest	4	4	4	3	4

As shown in category A, 50% of the principals indicated facilities were important to the program at the onset. This percentage increased to 100% during the course of the first year. All principals mentioned the necessity of a staff in both pretest and posttest. Under "staff" they included advisors as well as teachers. Category C again shows a 100% increase in respondents' awareness of the desirability of a variety of experiences for associate teachers. Every principal whose school was included in the initial implementation noted that the center should include materials and equipment relevant to the elementary curriculum currently in use. They stated that such materials would allow the associate teacher to integrate into the daily schedule with less interruption to the flow of school program. There was an increase in principals desiring an inservice component from 75% to 100%. One principal stated that the inservice component should definitely not be expanded and another principal stated that it definitely should be. The two remaining principals were unchanging in

their response that the proper focus of the ONSITE program is pre-service but more inservice should be incorporated at the earliest possible date.

Table XXV displays in four categories, principals' opinions concerning the nature and degree of cooperation in the teacher education process.

TABLE XXV

PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF COOPERATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

	A Should be cooperative venture	B Is cooperative venture	C More clearly defined responsibilities needed	D Should have equal responsibilities
pre-test	4	3	4	0
post-test	4	4	4	1

All four principals, as indicated in category A, consistently agreed that teacher education should be a cooperative venture of the university and the public schools. When asked if they considered teacher education to actually be cooperative, one principal had serious questions as indicated in the pretest. After a year in the experimental program, this principal changed to an affirmative stance, as shown in category B posttest. In discussing the concept of cooperation, 100% of the principals suggested that cooperative meant sharing clearly defined

responsibilities rather than having equal responsibilities.

Principals, generally performed the role they perceived to be theirs in the program. Data on the role perception principals had for themselves are shown in Table XXVI. Data concerning principals' perception of the role to be filled by the university are displayed in Table XXVII.

TABLE XXVI

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Liason person or coordinator	B Protector of school personnel	C Steering committee member
pretest	3	1	4
posttest	4	0	4

Table XXVI indicates that 75% of the principals identified their unique role as being a liason person or coordinator at the onset of the program. In this capacity they expressed responsibility for keeping the lines of communication open. Posttest data show an increase from 75% to 100% response in this area. Only one principal envisioned himself in the role of protector at the beginning. At posttest time, this role aspect disappeared. All principals stated a commitment to their inclusion as steering committee members. In commenting, each principal stated that he felt a responsibility to make this a cooperative venture.

TABLE XXVII

THE ROLE PRINCIPALS EXPECTED THE UNIVERSITY TO TAKE IN THE ONSITE PROGRAM

	A Provide staff	B Prepare associate teachers academically	C Parallel role with regard to control
pretest	4	4	1
posttest	4	4	2

Table XXVII shows that principals did not change their role expectation concerning the university's responsibility to provide staff and prepare the associate teachers academically (categories A and B). Expanding their answers, principals explained that a sequence of events is necessary. The university is expected to have already helped the associate teacher develop a sound theoretical/informational base and techniques for classroom implementation before they are actually ready for their clinical experience. Category C shows an increase from 25% to 50% of the principals who do perceive the role of the university to be a parallel role (neither superior nor inferior) to the public schools in the program control.

When asked how they felt about professors doing demonstration lessons in the classroom, all principals expressed approval. However, their reasons varied. Data from these responses are gathered in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS CONCERNING
PROFESSORIAL DEMONSTRATION
LESSONS

	A Should do demonstration lessons	B Professors need to do demonstration lessons	C Teachers welcome demonstration lessons
pretest	4	2	4
posttest	4	4	4

Category B indicates a 100% increase of principals who mentioned the need for professors to renew their personal contact with the elementary classroom; i.e., as one principal put it, "they need to go from the theoretical to where the action is really at!" Category C shows that all principals agreed that their teachers welcome professorial demonstration lessons and consider them a source of new ideas. Two principals cautioned, however, that the demonstration lesson should be convenient to the teacher and relevant to her teaching units. One of the principals said, "If the units they (the professors) present are not in keeping with the continuity in the classroom, there is a tendency to use children and this puts the cooperating teacher at a disadvantage time-wise." A third principal endorsed the idea of professorial demonstration lessons by saying, "They are good for the children, good for the teachers, and good for the professors."

When the question was reversed and the principals were asked if the classroom teachers should do demonstration lessons for associate teachers, the principals were again 100% united in agreement that they

should. This was interpreted as a partial implementation of the "cooperative" nature of this venture. When convenient, expertise should be shared.

Principals were also asked to comment on their teachers' competency to guide associate teachers in implementing desirable teaching techniques. There are a number of first year teachers employed in the system and there are also teachers teaching in the schools who have transferred from other geographical areas. Other teachers, although experienced in teaching, have not had training in supervision of practice teachers. These variables had potential bearing on principals' responses. Table XXIX depicts the data collected.

TABLE XXIX

PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS CONCERNING TEACHER COMPETENCY TO GUIDE ASSOCIATE TEACHERS IN TEACHING TECHNIQUES

	A All teachers competent	B All but first year teachers competent
pretest	2	2
posttest	0	4

Category A indicates that 50% of the principals at the onset of the program considered all of their teachers qualified. Category B shows an upward shift to 100% of the principals who refined their statement to the select group of teachers who have at least one year

of experience in this school. This would also include transfer teachers who are teaching in a new setting. One principal commented that he considered his teachers competent but that they should not feel any obligation to participate. Another principal said, "Yes, I feel all my teachers are well qualified, but they should enroll in university courses and keep up with what's being done in this area."

Table XXX shows the advantages of ONSITE as identified by the principals.

TABLE XXX

ADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY PRINCIPALS

	A Smaller pupil/ teacher ratio	B Associate teacher is better prepared	C Earlier student decision whether to enter profession	D New ideas from associate teachers	E Other
pre-test	2	2	4	2	3
post-test	2	4	4	3	5

Category A shows that 50% of the principals considered the extra adults present in the classroom to be advantageous for pupil assistance. One principal pointed out that the smaller pupil/teacher ratio made one-to-one contact and small group assistance a more frequent possibility. There was an increase from 50% to 100% of the principals who felt the associate teacher would be better prepared, as indicated

in category B. Another advantage of ONSITE as noted by 100% of the principals is that student teachers can decide at an earlier date in their academic life if teaching is really the profession they want to enter. Category D indicates an increase from 50% to 75% of the principals who thought the new ideas brought into the classroom by the associate teachers should be identified as a program advantage. The "other" category is inclusive of random comments such as ONSITE allows teachers time to do inservice, read, study; it will strengthen the profession; there is more cooperation between cooperating teacher and associate teacher; the associate teacher's theoretical ideas can be tried out in the classroom.

Disadvantages of the ONSITE program as identified by the principals are displayed in Table XXXI.

TABLE XXXI

DISADVANTAGES OF ONSITE AS IDENTIFIED BY PRINCIPALS

	A Overload for teachers	B Organization of program	C Too many adults around school	D Confusion among teachers	E Other
pre-test	2	2	4	4	1
post-test	3	4	4	2	5

Category A denotes 50% of the principals considered their teachers to be carrying overloads with the additional responsibility of associate teachers. Many of these teachers also had student teachers

and observation students from the regular program. However, these were volunteer assignments. At posttest time, there was an increase from 50% to 75% of principals who considered this a program disadvantage. Category B shows a 100% increase in principals listing program organization as a disadvantage. Most principals specifically identified scheduling in this category and requested more attention to coordination of the program. Category C is a reflection of actual body count. The students coming in mass groups created problems with regard to lounge facilities, toilet facilities and parking space as noted by all principals. These inconveniences were of a temporary nature and were resolved to a satisfactory degree as stated also by 100% of the principals responding. As one principal said, "These buildings are not new, and when they were built this type of program was not taken into consideration." Category D refers to the slow process of education and information dissemination concerning the experimental program. One hundred percent of the principals identified this area in the pretest and there is a visible decrease to 50% in the posttest. This particular category reflects principal confusion as well as principals' perception of teacher confusion concerning the program. The decrease at posttest time is indicative of the success of group meetings with the program director during the last semester, according to the respondents. The "other" category includes observations such as too many meetings, teachers need some time alone with their children and varying quality of individuals involved in the program.

Associate Teacher Responses

Nineteen students were selected for inclusion as associate teachers in the ONSITE program. There was an attrition rate of 10.5% (two) before the end of the first semester. Two students dropped out of school, one for health reasons and one for financial reasons. These two students were excluded from the experimental program data. The total number of associate teacher respondents is seventeen.

Associate teachers were invited to record their impressions of the program, identify strengths and weaknesses, and list activities in which they engaged as associate teachers. The associate teachers were guaranteed anonymity in order that uninhibited responses might be obtained. This information was gathered four times during the first year of the program, once during each different school and grade level assignment. The data was first gathered September 12, 1974. This data is designated pretest in the Tables. Subsequent data collection was done on December 10, 1974 (posttest 1); February 26, 1975 (posttest 2); and May 1, 1975 (posttest 3). In the final assessment, after completing all the courses incorporated in the program, associate teachers were also asked to identify areas in which they felt best prepared to teach and areas in which they felt least prepared to teach. These students were further invited to make recommendations for improvement of the ONSITE program. Data covering each of the requests are displayed in Tables appropriately labeled.

Associate teachers were engaged in a variety of activities during their elementary classroom assignments. These data fall into six categories and are displayed in Table XXXII.

TABLE XXXII

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY
ASSOCIATE TEACHERS
IN CLASSROOMS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Answer children's questions	Clerical work	Read stories	Construct bulletin boards	Teach small groups	Other
pre-test	16	12	10	13	2	7
post-test 1	17	8	17	17	7	6
post-test 2	17	6	17	17	17	1
post-test 3	17	15	16	15	17	28

Category A indicates very little change during the course of the year. Students were expected to and did relate to children on a one-to-one basis answering questions. This category also emerges as the strongest activity in which they were engaged at the time of the pre-test which was the third week into the program. Category B is a composite inclusive of such things as grading or checking papers, recording grades, making ditto sheets, etc. Respondents' percentages begin at 70.5% and digress to 47%, then down to 35.2%. They surge up to 88% in the final posttest. This heavy emphasis may be due to lack of other experiences at the beginning and need for assistance at the final grading time at the terminal point. Category C shows a steady increase through the posttest 2 from 58.8% to 100%. However, posttest 3 shows a decrease to 94% of respondents noting story reading as an

activity. Category D also indicates an increase between the pretest and posttest 2 from 76% to 100%. Constructing bulletin boards was a consistently heavy activity for associate teachers during the entire year dropping only to 88% in the last assessment. Associate teachers at first felt this to be a job only nominally related to teaching but several noted that they utilized it as a teaching technique, developing and displaying learning stations in the space.

Category E shows the most consistent growth and change of activity. At the time of their first assignment, only 12% of the respondents indicated any teaching activity, even small groups. At the time of the first posttest, 41% were involved in teaching small groups. This percent increased to 100% during the second semester of the program and remained an area of involvement for each of the associate teachers during their third and fourth classroom assignments. Category F is a collection of such activities as making charts, calling out spelling words, directing plays, handling opening exercises for kindergarten, making books, directing poetry writing, making puppets, tutoring, working with the Weekly Reader and teaching special art skills such as making dried apple dolls.

Table XXXIII is a condensation into six categories of the responses by associate teachers in identifying the strengths or advantages of the ONSITE program.

Category A (Table XXXIII) indicates an awareness on the part of associate teachers at the beginning of the program that early exposure to actual classroom experience would assist them in deciding whether teaching is really the profession they wish to pursue. A decrease from 88% response to 24% response on this item is indicative of a

relaxing of personal concern about teaching as a profession.

TABLE XXXIII

ADVANTAGES OF THE ONSITE PROGRAM AS IDENTIFIED BY ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Enables one to decide if he wants to teach	Direct contact with children	Learn what teaching is all about	Become more confident in class	Methods more relevant	Other
pre-test	15	12	10	5	7	6
post-test 1	12	13	12	8	7	16
post-test 2	2	13	15	16	3	10
post-test 3	4	17	16	17	10	12

A specific comment from associate teachers at each assessment time was:

Pretest: I feel that the program helps to prepare one for what takes place in the classroom and to notice the various problems encountered with pupils in teaching . . . I also feel that the program sets a very strong base on which to build. By being less scared of the classroom, I feel that we will be more effective as student teachers. The program is also assuring to me that I have chosen the 'right' vocation.

Posttest 1: One of the strengths of this program is that it lets you know how well you like teaching . . .

> Posttest 2: ONSITE has made me what I am today--a semi-teacher who knows enough to say more than I am going to be a teacher. Today I am becoming a teacher.
>
> Posttest 3: One of the advantages of the program is that I can decide how I personally feel about teaching--duties, responsibilities, my ideals and practicalities towards teaching.

Category B changes from 70.5% up to 100% of the respondents identifying direct contact with and observation of children as advantageous to those involved in the program. Category C shows also a steady increase in responses from 58.8% at the time of the first assessment to 94% at the final data gathering session. One associate teacher summed up her feelings in posttest 1 in this manner:

> Well, I think that this program has been very beneficial to me because it lets me know what is really happening in the public schools. It also makes me have more responsibilities and lets me realize that being a teacher is more than just teaching a lesson.

Another associate teacher's comments at posttest 1 were:

> Most importantly, I am setting a "model" for the type of teacher I want to some day be, and the teaching methods I will want to use. I have learned both positive and negative points from the teachers I have worked with; I will keep some and discard others.

Category D shows an increase in response at each period of assessment. At the beginning of the program only 29.4% of the associate teachers were able to identify confidence in the classroom as an advantage of the ONSITE program. At the time of posttest 1, the percentage had increased to 47%. At the posttest 2, the percent was 94% and then at the completion of the first year in the program, 100% of the respondents identified confidence in the classroom as a distinct advantage they were enjoying. One associate teacher said, "I have become so comfortable and I think this is an important thing-

especially just prior to student teaching." Other associate teachers said at posttest 2 period:

> The nervousness when presenting lessons is gone (except when my professor is observing). I can walk in now and instead of sitting in the corner with great big wide eyes, I have the confidence to say to my cooperating teacher--Hey! give me something to do that will help.

> I feel that I truly have become aware of many of the aspects of teaching. Each day I find myself thinking of ways that I would personally teach that particular idea.

Category E indicates at the beginning of the program and through the first semester, 41% of the associate teachers mentioned the relevancy of methods courses as an advantage. One associate teacher ventured this comment at the posttest 1 session:

> I feel I have learned more through discussions and activities in class than if material were presented and soon tested over. However, sometimes I have felt pressure from the amount of work (researching certain aspects in the library) but it must be realized that this is a part of the class discussions, and I probably make it harder than it really is.

Another student detailed her response at the end of the first semester in this manner:

> I like the experience in the classroom along with language arts; we are able to put many aspects of teaching into practice. Our problems are then expressed freely in the morning class. Having educational psychology and audio-visual aids along with the program is also good.

Posttest 2 reflects a drop of response rate from 41% in this category to 17.6%. There was a change in methods courses during this period. The last data gathered during the final methods course showed an increase to 58.8% of the associate teachers identifying methods relevancy as an advantage of the program. The "other" category is

inclusive of such items as exposure to different grade levels, more relaxed atmosphere of the class, relief from monotony of college courses, small class making for a feeling of unity, exposure to several teachers' ideas rather than just one, chance to try out new ideas, and observation of a variety of teaching styles.

Disadvantages of the program are listed in Table XXXIV.

TABLE XXXIV

DISADVANTAGES OF THE ONSITE PROGRAM AS IDENTIFIED BY ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

	A Daily time in classroom too short	B Not getting involved fast enough	C Scared academic background not adequate	D Disorganized program	E Other
pre-test	3	3	10	9	8
post-test 1	7	8	9	7	5
post-test 2	2	4	3	5	10
post-test 3	0	1	0	9	16

During the first classroom assignment, 17.6% of the associate teachers registered disappointment in not being in the elementary classroom long enough each day as shown in category A and also not getting to participate in more teaching activities immediately as shown in category B. At the time of the second assignment (posttest 1),

there was an increase to 41% who felt they needed more time in the elementary classroom daily to fit into the continuity of the teacher's program. There was a sharp drop at the period of the third assignment to 12% who felt the short amount of time was disadvantageous. In the final procurement of data, there was no mention of sparsity of classroom time as a disadvantage. Category B formed the same response pattern although the percentages were different. At the time of posttest 1, 47% of the associate teachers complained of not being allowed to get involved in the teaching activities in the classroom fast enough. As indicated in Table XXXII, most of the associate teachers were still answering children's questions, reading stories, constructing bulletin boards and doing clerical work. This response reflects a desire to incorporate more of the teaching techniques and skills. By posttest 2, the response drops to 23.5% who still saw this as a disadvantage and at posttest 3, the percentage was still lower--only 5.8%. This diminishing of the percentage is indicative of steady increase in their responsibilities within the classroom.

Category C shows a steady decrease in associate teachers' concern about being adequately prepared to accept teaching assignments. At the onset of the program, slightly over half of the associate teachers (58.8%) were admittedly scared of not being able to satisfactorily handle academic assignments. Over the course of the first year, this disadvantage also disappeared from the data. Category D reflects associate teachers' awareness of the experimental nature of the program. The pretest shows 52.9% of the students voicing disorganization as a main disadvantage at the beginning and again at the end. There was a decrease of response to 41% and then

to 29.4% during the two middle assessment periods but it would appear that the unpredictable aspects of the program as it developed were in evidence the entire year.

The "other" category displays an increasing collection of single or limited responses such as costly transportability or inconvenient transportation, too heavy a class load, schedule too tight--not enough time to get to classes, stage fright, concern over how they were to be evaluated, need for conference time with cooperating teacher and personal inconveniences. Within the group called personal inconveniences were problems such as parking and inadequate facilities in teachers' lounges.

The next three Tables involve data extracted only at the completion of the program. Data will be labeled exclusively by categories. Table XXXV displays responses from associate teachers concerning the areas in which they felt best prepared to teach.

TABLE XXXV

ASSOCIATE TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO AREAS IN WHICH THEY CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE BEST PREPARED TO TEACH

A	B	C	D	E
Language arts	Reading	Science	Social studies	Math
14	6	2	5	6

Table XXXV indicates the area of greatest security in teaching is language arts. Eighty-two percent of the associate teachers, after

having completed all methods courses, listed language arts as the area in which they felt best prepared. Categories B and E indicate that 35% consider themselves to be equally prepared to teach reading and math. Category D falls into third place with a rating of 29.4% of the associate teachers indicating a high level of security in teaching social studies. Twelve percent of the associate teachers stated that they felt best prepared to teach science.

The following statistics were gathered in response to identifying the areas in which associate teachers felt least prepared to teach (Table XXXVI).

TABLE XXXVI

ASSOCIATE TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO AREAS IN WHICH THEY CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE LEAST PREPARED TO TEACH

A	B	C	D	E
Language arts	Reading	Science	Social studies	Math
0	0	9	6	4

As indicated in Table XXXVI, language arts and reading were not mentioned by any associate teachers as areas in which they felt less prepared in comparison to other methods courses. (See categories A and B). Half or 53% of the associate teachers indicated that they felt least prepared to teach science in the elementary school. Thirty-five percent of the associate teachers listed social studies as the area which they felt least prepared to teach. One associate teacher

commented:

> I feel least prepared to teach social studies and science from texts. I can teach social studies as integrated with language arts and other everyday living in the classroom.

It should be noted that emphasis in methods courses was intentionally placed on an integrated approach. There was a distinct effort to avoid conceptual overlapping. Category E shows 24% of the associate teachers who felt least prepared to teach math.

At the final meeting with associate teachers, they were invited to have input into the future of the program by recommendation for its improvement. These recommendations have been reduced to a collective form. Although responses were highly individualistic, they fall into eight categories. These data are presented in Table XXXVII.

TABLE XXXVII

RECOMMENDATIONS BY STUDENT TEACHERS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO ONSITE

Recommendation	Number	Percent
1. Schedule more work in phonics.	1	5.8%
2. Teach math early in the program-- not last.	3	17.6%
3. Use more resource people.	1	5.8%
4. Help teachers be more aware of associate teachers abilities at different levels.	3	17.6%
5. Coordinate schedules more closely.	2	11.7%
6. Plan a better time schedule for audio visual aids.	3	17.6%
7. Make better parking arrangements at public schools.	1	5.8%
8. Screen students more carefully and be sure they are really interested and will show up regularly and participate.	3	17.6%

The recommendations by the associate teachers coordinate positively with areas identified as weaknesses or disadvantages of the program. Although the attitudinal assessment at each of the four data collection times was positive toward the program, associate teachers were conscientious in their efforts to help provide the most effective alternate program possible for student teachers in Stillwater. Typical of the comments made at completion of the program are the following:

> I think we all learned a lot about what education is all about as well as what we are all about. No matter how unbiased one tries to be, you find that you just seem to be in more harmony with one grade or cooperating teacher than another.
>
> I feel that I have matured in my thinking in this program. I was disillusioned at times and at other times so awed at what I saw happening in the classroom.
>
> We are all ready to go into the classroom now. I don't expect to see a group of Joes and Janes, rosy-cheeked and yes, ma'm, no ma'm. I know that children are human and can be just as angry and hurt as I, if a teacher needlessly overlooks their feelings.
>
> Teaching will be a challenge and any preparation that we can gain in college will most certainly help us meet our Waterloos and also enrich our enjoyment of classrooms and pupils.

> I feel like the ONSITE program has truly been successful. As I have stated before, the involvement with the children has been a great experience and I feel "ready" to student teach.

> Just getting to know children before you student teach is going to be a big help. I honestly don't see how you can student teach without going through this program. I would be scared to death.

> I, myself, can look back at how I was when first entering the classroom as compared to today, nine months later. During that time, I have had many personal interactions with students, been able to help with student problems, taught a math unit, taught a reading group for about four weeks, had many language arts lessons, done three bulletin boards, read stories to a class, but most important, just had the opportunity to be in a classroom with real children and good teachers. Just the exposure

to that situation can help me grow as a person and a teacher. I am sure that next fall, while student teaching, we will look back and be thankful for the opportunity of participating in ONSITE 1974-75.

I really feel like I have my "feet" into teaching. I know the realities, as I said before, the ups and downs.

Talk about responsibility!! The three hours we got this semester are well earned. Teachers are really beginning to put us to good use. My teachers usually wanted me to teach a lesson at least two or three times a week. No more of this sitting around observing!! I have really worked but I know it will go to good use. I liked it when we started and I still do.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Summary of the Study

This study was undertaken to provide a descriptive history of the development and implementation of a teacher education center in Stillwater, Oklahoma. The specific and stated purpose of this study was to determine what changes occur in the knowledge and attitudes of personnel involved in the establishing and maintaining of such a center. The particular personnel involved in the establishment of the ONSITE program were teachers, professors, principals and associate teachers.

A review of the literature revealed that although several thousand teacher/teaching centers exist in this country, there is a lack of a generic concept. Teacher centers are responses to locally identified educational needs. Strict definitional attempts are also localized. The major portion of the literature deals with such questions as purpose, function, program, organization, financing and governance. For reference, some general definitions have been ventured inclusive of the questions attended to within the literature. Nevertheless, a strength or weakness of the movement (depending upon interpretive perspective) will evolve from the flexibility of structure and definition. The data tend to speak for themselves in a descriptive

study of this type. However, minimal inferences are attempted.

The subjects for this study consisted of fifty-four respondents falling into four occupational classifications. Twenty-six public school teachers, four elementary school principals, seven university professors and seventeen associate teachers were involved in the first phase of the ONSITE implementation. All personnel were involved on a voluntary basis. Data were collected from professors, teachers, and associate teachers because of and during active personal involvement. Data were collected from principals because of their influential status to the experimental program and their responsibility for school program and personnel.

The instrument used most substantially for data collection was the interview. The investigator developed an interview schedule and administered it to professors, teachers and principals twice during the course of the first year of program implementation. The interview schedule included both open nondirective and closed directive questions. Associate teachers were invited to record their attitudes toward and impressions of the program four times during the course of the first year, once during each eight-week level assignment.

The study was exploratory and questions were designed to add knowledge in the following areas:

1. Attitudes of the participants toward the program at its genesis and after a reasonable period of involvement,
2. Attitudes of participants toward their role responsibility and the role responsibilities of

others involved in the process of teacher education,

3. Identification of program advantages and disadvantages or strengths and weaknesses by personnel involved,
4. Identification of activities and teaching procedures incorporated into the ONSITE program.

To obtain the data relevant to these areas of interest, the investigator: 1) examined and analyzed literature relating to the history and development of the teacher center concept and movement both from abroad and within this country, 2) attended and participated in steering committee meetings, 3) collected and studied data gathered from correspondence with other centers identified with the movement, 4) formulated an interview schedule, 5) administered the interview schedule to teachers, professors and principals, 6) collected data from associate teachers regarding the program, and 7) analyzed the data.

Conclusions

Many observations and inferences may be made from the data collected and recorded in the Tables in Chapter IV. These are presented in two patterns: 1) General conclusions that concern all levels of respondents, and 2) Specific conclusions that are relatively clean cut and unique to one type or classification of respondent.

General Conclusions

Although there is available in the literature a growing amount of information concerning the teacher center movement, the major source of baseline knowledge for all personnel involved in the establishment

of ONSITE was consistently from conversation or hearsay rather than from reading. However, during the course of the first year of involvement, participation in the program was considered an increasing source of education with regard to the center concept. Since the participants relied upon their own involvement for concept formation, confirmation of original stance on both program focus and elements to be included in the center were to be expected. Phase I was planned and implemented with a preservice focus and although inservice was not overlooked, it never reached more than a secondary focus status. All participants agreed that teacher education should be a cooperative venture by the public schools and the university but no clear vision ever emerged as to whether it is actually cooperative in nature. As time progressed, there was a striking change by all participants of an awareness of a need for more clearly defined responsibilities within the cooperative effort.

Role perception within the ONSITE program aligned very strongly in each of the personnel groups with their major school or university assignment. This is only true of how each perceived his own responsibility, however; respondents were more imaginative in how they perceived the role of others.

Although many individual advantages to different aspects of the program were identified, one stands out as receiving consistently increased identification, particularly by teachers and professors. This advantage is in improved relations and more open communication between the public schools and the university. Many comments were taped concerning the human relations element. It was noted by all respondents except the associate teachers.

The strongest disadvantage that cut across all personnel lines was scheduling. Although this was not anticipated, it evolved as the greatest single disadvantage. Scheduling was mentioned and expounded upon by all engaged in implementing the new program. The overall category of scheduling, however, was broken down into various components. Scheduling was inclusive of items such as not going directly from a particular methods course into a classroom where that subject was being taught, not having enough time to get from one school to another, professors being unable to fit their subject into the allotted time slot, associate teachers running into difficulty with needed campus courses being scheduled simultaneously with ONSITE classroom time, cooperating teachers scheduled to take too many students, etc.

The overall response to the program, however, was definitely positive. The response level started out high and climbed higher concerning the competencies expected of student teachers trained in the teacher education center as opposed to students trained in the regular student teaching program. Professors registered less change in their responses but they were consistently high. One interesting item with regard to this observation was that professors had a bit of difficulty with the term, "competent". Nevertheless, they stated they definitely expected these student teachers would be more comfortable in the classroom or more confident, if not more competent. Teachers did not voice this hesitancy. They refined the concept of competency to identify specific areas in which they expected visible results. Teachers and principals expected associate teachers to approach their student teaching experience with a more realistic

attitude concerning teaching responsibilities, to demonstrate better understanding of human development and handle classrooms with more confidence and assurance. Associate teachers, themselves, concurred with these expectancies as results of extra school exposure provided by the ONSITE program.

Specific Conclusions

With regard to informational sources, teachers were the only group that registered a striking change from 7.7% to 62% of respondents who acknowledged their representative on the steering committee as a dispenser of information concerning the center.

Teachers also voiced the greatest awareness of the changes in the area of human relations. Within the temporal limits, there was an increase from 30.7% to 100% of the teachers who identified cooperation or joint effort between the two organizational units (the public schools and the university) as being a component needed in the teacher education center.

Unique to professorial responses, from no mention during the pretest to a 43% response at the posttest, was an expressed desire for a formal means of communication during the next semester. The lack of a fulltime director or coordinator influenced this category and assisted in bringing into focus the immediate need for such a person or persons. The directorship of this program at its inception was an overload since the director was engaged in fulltime teaching. As might be expected, professors also did the major portion of the visiting of other centers.

One unusual and unexpected change occurred among professors'

responses. At the first interview, six out of seven professors saw themselves in the role of a resource person. After a year in the program, not a single professor identified himself as a resource person but when asked what role they expected the university to take in the ONSITE program, six out of the seven stated that they expected the university to provide resources. In all probability, the resource focus vacillated from human to material.

Attitudes among institutional constituents were of special interest to this study. During the course of the year, teachers expressed a change in role expectation concerning the university. Before entry into the program, the teachers were more willing to lean heavily upon the university to take the role customarily assigned in the regular student teaching program. There was a drop in the responses of those who expected the university to provide leadership and an increase in those who expected the university to provide resources and give guidance and counseling. Teachers registered a desire for more input but for the most part were willing to work through their steering committee member rather than through unique aggressive involvement such as doing demonstration lessons, taking extra inservice courses or being a program planner.

One change unique to principals' responses related to their opinions concerning teacher competency to guide associate teachers in teaching techniques. At the time of the first interview, the response was divided. Two responses indicated that all teachers were competent and two responses indicated that all teachers except first year teachers were considered competent to guide in this area. At the second interview, all principals were in agreement that teachers

needed at least a year of teaching experience to acquire the competency necessary to guide associate teachers in classroom teaching techniques.

One of the most unexpected interview responses came from teachers in identifying disadvantages to the ONSITE program. At the time of the pretest, all but one teacher cited several areas of concern and anxiety. It is of importance that after a year in the program, ten teachers (38%) responded "None" when asked to identify disadvantages. Several others who did identify some problematic areas, were quick to continue comment saying that they were minimal or nonconsequential in comparison with the program improvement.

Data gathered from associate teachers revealed a steady growth pattern of activities and responsibility in the classroom. Associate teachers indicated that they began by answering children's questions, doing clerical work, reading stories, and constructing bulletin boards mainly. These activities continued through each grade level exposure. There was a decrease in clerical work during the second two assignments. As time progressed, their responsibilities were enlarged and 100% of the associate teachers were involved in the experience of teaching small groups by the second semester of the year and also engaged in team planning of some small units.

With regard to the methods courses, associate teachers identified areas in which they felt the best prepared and the least prepared. Language arts, reading and math evolved as being well within the comfort zone as these associate teachers approach their student teaching experience. Data revealed that associate teachers felt least prepared to teach social studies and science. This lack of confidence can be attributed to the fact that they had more exposure

to the teaching of language arts, reading and math in the elementary classroom.

Associate teachers offered eight recommendations for improvements to the ONSITE program from their point of view. It is of interest that three of the eight relate directly to the problem of scheduling. There was general consensus that there was a problem of getting into the classrooms at the time the specific subjects were taught as well as having time to plan with the cooperating teacher. The other areas of multiple response show a concern for future associate teachers from two angles. They expressed a desire for more careful screening of students because of extra time demands made by this program. They also expressed a desire that cooperating teachers be made more aware of associate teachers' abilities. For example, students were often asked to participate in subject areas before they were exposed to those methods.

Recommendations for Further Study

This descriptive study is only a first step in providing data needed for analytical and effectual program planning related to this alternate teacher education program entitled ONSITE. The findings indicate there are several identified areas of expectation that need further research to determine the level of success.

Further study should be conducted to determine if, in effect, student teachers trained in the ONSITE program do have competencies not available or observable in student teachers trained in the regular student teaching program. This comparative study may only be done after the first year associate teachers have completed their

student teaching experience.

The researcher also suggests that a significant contribution can be made by a refined identification of associate teacher competencies.

Within the area of professional development, both preservice and inservice, there is a great need for the use of quantified instruments for evaluation purposes. This study used perceptions and opinions of program participants in identifying areas of subject competencies. The investigator suggests that a comparative study of teaching techniques or strategies would prove most helpful to future program implementors.

Since the end result of all teacher preparation programs is the successful instruction of children, a significant future research study might well be to measure the impact of program participants upon the lives of children involved.

Further Considerations

During the year of direct involvement in this research project, the author made countless observations and formulated many personal views concerning this venture. Thus, the discussion which follows is based upon observations rather than any analysis of data collected in this study.

Stillwater is a university town. Consequently, the public schools have been beseiged through the years with an abundance of educational projects. Nevertheless, the level of enthusiasm after a year of involvement is unusually high among teachers who have participated in the ONSITE program. A cooperative spirit is now in evidence that a year ago was nonexistent. There is a definite possibility

that this spirit of cooperation is directly related to the ONSITE program. University people and public school people are coming together and working on common goals. They both want better teachers in the classrooms. Teachers and professors are sensitive to the need for progress and are open to processes which might prove beneficial. There is a warmth of relationship which is reflected especially in the speech patterns of teachers and teacher associates.

The teacher center concept has potential as a change agent that defies limitations. Personnel involved in the local implementation of ONSITE have only slightly tapped the surface of potential changes in relationships and educational programs. Although a disappointingly few people involved in ONSITE enlarged their knowledge of the movement by becoming familiar with the current literature concerning it, the one inservice component in the program made a great change in the reading patterns of those teachers and principals who were involved. Even the conversation in the faculty lounges was noticeably affected by exposure to current educational literature--a much needed and most welcome change and one in which teachers took justifiable pride.

Concerning the spirit of enthusiasm and cooperation, teachers are eager to expose children to new experiences and provide them for small group work with associate teachers. The writer has also taken note of how influential principals are in establishing the basic tenor of their entire school concerning this innovative program. People tend to feel more comfortable when they are included in the formative stages and communication cannot be overemphasized. The entire concept of cooperation, of course, is inclusive--not exclusive.

The future of this project in the eyes of the writer hinges

heavily upon continued emphasis on its cooperative nature. There is the possibility that the ONSITE classroom will change its location before another term begins. However, the site is currently in an elementary school where children are easily accessible. There is doubt that space will be available to continue at this site. Perhaps a neutral location in Lincoln school, which is being phased out, would be a better choice than a classroom on the university campus. It is possible that personnel in the public schools would feel a stronger attachment to the program.

A good deal of study should precede further curriculum innovation. A successful alternate teacher preparation program may well necessitate a broadening of teaching techniques. Certainly if this program is to realize its potential, there must be a reallocation of professorial responsibilities. To attempt this type of program with no load adjustment takes dedication beyond the call of duty. All personnel involved should reasonably expect remuneration in the form of salary increment, college credit, load adjustment or some other appropriate honorarium.

To listen to the students talk about this program is to become excited to the point of action. Without exception, the student evaluations encourage continued effort and interest. All personnel are realistic to the extent of recognizing that the ONSITE program is no more a panacea than any other program. However, even while identifying weaknesses, they continue to enthusiastically accentuate program strengths. This one factor alone has convinced the writer beyond a shadow of a doubt that this program is worthy of further pursuit by all educators who are seriously concerned with the

professional growth and development of teachers. It is hoped that findings from other research studies will be employed to avoid unnecessary repetition.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archambault, Reginald D. (ed.) John Dewey on Education. New York: Random House, 1964.

Arnold, R. "Centre in Britain." Trends in Education, XXIII (July, 1971), 42-45.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Teacher Centers: A British First." Phi Delta Kappan, LII, No. 3 (November, 1971), 146-49.

Bender, A. E. "Teacher Centers in England and Wales" Intellect, CII (March, 1974), 387-89.

Berty, Ernest. Evaluation Report of the Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia. Charleston: West Virginia State Department of Education, 1973.

Broudy, Harry S. The Real World of the Public Schools. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Burdin, Joel L. "Scenario on Teacher Centers in the 1990's." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 40-43.

Burns, W. J., and Others. Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Attain Their Learning Goals? Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, November, 1973.

Clark, Christopher M. "Now That You Have a Teacher Center, What Are You Going to Put into It?" Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 46-48.

Cohen, Saul B., and Mitchell P. Lichtenberg. "Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes." Final Report. Worchester, Mass.: Clark University, July, 1970.

Collins, James F. "The Making of a Teacher Center." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 13-20.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1965.

Crosby, Michael J. "A Teacher Looks at Teaching Centers and Educational Reform." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 31-36.

DeVault, M. Vere. "Teacher Centers: An International Concept." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 37-39.

Dickson, George E. (ed.) Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio. Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, College of Education, June, 1972.

Eddy, W. F. "How Successful are the British Teacher Centers?" Educational Leadership, XXXI (March, 1974), 509-511.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The Reform of Education and Teacher Education: A Complex Task." Journal of Teacher Education, XXIII, No. 2 (Summer, 1972), 117-25.

_____ and Dave Darland. "Fickle Frenzy of Federal Funding: Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education, XXIII (Spring, 1972), 3-4.

Elam, Stanley, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971.

Ellis, M. W. "Systems Model for Integration of Media into the Teacher Center Concept." Education Technology, XIV (July, 1974), 45-49.

Fibkins, W. "Whys and Hows of Teacher Centers." Phi Delta Kappan, LV (April, 1974), 567-69.

Fisher, Stephen J., and Roland J. Goddu. Student Teaching Centers: A Pilot Project. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Center for Research and Development, 1962.

Flowers, John and Others. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.

Futchs, Mariya. "Shared Responsibility: A Special Study on One Structural Feature of Teacher Centers." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1971.

Galler, Wayne H., and Myrna M. Taney. Benefits Accruing for the Profession via University-Public School Partnership. Illinois State University, College of Education, 1974.

Good, Carter V. and Douglas E. Scates. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Grabowski, S. M. "Educational Resources Information Center." Adult Leadership, XVII (January, 1974), 313-14.

Hillerich, R. L. "Creative Learning Center." Elementary School Journal, LXIV (February, 1969), 259-64.

Houston, W. Robert and Others. Restructuring Teacher Education. A Report of the Rationale, Objectives, and Activities of the Houston Teacher Center, 1970-73. Houston, Texas: University of Houston, College of Education, 1973.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Comprehensive Renewal in the Public Schools: The Context and Potential of Teacher Centers." Education Digest, XL (October, 1974), 20-23.

_____. "Teacher Centers--Is There Anything New? Some Tentative Guidelines for Assessing the Nature and Extent of Collaboration and Renewal." Paper prepared for the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1974.

Hyman, Herbert. Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Jahoda, Marie, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. Part One: Basic Processes. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

Jenkins, Kenneth D. "Proposal for Teacher Education Centers." Unpublished proposal. Boone, N. C.: Appalachian State University, January 10, 1975.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Marsha Weil. Concepts of Teacher Centers. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May, 1973.

_____. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Judson, Madison. "Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 44-46.

Kahn, R. L. and C. F. Cannell. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: Wiley Co., 1957.

Kaplan, Leonard. "Survival Talk for Educators--On Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 49-51.

Kelley, Earl. Education for What is Real. New York: Harper, 1947.

Labovitz, Sanford, and Robert Hagedorn. Introduction to Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Leonard, Albert J. "Teacher Centers: Where Do They Come from and Why?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1974.

Lord James of Reisholm. Teacher Education and Training. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.

Macoby, Eleanor E. and N. Macoby. "The Interview: A Tool of Social Science." In G. Lindsey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954, 449-487.

Maddox, Kathryn, (ed.) In West Virginia, It Is Working: One Teacher Education Center in Action. Washington, D. C. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.

_____. "Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center Handbook." Charleston, West Virginia: Kanawha Valley MITEC, n.d.

Malcolm, D. D. "Center/Satellite Model: Grand Strategy for Change." Personnel and Guidance Journal, LII (January, 1974), 303-308.

Mallan, John T. "Teaching Centers: Utopia, Eutopia, or Kakotipia?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, February, 1974.

Marsh, David. "An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites." Paper prepared for the Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development, University of South Florida, Tampa, 1972.

Meade, Edward J. "When a Foundation Goes to School." Today's Education, LVII (March, 1973), 22-24, 64.

Merrit, Daniel L., and Evelyn Belle. "The Teaching Education Center Is Alive and Well." Journal of Teacher Education, XXIII, No. 2 (Summer, 1972), 152-54.

Moser, C. A. and G. Kalton. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Myers, Donald A. "Citizens Advisory Committees and Educational Policy Development." (Unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962.)

Owen, J. G. "Developing Teacher Centers." Trends in Education, XXVIII (October, 1972), 2-7.

Pitcher, Paul S. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan, VIV, No. 5 (January, 1973), 340-43.

Plowden, Bridget. Children and Their Primary Schools. London: Institute of Education, University of Exeter, 1970.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Opening Up the View." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), 52-58.

_____. "Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information." Journal of Teacher Education, XXIII (Fall, 1972), 389.

Rogers, Vincent R. Teaching in the British Primary School. New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.

Ruchkin, Judith. "Teacher Centers: How Does One School-College Collaboration Work?" Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Summer, 1974), 170-174.

Rust, V. D. "Teacher Centres in England." Elementary School Journal, LXXIII (January, 1973), 182-192.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Schmieder, Allen. "Teacher Centers: A Brief History." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1972.

_____ and Sam J. Yarger. "Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene." Joint publication AACTE, Leadership Training Institute on Educational Personnel Development, and ERIC Clearinghouse. Washington, D. C., November, 1974.

_____ and Sam J. Yarger. "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), 5-12.

_____ and Stephen Holowenzak. "Consortia." Competency Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospectives. (ed.) W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1972, 87-91.

Selden, David and David Darland. "Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?" Teaching Leadership Training Institute of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, January, 1972.

Sheatsley, P. B. "The Art of Interviewing and a Guide to Interviewer Selection and Training." (ed.) Marie Jahoda and Others, Research Methods in Social Relations. Part 2. New York: Dryden, 1951, 463-492.

Silberman, Harry. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

_____. "Santa's Workshop for Teachers--Philadelphia's Teacher Center." American Educator, VII (December, 1971), 3-8.

Smith, B. O. and Others. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Smith, E. Brooks and Others. (ed.) Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association for Student Teaching, 1967.

_____. "Partnership in Teacher Education Revisited: Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Fall, 1974), 253-55.

_____. "Total Professional Development of Teachers: The Teachers' Center Way." Childhood Education, L (April, 1974), 330-32.

Smith, Emmitt D. "The State of the States in Teacher Centering." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), 21-25.

Smith, William L. "A * by Any Other Name." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV (Spring, 1974), 2.

Solomon, Elane. "The Wednesday Program." Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Regional Schools, n. d.

Thorndike, Robert L. and Elizabeth Hagen. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.

Walton, J. "Teacher Centres: Their Role and Function." Forum, XV (October, 1972), 15-17.

Weber, Lillian. The English Infant School and Informal Education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Woodruff, Asabel. Basic Concepts of Teaching. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1961.

Yarger, Sam J. "The Future--Do Teacher Centers Have One?" Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1974.

_____. "A Tool for the Analysis of Teacher Centers in American Education--A Working Paper." Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University, 1973.

_____ and Albert J. Leonard. "A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education." Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University, 1975.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

1. Have you learned about teacher education centers by reading, hearsay, visit, coursework or involvement?

2. What do you think a teaching center should include?

3. In planning a teacher education center for Stillwater, would you prefer that its main focus be on preservice training for student teachers or on inservice training for teachers already employed?

4. Do you think that teacher education should be a cooperative venture by public schools and the university?

5. Do you think Stillwater teacher education is a cooperative venture by public schools and the university? If not, why not?

6. How do you see yourself involved in the Stillwater teacher education center?

7. What role do you expect the university to play in the teacher education center?

8. Would you want the teaching center classroom in your school?

9. What do you expect will be some of the advantages of the teacher education center?

10. What do you expect will be some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center?

11. Do you feel this teacher education center concept will improve the quality of our teacher preparation program?

12. Do you expect the beginning teacher to be more competent as a result of being trained in a teacher education center? How?

13. How do you feel about having professors around the school and in the classrooms?

14. Do you expect to do demonstration lessons for associate teachers?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROFESSORS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROFESSORS

1. Have you learned about teacher education centers by reading, hearsay, visit, coursework or involvement?

2. What do you think a teaching center should include?

3. In planning a teacher education center for Stillwater, would you prefer that its main focus be on preservice training for student teachers or on inservice training for teachers already employed?

4. Do you think that teacher education should be a cooperative venture by public schools and the university?

5. Do you think Stillwater teacher education is a cooperative venture by public schools and the university? If not, why not?

6. How do you see yourself involved in the Stillwater teacher education center?

7. What role do you expect the public schools to take in the teacher education center?

8. How do you feel about having to go to the schools to teach?

9. Do you feel welcome in the public school setting? If not, why not?

10. Do you plan to do demonstration lessons using children? Or do you plan to capitalize on the availability of children in any way? How?

11. Do you plan to teach your course differently from the way you teach it on campus? How?

12. Do you think teachers are competent to guide associate teachers in implementing desirable teaching techniques?

13. What do you expect will be some of the advantages of the teacher education center?

14. What do you expect will be some of the disadvantages of the teacher education center?

15. Do you expect this teacher education center concept will improve the quality of our teacher preparation program? If so, how?

16. Do you expect the beginning teacher to be more competent as a result of being trained in a teacher education center? How?

17. How will this program affect your teaching load?

18. Do you consider your involvement in this program as a professional improvement opportunity for yourself? How?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

1. Have you learned about teacher education centers by reading, hearsay, visit, involvement or coursework?

2. What do you think a teaching center should include?

3. In planning a teacher education center for Stillwater, would you prefer that its main focus be on preservice training for student teachers or on inservice training for teachers already employed?

4. Do you think that teacher education should be a cooperative venture by public schools and the university?

5. Do you think Stillwater teacher education is a cooperative venture by public schools and the university? If not, why not?

6. How do you see yourself involved in the Stillwater teacher education center?

7. What role do you expect the university to play in the center?

8. How do you feel about professors doing demonstration lessons in classrooms using children?

9. Do you think classroom teachers should be used to demonstrate for associate teachers? Elaborate.

10. Do you feel all the teachers in your building are competent to guide teachers in implementing desirable teaching techniques?

11. What do you think some of the advantages of the teacher education center might be?

12. What do you consider to be possible disadvantages of the teacher education center?

13. What complaints have you heard from your teachers concerning the new program?

14. What kinds of positive feedback are you getting from your teachers concerning the program?

15. Have any inconveniences to your school been created by this new program? If so, how have they been dealt with?

16. Do you and your teachers feel any more involvement with the new program than with the regular student teaching program?

17. What specific responsibility do you feel toward making this program a cooperative venture?

APPENDIX D

DIRECTED QUESTIONS FOR ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

DIRECTED QUESTIONS FOR ASSOCIATE TEACHERS

1. In what activities have you been engaged as an associate teacher in the elementary classroom?

2. What subject do you feel best prepared to teach?

3. What subject do you feel least prepared to teach?

4. What do you consider to be advantages of the teacher education center?

5. What do you consider to be disadvantages of the teacher education center?

6. What recommendations would you make for program improvement?

VITA

Jeane Walker Yates

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

Major Field: Elementary Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in North Wilkesboro, North Carolina, the daughter of Rex Colonel and Chloe Martin Walker.

Education: Attended Elementary schools in Winston-Salem, North Carolina; was graduated from R. J. Reynolds High School in 1943; received the Associate of Arts degree from Mars Hill College in Mars Hill, North Carolina in 1946; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina in 1948; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma in 1972; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 1975.

Post graduate courses taken at Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, Calif.; University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif,; College of Marin, Kentfield, Calif., and Dominican College, San Rafael, Calif.

Professional Experience: Kindergarten teacher, Ellen Semple Elementary School, Louisville, Ky., 1949-50; Kindergarten/ Music teacher, Jacob Elementary School, Louisville, Ky., 1950-51; Music/English teacher, Eastern High School, Middletown, Ky., 1952-53; Fourth Grade teacher, Danville Elementary, Danville, Calif., 1954-55; Title III Resource Teacher, Isabel Cook Elementary School, San Anselmo, Calif., 1964-65; Language Arts Core teacher, Red Hill

Junior High, San Anselmo, Calif., 1966-68; Sixth grade teacher, Sleepy Hollow Elementary School, 1968-69; Post graduate Instructor at Golden Gate Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, Calif., 1962-63; Education Methods Graduate Assistant and Student Teacher Supervisor, Oklahoma State University, 1972-75; Title III Intern, 1973-74; Extension Instructor, Oklahoma State University, 1974; Panel Developer and Moderator on Model Elementary Teacher Program for State meeting of Teacher Educators, Oklahoma, 1975.

Professional Organizations: National Education Association; Oklahoma Education Association; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Delta Kappa Gamma; Kappa Delta Pi; Phi Delta Kappa; Association for Teacher Educators; Curriculum Committee Member, Oklahoma Council of Teachers of English.