INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

PERCEPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

WHO WORK IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOLS

by

Larry Glenn Julian

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1995

Approved by

_____
Dissertation Advisor

UMI Number: 9544122

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor _____.

Committee Members _____.

_____.

_____.

_May 2, 1995_____.
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_February 27, 1995_____.
Date of Final Oral Examination

JULIAN, LARRY GLENN, Ph.D. Perceptions And Beliefs Of Teacher Educators Who Work In Professional Development Schools. (1995) Directed by Dr. Bert A. Goldman. pp. 230

The purpose of this study was to investigate the beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding (a) their individual roles as teacher educators in professional development schools, and (b) the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers. Initial and follow-up interviews were conducted with four faculty members in schools of education at two doctoeal-granting southeastern universities. Supporting data were gathered from interviews with others who had first-hand knowledge of the participants behaviors in professional development schools. Also, the participants' course syllabi, related professional writings, and departmental publications were examined to support perceptions and beliefs stated in the interviews.

The research indicated that the participants, in their roles in professional development schools, saw themselves as helpers, facilitators, colleagues, and team members. They were strongly committed to close involvement with the faculties and staffs at the professional development schools in which they worked. They believed that the teacher educator's ideal role included both development of preservice teachers and working to improve what takes place in professional development school classrooms. Participants reported that major influences on their roles had

come from prior experience as classroom teachers and from the influences of mentors. Each participant indicated a large degree of autonomy in carrying out duties in professional development schools.

Regarding the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of preservice teachers, participants believed that field experiences could be more effective if conducted in special settings where frequent support and reinforcement from university-based teacher educators would be available. Participants believed that each university-professional development school partnership should not fit a standard mold, but should be organized to fit the need of the teacher education program and the participating public school. With one exception, participants believed that the professional development school concept was viable for small colleges as well as large universities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks be to God for His love and grace and for the strength and guidance He provided in this endeavor. My family has been a source of tremendous support and encouragement. My now-grown children, Jason and Amy regularly kept me on track and I am especially indebted to them for their understanding and their prodding.

I am most appreciative of the willingness of the participants in this study to share their beliefs and perceptions. At considerable length, they openly and honestly shared much of their inner professional selves.

More than just providing superb academic leadership and support, the members of my initial dissertation committee were good friends and fine colleagues. My chair, Dr. Bert Goldman constantly guided me through coursework and this study and to him I am deeply indebted. The able support, high expectations, and professional assistance from Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. David Strahan, and Dr. Charles Achilles contributed tremendously to the completion of this research. I am also appreciative of the support from Dr. Tony Johnson who joined the committee as this work was in progress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Reform became the educational watchword for the 1980s and that trend has continued into the 1990s. Sparked by the indictment of American public education in *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), educational leaders scrambled to regroup themselves, revitalize the traditional, revamp the unproductive, and rethink teaching and learning processes in general. In a word -- *reform*.

According to Tom (1991), "Not since James Conant published *The Education of American Teachers* in the 1960s has the reform of teacher education received so much sustained critical attention" (p. 7). What else has this educational reform movement affected? Indeed, it is difficult to identify a single aspect of public education that has not been affected in some way. Without question, entire programs of teacher education have been affected by the latest reform movement that began in the 1980s. From revised entry requirements, through restructured programs of study, to enhanced induction efforts, the pervasive reach of reform has been broad (Winitzky, Stoddart, & O'Keefe, 1992).

On the heels of *a Nation at Risk*, state legislatures passed numerous pieces of legislation and administrative regulations intended to rectify the perceived inadequacies in the various state

systems of education and to promote educational quality (Prestine & Bowen, 1993). Two major and enduring reports were produced which caused a considerable stir in higher education institutions that offered teacher education programs. These reports stirred some in the profession of preparing school teachers to evaluate their own individual programs and their methods and ask if the new proposals had merit. A great nationwide debate began over two proposals--one from The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers For The 21st Century* (1986), the other, *Tomorrow's Teachers* by the Holmes Group (1986). The central idea in this debate was reform of teacher education programs. In 1990, the Holmes Group released *Tomorrow's Schools* which added to the impetus for significant reform in teacher preparation programs.

Calls for reform in teacher education are not new to the profession (Klausmeir, 1990). Over the last 50 years there have been more than 25 major reforms proposed (Cruickshank & Cruz, 1989). Koerner (1963), Lortie (1975), Clark (1984), Denemark (1984) and others have criticized traditional teacher education for a variety of reasons. But in the 1980s, the gears of educational change meshed at a more rapid pace and as the 1990s began, change, innovation, and reform in education and teacher preparation became more and more prevalent. The Holmes Group initiative for change, however, was unique because it came from

within the higher education establishment (Wheeler & Giese, 1988).

Despite seemingly continuous calls for reform in education, Sarason (1990) argued that the more things change, the more they stay the same. He observed that in succeeding attempts, reformers had failed to learn from failures of the past. In fact, the examination of the history of field experiences in teacher education reveal some similarities. Writing about educational reform, Cuban (1990) observed that historically, reform efforts seem to be repeated in cycles in which similar approaches and ideas reappear. Whether professional development schools--the setting for this research--will succumb to Sarason's prediction remains to be seen.

More recently, Sarason (1993) continued to urge a major overhaul of traditional teacher education programs. He argued that present preservice programs fail to adequately prepare future teachers for the realities of classroom life. Aligning himself with Goodlad (1984, 1990a), he proposed, not an expansion or strengthening of existing teacher preparation programs, but a total redesign of those programs.

One initiative growing out of the reform movement was the recommendation by the Holmes Group (1986, 1990) that professional development schools be established. Although not a totally new concept (Brennen & Simpson, 1993), the notion of a professional development school was described as:

working partnerships among university faculty, practicing teachers, and administrators designed around the systematic improvement of the practice. These professional development schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, will bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships based on the following principles:

- Reciprocity, or mutual exchange and benefit between research and practice;
- Experimentation, or willingness to try new forms of practice and structure;
- Systematic inquiry, or the requirement that new ideas be subject to careful study and validation; and
- Student diversity, or commitment to the development of teaching strategies for a broad range of children with different backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles.

These schools will serve as settings for teaching professionals to test different instructional arrangements, for novice teachers and researchers to work under the guidance of gifted practitioners, for the exchange of professional knowledge between university faculty and practitioners, and for the development of new structures designed around the demand of a new profession. (1986, p. 66-67).

Yinger and Hendricks (1990) observed that the professional development school was the organizational concept that had received the most attention from the Holmes Group and others. "Broadly conceived, these schools are intended to be real schools committed to organizational and role changes that will enable the integration of preservice education, and professional development with innovative practice and research," (Yinger & Hendricks, 1990, p. 24). Earlier, Abdul-Haqq (1989) said that professional development schools could be viewed as both a product of the most

recent educational reform movement and a means to achieve some of its goals. A significant aspect of the Holmes Group conception of professional development schools was university faculty involvement in the practical field experiences of preservice teachers to a greater degree than was previously known. The professional development school would be more than a location for the capstone student teaching experience at or near the end of a teacher education program. It would be a site where preservice teachers in various stages of preparation would gain valuable, hands-on clinical experience. Brennan and Simpson (1993) believed that "the professional development school can serve as the centerpiece for the teacher education reform effort currently underway" (p.9).

Woloszyk and Davis (1993b) proposed that the professional development school concept could be a major component of change in teacher education. They described an establishment process somewhat more complex than the old laboratory school.

Sedlak (1987) described the relationship between practicing teachers and university faculty as a partnership. He argued that professional development school partnerships would overcome some previous practices in clinical settings and improve the education process in those settings in two ways. First, the education of preservice teachers would be enhanced through this partnership. Second, students enrolled in special clinical schools

would benefit because of the increased effectiveness of the preservice teachers assigned to work with those students.

Clinical experience in teacher education--be it the apprenticeships of yesteryear or traditional student teaching--has long been a significant component in programs of preservice teacher education. In relation to the notion of reform, Berliner (1985) noted that most of the reform efforts have shown increased faith in student teaching and other field experiences. For many years, colleges and universities that specialized in teacher education have, in one way or another, either established and maintained or been associated with designated schools in which preservice teachers could observe teaching-in-action and also develop their own skills under supervision. Even though the number of these designated schools has declined significantly over the past 30 years, the proposal by the Holmes Group to establish professional development schools rekindles hope among those who see the potential value of such sites.

Prior to the Holmes Group (1986) initiative, a similar proposal had been put forth by Goodlad (1984). He suggested a partnership between selected public schools and universities which he called demonstration schools.

> These are the schools targeted for innovation and change which I recommended earlier in this chapter. To them, outstanding career and head teachers are to be drawn. Beginning teachers are to be interned *only* in these schools. University faculty members oriented to research and

development in school organization, curriculum, and teaching are to be provided space in these schools and here carry on their scholarly inquiries, sharing their expertise with the school faculty. The head teachers and a few highly gifted career teachers will serve as clinical faculty in the schools of education. Here, too, resident teachers will spend time as junior members of the faculty, preparing for appointments as career teachers. Research, school improvement, inservice education of experienced teachers, and preservice teacher education will proceed hand in hand. (p. 316).

The historical traditions of these schools will be more fully addressed in the Review of Literature.

Unquestionably, the university faculty member engaged in teacher education was to be, under this concept, a far more significant factor in the field experience for preservice teachers than ever before. The Holmes Group (1986) also envisioned a professoriate more actively involved with the field site itself by greater participation in the experiences of the school and through the opportunity to engage in research in the special settings called professional development schools.

But what is known about professors of teacher education, particularly in relation to clinical situations? Applegate (1987) observed that, in relation to early field experiences, the least examined viewpoint was that of the university faculty member. Sarason (1993) said, "In fact, in the entire literature, reference to personal experience is very rare" (p. 10). A literature search for the purpose of this study confirmed this. McIntyre (1983) pointed out that most of the research on field experience supervision had

examined the influence of the cooperating teacher on the student teacher. Weber (1986) said that even though research efforts had been very thorough in examining most of the major components in teacher education--students, cooperating teachers, program structures, and the like--the research literature of teacher education is remarkably silent on the topic of university-based teacher educators. Lanier (1985) pointed out that very little research of any kind was available dealing specifically with the experiences of being a university-based teacher educator. Zeichner (1980) identified four themes that had emerged in studies related to field experiences. These themes were (a) the influence of the cooperating teacher, (b) the influence of the classroom ecological environment, (c) the conservative influence of the school bureaucracy, and (d) the development of utilitarian teaching perspectives. He pointed out the "plethora of literature" (p.47) which focused on student teachers, but nowhere in his extensive literature review were teacher education faculty mentioned.

The lack of research attention focusing on higher education faculty is obvious in several other works. Field (1991) provided a detailed description of an elaborate planning process for a professional development school associated with the University of West Virginia, but her report did not mention the university faculty to be involved in the project. Lakebrink (1991) reported a graduate-level certification program at DePaul University which

utilized a professional development school. Again, there was no mention of the role or activities of university teacher education faculty. These reports continued a trend previously noted by Lanier and Little (1986) who wrote

> Research on teaching teachers stands in stark contrast to research on teaching youngsters. When teaching is studied in elementary and secondary schools, teachers are considered too important to overlook. But teachers of teachers--what they are like, what they do, what they think--are typically overlooked in studies of teacher education(p. 528).

According to Ducharme (1986), only in rare instances have instructors of professional teacher education courses been singled out for study. "Little is known about 'teacher educators,' the higher education faculty responsible for teacher education," (p. 1). He highlighted the need to narrow the research population to teacher educators in studies of college faculty.

Troyer (1986) believed that the quality of any teacher education program is at least partially dependent on the quality of its professoriate, but noted that teacher educators had rarely been the focus of research on teacher education.

To explain possible reasons for the lack of research on teacher education faculty, she suggested that researchers could have feared that common criticisms of teacher educators might be borne out. Further discussion of these criticisms is contained in the review of Literature. Another possibility offered was a hesitancy to study a complex and diverse population in formats that could yield only simplistic findings.

Thus, it seems that the research arena is abundant with potentially ripe issues related to professors of education, their relationships to field experiences, and their involvement in special clinical settings, which for the purpose of this study, will be called *professional development schools*.

<u>Statement of the Purpose</u>

The purpose of this study was to investigate the beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding (a) their individual roles as teacher educators in professional development schools, and (b) the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers.

<u>Significance of the Study</u>

Teacher educators are arguably a most vital aspect contributing to the preparation of teachers. They teach basic courses and supervise practical field experiences as they implement state rules and regulations governing teacher certification as well as programs of preparation designed by their schools, colleges, or departments of education. They write texts used in teacher preparation courses; they organize and supervise the bulk of research on teaching and learning. Regardless of well intended governmental regulations or the quality of organization of a teacher education program, it is the teacher education professor who makes that which has been planned, researched, and committed to written form, real and meaningful to the aspiring teacher.

Despite the unique and important role of teacher education faculty in developing prospective teachers, relatively little research which focuses on those teacher educators has been conducted other than routine demographic studies based primarily on surveys. What the teacher educator thinks, feels, perceives or believes concerning his or her professional role, particularly as it relates to field experiences for preservice teachers, has been investigated little if at all. McIntyre (1983) observed that research on the influence of university faculty members on any aspect of teacher education field experiences had been uncommon, save for the supervision of student teachers. That trend continues today.

The notion of a professional development school, as envisioned by the 1980's reformers, throws a new, potentially significant ingredient into the mix. University professors involved in teacher education have a new and exciting opportunity. But the elation prompted by a concept is not always born out in real life and there is now a need to investigate the roles and beliefs of teacher education professors who have actually experienced the professional development school. To date, such research is nil. This study will begin to fill that area of research.

Goodlad (1990a) pointed out the importance of studying faculty views because of the impact these perceptions can have on teacher education. His work, however, addressed faculty perceptions about programmatic issues such as teacher education

programs, goals, and socialization, but did not address how teacher education faculty made sense out of their own individual roles.

Research Questions

1. What are the beliefs and perceptions held by teacher education professors regarding their individual roles in professional development schools?

2. What do teacher education professors believe about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers?

Selection of the naturalistic paradigm

Research on teacher educators has been almost exclusively quantitative. For example the works of Ducharme and Ange (1982), Wisniewski and Ducharme (1989), Galluzzo and Arends (1989) and Goodlad (1990a) all deal primarily with percentages of teacher educators who hold particular attitudes or spend their time in particular ways. Such research has yielded descriptive information based on data gathered from questionnaires and surveys. Useful demographic information has been produced through quantitative methods. These methods have been appropriately chosen to address the research questions posed by previous investigators. Believing that the research questions drive the methodology (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990; Locke, 1989; Seidman, 1991; Yarger & Smith, 1990), the investigator has chosen to utilize a naturalistic approach.

Studies which utilize a naturalistic inquiry investigate the ways people make sense out of their lives (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Van Mannen, 1990). The research focuses, not so much on numbers, but on understanding particular circumstances, situations, or relationships (Lincoln & Guba, 1981). According to Wolf and Tymitz (1977), naturalistic research examines "slices of life" to reach an understanding of how people feel, what their concerns are, and what they believe and perceive about the events and circumstances under study. This is done through interviews of subjects, examination of their writings, interviewing others who observe the subjects, and observation of their actions in settings related to the study.

Definitions

Field Experience - directed activity of preservice teachers which is accomplished in professional development schools. This can include observing, teaching and working with individual students or small groups, conducting individual lessons or units of instruction to entire classes, and/or engaging in formal student teaching. These are activities conducted in conjunction with formal preservice coursework or as the formal period of student teaching. The phrases clinical experiences, laboratory experiences and practicum experiences may be used interchangeably.

Professional Development School - a school which has been formally designated as such resultant from a formal agreement

between authorities in charge of the school and leaders in a university school, college, or department of education. The school so designated may be organized according to the plan of the district in which it is located; that is, it may be an elementary school, a middle school, or a high school. A professional development school under this agreement provides a setting for preservice teachers to engage in multiple early field experiences prior to student teaching which may be done in the same school. University faculty are present and actively involved in the professional development school working with preservice teachers as well as with the administration and faculty of the school. The professional development school may also provide a setting for university faculty to engage in educational research (Abdal-Haqq, 1991)

Teacher Education Courses - formal college courses offered through schools, colleges, or departments of education commonly referred to as *methods courses*, in which preservice teachers learn general fundamentals of teaching or learn skills and techniques of teaching a specific subject in the school curriculum.

Teacher Educator - A full-time faculty member in a university school, college, or department of education who is primarily appointed to teach teacher education courses, and who works with preservice teachers in on-site field experiences. Other terms, such as *professor of education, teacher education professor,* or *teacher education faculty* also fit this definition. For the

purposes of this study, the term includes those at or above the academic rank of Assistant Professor.

<u>Limitations of the Study</u>

Responses from participants in the study were framed by their individual backgrounds tempered by their own philosophies which have developed in various ways. Their individual understandings of professional development schools differed because of their past experiences in different locations. Their beliefs about faculty roles, therefore, were, as expected, shaped by their blend of philosophical orientation, their total experiences as teacher educators and their experiences in professional development schools.

The participants were drawn from faculty at major, doctoral granting institutions where there is an emphasis on research. In this study, there was no attempt made to embrace a wide range of institutional types. Thus, the conclusions must be considered in that light.

The study was limited to the investigation of university teacher education faculty. Other components of the larger picture of teacher education in a professional development school were only addressed as participants drew these components into a relationship with their faculty roles. This study did not investigate preservice teachers, cooperating teachers, or students enrolled in professional development schools.

<u>Organization of the Study</u>

Chapter 1 presents the overview, purpose and significance of the research project. It identifies the research questions, definitions, and limitations of the study and provides a rationale for the selected research methodology.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature. This section reviews the recent literature on professional development schools and includes a brief history of precursors to these schools. Literature on teacher education faculty, and field experiences in teacher education are also reviewed.

Chapter 3 describes the research design, the data gathering procedures, and analysis techniques.

Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data gathered for each subject in the study. These data included major interviews, follow-up interviews, examination of professional writings of the subjects, and interviews with others who worked directly with the subjects. An analysis across cases is also presented.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the research project. This is followed by conclusions and recommendations for further research on teacher education faculty.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding (a) their individual roles as teacher educators in professional development schools, and (b) the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teacher. This chapter is designed to provide a review of the literature related to the study of teacher education professors who work in professional development schools. The chapter also contains a review of literature on professional development schools in order to provide a brief background of the setting for the study, on teacher education faculty for the purpose of providing some description of the group from which the subjects come, and on field experiences in teacher education programs to review the specific context for the study. This review will also examine some of the literature on education reform movements as it relates to professional development schools.

The three major components of this investigation include teacher education faculty, professional development schools, and field experiences in preservice teacher education. An extensive literature search revealed a near-absence of research where these

major components intersect. Even though considerable study exists in each of these major areas, nothing has been found that focuses directly on teacher educators as they view their work with preservice teachers who are learning through field experience in specially designated schools designed to provide that experience.

The issue of teacher educators working in professional development schools is quite narrow. Thus, critical decisions had to be made about the sources to be included in this review. The researcher had to evaluate each article and text that was reviewed in conjunction with this investigation to determine which items should be included in the final literature review. Therefore, the decisions about which literature to include were based on the researcher's judgment about the relevance to the present study.

Several major works have considered the role of the professor of education. Goodlad (1984) called attention to the plight of teacher educators noting that they were frequently cut off academically from the rest of the university simply because they were professors of education and not of some discipline in the arts and sciences. Not only did he observe that, in the major universities, professors of education were getting little if any support, he found that there was general indifference about teacher education throughout college and university faculties. Additionally, he pointed out that institutional expectations for research worked against any serious commitment to teacher education.

To overcome these problems, Goodlad (1984) recommended that research should be focused on teaching itself and not so much on the structure of preparation programs. Student teachers should not be haphazardly assigned to any available public school classroom for field experience, but should be placed in specially designated demonstrations that are developed as a result of strong partnerships between universities and public school districts. Soder and Sirotnik (1990) proposed a coalition between universities, public school districts, private corporations, local private foundations and state agencies all of which would form a partnership for the improvement of teacher education.

Later, Goodlad (1990a) reported that professors continued to straddle the culture of the public schools and that of higher education. Reporting on data gathered from more than 1,000 faculty members, he concluded that the culture of higher education had become the dominate force for teacher educators.

> Higher education has evolved substantially within the career span of many professors, profoundly changing the expectations and circumstances under which they work. The impact of this evolution on those who prepare teachers and, indeed, on teacher education programs has been substantial (p. 155).

In fact, Goodlad (1990a) found that many of the conditions reported by previous writers (Blanchard, 1982; Counelius, 1969; Elbe, 1972; Lanier, 1984; Professor X, 1973) continued to exist on college campuses. Even though variations existed, schools of

education remained on the edge of academia, a decline in the status of teacher education particularly at regional universities, and most faculty outside of education knew little of what went on in teacher education. Interestingly, some non-education faculty criticized teacher educators for the declines in academic achievement in public schools, thus reducing the quality of entering college students. Along with the decline in significance and prestige of schools of education came a decline in the morale of professors of education (Goodlad, 1990b).

Levin (1990) also wrote on the tensions with which professors must deal and added a new perspective. Commenting on Goodlad's (1990b) observation of the disinterest of arts and science faculty with teacher education, he said

> The real question seems to be the extent to which the community of scholars cares a whit about mass democratic education for the nation's children, beyond slinging barbs at the schools and/or education faculties (p. 46).

Clifford and Guthrie (1988) added to the literature on the difficulties and tensions faced by professors of education. They, as have others, reported that schools of education in the main were unequal with other schools and colleges in prestige and faced continuing criticism from within the university and externally. They believed that efforts by professors of education to put themselves on par with faculty in other disciplines had been unsuccessful.

> Victimized by the American disease of "status anxiety,"
> schools of education have been tracking in circles. One
> presumed route to higher regard was to encourage
> abandoning of the classroom. Rather than bend their talents
> to helping teachers gain skills and build structures that
> would professionalize teaching, the most nationally visible
> professors of education constructed their own careers without
> much reference to that most important and challenging task
> of professional education: creating the effective and
> influential teacher. another well worn path that brought
> them far short of their destination was to be as academic as
> possible. The usual and unexpected reward was repudiation
> by other academics on the grounds that such work could
> only rarely be as worthy as the sane work done in
> disciplinary departments (p 325).

According to Sarason (1993), little has changed. Even within schools of education, those who work in field settings guiding preservice teachers are viewed differently from educational researchers.

> It has long been the case that faculty with primary
> responsibility for preparatory programs have far less status
> and influence in these schools than those whose time is
> devoted mostly to research, theory, and practice (p. 272).

Professional Development Schools

Laboratory Schools. School settings for the professional development of preservice teachers and the development of pedagogy have existed in several forms for many years (Page, 1983; Stallings & Kowalski, 1990). John Dewey (1896) wrote that prospective teachers need special sites to learn their craft in the same manner that scientists need training laboratories and medical students need teaching hospitals.

The Horace Mann School at Teachers College, Columbia University was established in 1887 and the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago was begun a few years later (Page & Page, 1981). The organization and operation of these two schools closely matched the two major tenets of Dewey's (1896) theory-- research conducted to improve teaching and learning and research on the preparation of prospective teachers. The influence of these two schools regarding the research expectation was strong for more than three decades, but during the 1940s research activities in laboratory schools began to diminish, possibly due to the national war effort. (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990). McGeoch (1971) observed that as the 1970s began, research done in laboratory schools was mostly a topic of discussion accompanied by very little practice. She identified a shift in the primary purposes of laboratory schools from research to that of providing a setting for prospective teachers to accomplish two important tasks. First, preservice teachers would be able to observe actual teaching practice. Secondly, these schools were places where student teaching could be done. Many of these laboratory schools were situated on or adjacent to university campuses which contributed to the convenience for students and teacher education faculty (Lumpkin & Parker, 1986).

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, laboratory schools were mainly places for student teaching with some opportunity for observation, limited participation, and demonstration (Rucker,

1952; Williams, 1942). But as teacher education enrollment increased, it became necessary to expand settings for student teaching into public schools that were not associated with universities. Van Til (1985) observed that leaders in teacher education programs gradually looked to public schools as places for student teaching. With the research component abandoned, and the availability of public schools for student teaching, the need for university supported laboratory schools was questioned (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990).

Sources vary concerning the exact number of laboratory schools that have operated in the United States. Stallings and Kowalski (1990) cited Kelly's (1964) figure of 212 as an all-time high, but Jackson (1986) reported 252 laboratory schools in 1959; by 1983, the number had dropped to 83 (Jackson, 1986), but by 1988 the count was up to 95 (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990). Even though the number of laboratory schools began to decline in the 1960s, some new laboratory schools were reorganized or established in the latter part of the decade (Prince, 1991). Nevertheless, the number of closings exceeded the number of new units (Howe & Browne, 1970). In more recent research, Goodlad (1990a) discovered that laboratory schools were still present on nine campuses studied as part of a major investigation of teacher education practices.

Jackson (1986) believed that the number and influence of laboratory schools declined in part because of lack of agreement

between laboratory school faculties and university faculties on the importance of the functions carried out in these schools. He also noted insufficient financial support for laboratory schools from both universities and public school districts. He also cited problems with attracting teachers and administrators to work in what he described as a "fish bowl" setting. Page and Page (1981) surveyed 123 laboratory schools and concluded among other things, that the increased costs in higher education contributed to the closing of many laboratory schools.

Portal Schools. Even though traditional laboratory schools operated by universities declined, the basic concept remained. Sowards (1969) used the term *portal schools* to describe certain facilities in the Florida State University program for preparing elementary teachers. These schools were places where preservice or experienced teachers could learn about teaching and where new practices or curricula could be introduced and developed.

Established in regular schools within public school districts, portal schools were envisioned as focal points for the improvement of education at all levels. Not only did these schools serve as locations for developing teaching skills, there was an emphasis on curriculum development and a more visible university presence than in laboratory schools. In some cases, a full-time university professor was provided to portal schools (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990).

The portal school concept was adopted at Florida State University, Temple University, the University of Georgia, and the Wisconsin Research and Development Center, each in conjunction with local public school districts. The effectiveness of these schools remains in question as leaders in the movement did not develop ways to measure or document the outcomes. By 1980, the term portal school was no longer used in the literature (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990).

For the most part, laboratory schools and portal schools vanished from teacher education programs. Various reasons could be proposed including budget issues and shifting philosophies but, according to Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992), no body of literature was developed on the operations, successes or failures of the precursors to professional development schools. The absence of that literature base, which could have yielded some lessons on collaboration, has hampered more recent reform efforts.

Reemergence of Professional Development Schools. During the 1980s, Dewey's idea of special schools for training teachers was "rekindled as schools of education sought improvements and more rational solutions to the myriad problems plaguing elementary and secondary education" (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990, p. 251). The first Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) proposed professional development schools as an essential component in the reform movement. This report proposed that professional development schools be

working partnerships among university faculty, practicing teachers, and administrators that are designed around the systematic improvement of the practice. These professional development schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, will bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships based on the following principles:

- Reciprocity, or mutual exchange and benefit between research and practice;
- Experimentation, or willingness to try new forms of practice and structure;
- Systematic inquiry, or the requirement that new ideas be subject to careful study and validation; and, Student diversity, or commitment to the development of teaching strategies for a broad range of children with different backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles.

These schools will serve as settings for teaching professionals to test different instructional arrangements, for novice teachers and researchers to work under the guidance of gifted practitioners, for the exchange of professional knowledge between university faculty and practitioners, and for the development of new structures designed around the demand of a new profession (p. 66-67).

Earlier, Goodlad (1984) posited a similar notion he called demonstration schools.

These are the schools targeted for innovation and change which I recommended earlier in this chapter. To them, outstanding career and head teachers are to be drawn. Beginning teachers are to be interned *only* in these schools. University faculty members oriented to research and development in school organization, curriculum, and teaching are to be provided space in these schools and here carry on their scholarly inquiries, sharing their expertise with the school faculty. The head teachers and a few highly gifted career teachers will serve as clinical faculty in the schools of education. Here, too, resident teachers will spend

time as junior members of the faculty, preparing for appointments as career teachers. Research, school improvement, inservice education of experienced teachers, and preservice teacher education will proceed hand in hand (p. 316).

In 1990, Goodlad connected his previous proposal to the Holmes (1986) document and highlighted the fact that professional development schools were developing at a deliberate pace. He observed that, "At the time of this writing, all of these are in an exploratory, embryonic stage; few of the problems of control, funding, division of labor, and the like have been worked out" (p. 281). Nevertheless, he argued strongly for significant field experiences in preservice teacher education.

> Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate a wide array of laboratory settings of observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences
> (p. 295).

He pointed out that professional development schools were being proposed as a natural, almost unopposed answer to the need for structured sites where teacher education students can gain practical experiences. Interestingly, despite the lack of controversy over these sites, he observed a lack of urgency in developing professional development schools.

In 1993, Goodlad further refined his position on revamping teacher education. He proposed centers of pedagogy, conceived as a close fraternity between school districts, university schools of

education, and university departments of arts and sciences. He emphasized the importance of the more neglected higher education components. Citing John Dewey's proposal for laboratory schools as a foundation, Goodlad (1993) argued that special schools that provide practical experiences for preservice teachers should be more tightly linked to higher education than he observed to be the case. His center of pedagogy would strengthen those links.

According to Goodlad (1993), the center of pedagogy should be both a concept and a setting. Much like proposals previously put forth by others, he urged that formal contracts be established between participants in a center of pedagogy. He believed that contracts would contribute to the stability of the center and would provide some assurance of the continued availability of professional development schools. Goodlad (1993) believed that a center of pedagogy might require as many as thirty such school sites.

Commenting on obstacles he observed in some existing partnerships for teacher education, Goodlad (1993) identified two problems that may have resulted in less achievement that might have been realized. Some school and university leaders had lost their zeal for vigorously continuing the partnership arrangement once the formal planning was completed. In essence, the nurturing of the partnership was not evident. Also, some college professors, particularly those not tenured, had their enthusiasm

dampened by fear that field-based activities would hurt or even block their chances for tenure and promotion.

A broader field experience component was proposed by Sarason (1993) who suggested a year long field experience that would include classroom experience but would also extend well beyond it. Students would also spend considerable time with principals, counselors, and other support personnel. They would spend time with the superintendent and the central office staff and be involved with a broader concept of education than classroom teaching.

The reemergence of a specialized field-based setting for the purpose of giving prospective teachers hands-on experience in schooling has been directly attributed to the 1980s calls for reform. There was a recognition that any school reform effort must be directly linked to reform in teacher education. (Brennan & Simpson, 1993). The professional development school was conceived to build on effective practices of the past shaped by lessons learned along the way.

Shortly after the Holmes Group (1986) proposed the professional development school, Joyce (1987) said that these schools should reflect unity rather than difference and called the idea an important one saying that "ultimately such institutions might be the key to the development of professional ethos" (p. 81). Shanker (1987) said 'It is hard to imagine the retooling of teacher

education, indeed the retooling of education, without such model schools" (p. 118).

According to Liberman and Miller (1991) there are three complementary agendas for professional development schools. These are:

> (1) to provide a context for rethinking and reinventing schools for the purpose of building and sustaining the best educational practices, (2) to contribute to the preservice education of teachers and induct them into the teaching profession, and (3) to provide for continuing development and professional growth of experienced in-service teachers. (p. 105)

In 1990, the Holmes Group's second report proposed six principles that should mold the development of a professional school. These principles are (1) teaching and learning for understanding, (2) schools organized as communities of learning based on democratic practices, (3) learning for understanding for all students, not just those of the primary culture, (4) adult participants continuing their professional growth, (5) continued research into teaching and learning, and (6) the creation of a new structure for learning and for advancing education.

After several years, during which the concept has been refined, Huffman-Joley (1993) offered that professional development schools should be designed to

1. provide conditions which ensure higher levels of learning for all the students in them.

2. serve as exemplary settings for the education and training of preservice educators, school settings where

teachers do not view themselves as isolates, but where collaboration for teaching and school improvement with other teachers, university faculty, parents, and community people is the norm and the expectation.

3. provide ongoing sustained staff development for school and university faculty, based on programmatic goals which site-based participants identify.

4. support inquiry and research which has been collaboratively designed by both school and university faculty and is meaningful to both (p. 213).

A similar approach has been offered by Brennan and Simpson (1993) who suggest first that professional development schools should be built on a mutually beneficial partnership that shares responsibilities, resources, and status. A second guideline is that the goals of the professional schools should emphasize examination of the teaching-learning process and, when appropriate, change instructional practices to meet the needs of students. This is associated with their third guideline, a program of systematic research into teaching-learning practices. Their last two guidelines include encompassing the wider community to help reach goals and establishing several professional development schools with a variety of organizational arrangements.

Both Brainard (1991) and Nystrand (1991) observed that the idea of professional development schools, which they indicated came from a tradition of practice teaching that was over 400 years old, was revived as a direct result of the reform initiatives of the 1980s.

Woloszyk and Davis (1993) highlighted the need for and value of professional development schools as well as the complexity of establishing such sites. The partnership aspect between the site and the university along with the close involvement of teacher education faculty make the professional development school distinctive from the laboratory school.

The professional development school concept was hailed as offering hope that what past reformations had not done, could now be accomplished. This concept held promise because of the goal to more solidly link universities and public schools and to make a meaningful connection between theory and practice (Winitzky, Stoddart, & O'Keefe, (1992).

According to Dixon and Ishler (1992)

> The goal of the professional development schools (PDSs) movement is the inventing of a new institution mixing the best of theory, research, and practice at the precollege level and among teacher preparation programs (p. 28).

Rushcamp and Roehler (1992) reported a lengthy research project connected with the work of a professional development school in order to identify those characteristics critical to supporting change in the school. They determined that the role shifts of members on a central steering committee needed nurturing, that the direction, nature, and pace of change should evolve from both school and community sources, that school community strengths should be expanded to become the foundation of change, that expectations for continued growth

should be established, that a balance should exist between supporting and challenging professional development at the school, and that the school community should embrace curriculum and instructional complexities.

This report reflected a positive climate characterized by mutual support and collaboration. Although little mention was given to university faculty connected with this school, some were reported to have planned, taught, and assessed in several content areas on a daily basis. A classroom teacher was reported to have valued the opportunity to work with a university math educator while another expressed enthusiasm over research possibilities with a university researcher. If any perspectives of professors who worked in the school were gathered in this study, they were not mentioned.

Moore and Hopkins (1993) sought to identify what classroom teachers, principals, and teacher educators consider to be the most important components of professional development schools. Through a literature search, they developed a list of 12 components. This list was mailed to 800 educators and administrators at all levels who were asked to rate the importance of each component. Overall the respondents agreed that all of the characteristics were either important or very important. The characteristics that were identified were

1. Share expertise by teaching in other's classroom
2. Decision-making body

3. Release time for teachers

4. Improvement team to address school/curriculum problems

5. Reward system for professors

6. Reward system for public school personnel

7. Research by professors

8. Research by public school personnel

9. University courses taught at the school site

10. University courses team taught

11. University students work as aides

12. University students plan and teach lessons

Even though some have applied different names--partner schools, teacher centers to these special sites, the functions, structure and appearance appear to be generally the same. Harris and Harris (1993) describe the development of what they called a *partner school* developed through the facilitation of noted educator John Goodlad. They emphasized collaboration between the school and the university. This collaboration was built on four attributes--(1) a common goal of school renewal and developing new teachers, (2) shared expertise between school and university educators, (3) equity and trust among all participants, and (4) promoting self-interest for the good of all while maintaining an attitude of selflessness. It was through the collaborative process that they believed their approach had addressed many of the problems impeding educational reform.

After several years of fairly slow growth, the rate of establishment of professional development schools appears to be

increasing. In 1990, Goodlad noted unhasty progress in establishing professional development schools, but by 1994 Duffy suggested that getting these school on-line had become an immediate priority for larger universities. He believed that the eagerness to establish professional development schools came from something of a trend in teacher education. In addition, fears that funding for these sites may evaporate has fueled the haste in establishing them. An overall examination of the literature reveals that since 1986, there has been a steady progression in a number of quarters to organize and implement the professional development school concept. Even though several of these programs have adopted different names, the concepts have remained the same. (Bauer 1991a; Bauer 1991b; Colburn, 1993; Dishner & Boothby, 1986; Field, 1990; Fountain, 1993; Harris & Harris, 1993; Kern, 1991; King 1993; Neufeld, 1992; Neufeld & Haavind, 1988; Schlechty, Ingerson, & Brooks, 1988; Siedman, Schneider, & Cannon, 1991; Winitzky, 1991).

Whether professional development schools can become firmly entrenched as a standard component of teacher education remains to be seen. Farris and Smith (1993), noting that

> The professional development school has been embraced by numerous colleges of education throughout the nation as the one tangible ingredient that will both redeem and restore dignity to the teacher education programs (p. 262),

suggest that if professional development schools fail, so too will many colleges of education that have sanctioned these schools as

the salvation of teacher education. A recent account (Nicklin, 1995) of the latest Holmes Group report indicates that this body remains solidly behind the professional development school concept and urges its universal adoption in teacher education programs. From their experience, Brennan and Simpson (1993) are quite optimistic that, under the proper conditions, professional development schools can succeed and impart a positive impact on the preparation of prospective teachers.

Teacher Education Faculty

"Teacher educators are often talked about but rarely studied" (Ducharme, 1986, p. 40). The reasons for the lack of study range from the traditional low esteem in which education faculty have been held by arts and science faculty, to fear of self-examination lest justification of the arts and science community's contempt be found, to problems of identifying exactly who teacher educators are. Because of the profound influence that professors of education can have on preservice teachers, it is important to examine their perceptions and beliefs. As Sarason (1993) said

> ...unless the conditions exist wherein the educators of these students can experience a sense of learning, growth and personal and intellectual change for themselves, they cannot create and sustain those conditions for their students (p. xiii)

Goodlad (1993) identified a growing need for close collaboration between arts and sciences departments, education departments and local schools, but he believed that education

faculty might not be ready for sharing responsibility for teacher education.

> Many faculty members in education rightly perceive themselves as having sustained programs through the ups and downs of the rather troubled history of teacher education. They have their doubts about the degree to which colleagues in the arts and sciences will exhibit equal devotion over the long haul (p. 53).

Despite the widespread belief that professors of education, even by their own admission, hold lower status than arts and sciences faculty, Goodlad (1993) noted that some may not be inclined to change. His observation highlights a disparity between professors of education who's work is primarily clinical and those who are theorists and researchers.

> Some professors of education not involved in teacher education like the present situation: they hold considerable power in such vital matters as the attention and resources to be allocated to teacher education, yet they need not get more directly involved. Some no doubt are aware of the disproportionately low fraction of the total budget committed to teacher education (p. 54).

Historical Issues. There is no comprehensive study of the organization or development of the education professoriate, it is about a hundred years old (Hazlett, 1989; Howey & Zimpher, 1990) and developed from a monopoly gained many years ago when various states established certification requirements for public school teachers (Professor X, 1973). By 1890, there were 31 professors of education in the United States (Hazlett, 1989).

In these early days, there was comparatively little need for professors of education. For the most part, those planning to teach in secondary schools were prepared in colleges. Preparation of elementary teachers was less formal. Even as late as the 1930s, preparation and certification of elementary teachers was left to normal schools and district superintendents. Evenden's 1933 survey found that only 12.1 percent of elementary teachers in America had four or more years of college education. Howey and Zimpher (1990) noted very few biographies of early professors of education. Likewise, they reported only a few institutional histories giving attention to professors of education.

Research about the Education Professoriate. The first significant works on the education professoriate were published in the 1960s. *The Professorship in Educational Administration* , edited by Willower and Culbertson, was published in 1964. In 1969, Counelius produced *To Be a Phoenix: The Education Professoriate*. The major work of the 1970s, *The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions* (Bagley, 1975), was a collection of writings that examined the conditions under which education professors worked. The most recent book, *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry,* was edited by Wisnewski and Ducharme and published in 1989.

Throughout the literature on college teaching, there are references to the diminished status of professors of education in the eyes of the rest of academia, along with substantial

indictments of the study of education in colleges (Carter, 1984). Hill (1977) claimed that education, as a subject, stood at the bottom of the academic totem pole in most schools. An anonymous author (Professor X, 1973) in a somewhat scathing view of college teaching in general called educationists the "laughing stock of the entire academic world" (p. 17). He further charged that professors of education have traditionally set the lowest possible standards and required the least amount of hard work from students, and failed very, very few. Farris and Smith (1993) noted that the status has changed little. Patterson, Sutton, and Schuttenburg (1987) had similar findings.

Goodlad (1993) acknowledged the low status of teacher education and of teaching itself. He suggested that years of neglecting actual inquiry into pedagogy had contributed to that diminished status. His concept was that preparation of prospective teachers should go beyond training in the mechanics of teaching. that preparation should extend to intellectual inquiry about teaching itself.

Some writers have suggested that the lower-middle-class backgrounds of most professors of education may account for both the low esteem in which they are held (Lanier, 1988) as well as their characteristic practical orientation which some feel borders on anti-intellectualism (Carter, 1981; Professor X, 1973; Lanier, 1984.) In separate studies (Counelius, 1969; Elbe, 1972; Blanchard, 1982; Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989), professors of

education were found generally to be older, male, and not as intellectually apt, but more broadly educated at the undergraduate level than professors in other fields. Education professors had predominately middle-class backgrounds and attended non-elitist state colleges before working for some years in public grade schools. In these studies, fewer education professors were found to possess the doctorate and the doctoral programs in existence produced fewer researchers. The lack of research emphasis in the graduate programs of these professors was attributed to part-time study at both the masters and doctoral levels as well as pragmatic dissertations and doctoral projects. Goodlad's (1990a) research supports the notion that faculty believed that teacher education programs continue to be held in low regard across the higher education campus.

More recent research, (Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989) revealed that the overwhelming majority of education professors were at some time public school teachers and administrators. In addition, professors of education were found to have entered higher education for many of the same reasons as those in other fields--enjoyment of teaching, intellectual stimulation, and the lifestyle of a college professor.

Cruickshank (1990) proffered a more positive view than that drawn by earlier writings. He wrote

> members of the education professoriate might best be described as pedestrian in terms of their origins, abilities, academic prowess, and scholarly interest and productivity.

They also could be characterized as hard-working and dedicated to their teaching and advising" (p.132).

It is interesting that no mention was made of research. It has long been the traditional province of university professors to engage in research, teaching, and service (Ellner & Barnes, 1983). However, studies have revealed that most professors do not conduct research or publish. For those who conduct research in education, the type of studies done are likely to be influenced more by institutional expectations rather than genuine inquiry. As Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992) observed,

> Applied, collaborative research still does not carry the cachet of more traditional scholarly work; untenured faculty experience a disincentive to conduct collaborative work in PDSs (p. 14).

According to Wisniewski (1989), most professors do not believe they should be expected to perform in all three areas of professional responsibility. Burch's (1989) survey of 103 professors found only one who indicated that the opportunity to do research was a primary reason for becoming a professor. She found that education professors decided to work in higher education because of the enjoyment of teaching, intellectual stimulation, and the lifestyle of a college professor. These were essentially the same reasons as professors in other fields.

Teacher educators are more likely to be clinically oriented, according to Raths, McAninch, and Katz (1991) who said that

> ...teacher educators are often primarily responsible for instruction in methods courses and supervision of field internships. In teaching methods courses, teacher educators focus more heavily on how-to aspects of various techniques than their theoretical bases. Because practice is the primary concern of methods courses, teacher educators tend to focus on such clinical issues as taking action and what works, and thus adopt the clinical point of view (p. 45).

Not only do teacher educators have to deal with institutional tensions as described elsewhere in this chapter, they are affected by their own feelings of satisfaction with their work in light of their clinical or theoretical orientations.

Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992) offered no research findings on teacher education faculty who work in professional development schools, but did put forth some observations based on their association with such a site. They observed that the work of some education faculty members is more directly related to teacher education and the professional school than others. They noted that faculty generally argued that none should have a choice about working in a professional development school or all should have a choice. In addition, they pointed out that the burden of establishing professional development schools has so far been left to a fairly small number of faculty who were already heavily engaged in teaching, research, and supervision.

Likewise, Dixon and Ishler (1992) described an extensive and elaborate process for establishing nearly a dozen professional development schools associated with a large southeastern university. They reported participation from some university

faculty and they observed that contradictions would sometimes develop between the goals university faculty and those of public school faculty. They also expressed worry over participation by university faculty.

> We are also concerned that fewer university faculty are involved than we had hoped. We are, however, optimistic that the collaboration process itself and other available strategies can promote a significant increase in the number of faculty collaborators. Inherent to the PDS collaboration process is a movement toward specific activities. The PDS Institute is one approach to promoting that movement, We expect faculty who are inclined toward isolation and highly independent professional work to respond most favorably when they are sought out to apply their special expertise to well-defined tasks. Clearly, research and publication opportunities offer a major incentive for faculty seeking promotion, tenure, and merit in research institutions (p. 33).

Duffy (1994) identified several problems that can affect professors of education who work in professional development schools. He noted that in the haste to establish these sites, a top-down management approach has been used too often which has not allowed for proper relationships between university faculty and school faculty to be developed. Both teacher educators have had little time to establish egalitarian, collaborative relationships which have been identified in theory as a cornerstone of a successful professional development school. Thus, these educators have been left in the traditional roles where professors continue to be viewed by school personnel as the guru's of education and classroom teachers are expected to do as they are told.

Further, because of top-down management models, professors feel pressures to both participate in the project and to make it succeed. This causes them to over-promote a program to which they may not be totally committed rather than working collaboratively for the good of preservice teachers, the school site and education in general. Such approaches can cause both professors and classroom teachers feel disempowered which cancels the notion of collaboration that is noted throughout the literature as an essential component of professional development schools (Duffy, 1994).

Crawford, Smith, Thacker, Turner and Watkins (1993) described some of their activities as clinical professors of education in establishing a professional development school. These activities were organizational and consisted of building an infrastructure, establishing trust, implementation, and evaluation. Chief among the infrastructure founding was developing lines of communication. Even though they generally described their activities, these writers made no reference to their beliefs and perceptions about their work in the professional development schools.

Definitional Issues. "The connotative meaning of 'teacher educator' would refer to professors of pedagogy" (Lanier & Little, p. 529). However, a major problem that has plagued the study of professors of teacher education is that there has been no widely accepted definition of exactly who a teacher educator is. The

organization of teacher education programs will very among institutions of higher education. For example, an English professor in one university might teach a course in methods of teaching secondary English in addition to other courses in English. Even though this professor might educate preservice teachers, he or she would probably define his or her role as a professor of English, rather than a teacher educator. In another institution, an English professor might specialize almost exclusively in teacher preparation through courses taught in the English department. Another setting might have English methods courses offered in a school of education taught by a professor of education who specialized in English education.

Allison (1989) noted the difficulties in defining the boundaries of the education professoriate and Lanier and Little (1986) pointed out that the term teacher educator is not synonymous with those appointed in departments of education. They said that "definitional problems for researchers who seek to learn more about those who teach teachers is formidable" (p. 529).

In this connection, Ducharme (1986) observed that most of the knowledge about teacher educators has been inferred from research on the education professoriate broadly defined. He believed that too many generalizations have been made from this broad based research, and proposed that research about teacher educators be limited only to those who provide professional coursework and experiences for teacher education students.

Field Experience in Teacher Education

There is wide diversity of opinion expressed in the literature on field experiences in teacher education. One explanation for the range of research findings is that *field experience* is used as an umbrella term that encompasses numerous activities, dissimilar settings, and many years of study during which culture, society, and education have changed dramatically. Another explanation is that, given the diversity of the topic, defensible research can be framed in such a way as to warrant conclusions in harmony with the perspectives of the researchers. It is therefore important to examine each aspect of an individual investigation in order to more completely understand how conclusions were derived. Considerable writing has been done on field experiences in teacher preparation, and it is not the intent of this chapter to review and report the details of relevant studies, but rather to report the findings and conclusions.

Zeichner (1980) offered what has become the most widely cited work on the contradictions over the effectiveness of field experiences. Even though it is several years old, Zeichner's observation, based on his review of research, seems to hold true today:

> Although it is difficult to draw any clear implications from the research on field-based experiences, two conclusions emerge from the existing data. First, from a review of the literature it can be concluded that field-based experiences are neither all beneficial in their effects as the abundant testimonials and the increased emphasis on these

experiences would lead us to believe; nor are they merely vehicles for adapting new personnel into existing patterns as many critics would have us believe. Instead, field-based experiences seem to entail a complicated set of both positive and negative consequences that are often subtle in nature (p. 46.).

Because professional development schools may offer the complete range of preservice field experiences, the term, as defined in Chapter 1, is intentionally broad for the purposes of this study. Activities in these schools are varied. For preservice teachers, experiences are included which range from detached observation to formal student teaching.

Clarken (1993) urged that great care be taken in organizing field experiences in teacher education so that preservice teachers can receive the maximum benefit. Without proper program organization, he believed, field experiences may be miseducative in preparing future teachers. Haphazardly sending preservice teachers into public schools in the hope of gaining practical experience can be avoided through collaboratively structured partnerships such as professional development schools.

Overview. Learning by doing has long been recognized as an appropriate component of teacher education. According to Cruickshank (1985), laboratory, clinical, and practicum experiences have been included in the curriculum since the early nineteenth century. Dewey (1904) believed that practical experience was a necessary complement to theoretical coursework. He considered practical experience part of "professional

instruction" (p, 44). The most important link between the college classroom and the hands-on experience in the public schools is the teacher education faculty member (Evans, 1991).

In 1963 Conant identified student teaching as "the one indisputably essential element in professional education" (p. 142). He went on to say, "...it seems clear that the future teacher has much to learn that can be learned only in the ...classroom....I would argue that all education courses for elementary teachers...be accompanied by 'laboratory experiences' providing for the observation and teaching of children" (p. 161).

National organizations have also supported field experience for preservice teachers. The Commission on Teacher Education (1946) was one of the first to advocate such practicum experiences. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education teacher education curriculum study (Scannell, et al, 1983) favored laboratory experiences calling for "a series of carefully designed and supervised campus- and field-based experiences...conducted throughout the period of professional study" (p. 15). NCATE, The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1990) requires that field experiences be included in programs of preservice teacher education. Of course, all institutions that prepare teachers do not belong to NCATE. Nevertheless, the survey by Webb, Gehrke, Ishler, and Mendoza (1981) of 270 teacher education institutions found that 99% reported offering, prior to student teaching, field

experiences that included observation, tutoring, working with small groups, and assisting with noninstructional tasks. Despite years of debate over how teachers should be prepared, field experience was the one component of preservice teacher education that, only until recently, escaped attacks from critics of education (Zeichner, 1980.)

Types of Experiences. Except for the minimum 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, the NCATE (1990) standards do not specify time requirements for these field experiences. Rather the standards address the types of settings in which the experiences should take place and the quality of those experiences. Ishler and Kay (1981) reported that, prior to student teaching, preservice teachers typically spent 150 hours in field settings. The most common activities, in order of frequency, were observation, tutoring, reporting on classroom experience, performing non-instructional duties, operating media, assessing pupil characteristics and activities, planning instruction, designing instructional material, supervising extra curricular activities, assessing teacher characteristics, reviewing educational literature, supervising laboratory work, and field trips. Beecher and Ade (1982) noted a significant trend toward increasing the number of clinical experiences. They contended that it is "assumed that the best opportunities for the improvement of preservice teacher education and the corresponding development of quality education for children, are provided as students work in the field practicing

skills and developing competencies" (p. 24). Several states have required additional field experiences and some states have initiated an intern year as a prerequisite for teacher certification while still other states have extended teacher training by requiring a 5-year preservice program (Waxman & Walberg, 1986). Morris and Curtis (1983) observed that "most states continue to recognize the importance of these experiences, either by statute or through program approval standards" (p. 5).

A number of writers have commented on the composition of field experiences (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Anderson, 1987; Austin-Martin, Bull, & Molrine, 1981; Henry, 1983; Olszewski, Hoffman, & Borchardt, 1991; Quinn, 1986). Nolan (1982) suggested that laboratory, clinical, and practicum experiences should be viewed as a continuum of inquiry as one learns to teach rather than having student teaching seen as a time to practice what was supposedly learned in earlier field experiences. He argued that certain early field experiences should precede student teaching and that these early experiences should be designed to foster reflectivity.

Lindsey (1969) believed that these experiences should be made more laboratory-like and systematic rather than isolated observation or conducting individual lessons. Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, and Nash (1976) agreed proposing that:

> The teacher education classroom should be a laboratory
> for the study and development of teaching knowledge
> and skills. This laboratory should be expanded to include

instructional procedures such as microteaching, simulation, modeling and demonstration. These procedures help students to confront a controlled reality by concentrating on particular teaching-learning behaviors until they attain adequate levels of skills and confidence. When students do encounter the complexity of a regular classroom, they will have experienced a planned series of teaching acts in a minimally threatening environment, with immediate feedback and experienced supervision (p. 93).

Research on Early Field Experiences. The research regarding the effect of early field experiences on student attainment has produced ambiguous findings. Zeichner (1980) pointed out the difficulty in drawing clear conclusions from existing data despite hundreds of studies on preservice field experiences.

Several studies (Ingle & Robinson, 1965; Ingle & Zaret, 1968; Hedburg, 1979) found no difference in the achievement of prospective teachers who participated in field experiences and those who did not. Research by Scherer (1979) and Sunal (1980) did not show preservice teachers with early field experience to be rated higher on teaching skills than preservice teachers without such experience. The majority of studies, however, report positive findings that support the notion and value of field experiences in teacher education (Benton & Osborn, 1970; Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986; Elliott & Mays, 1979).

Veldman, Menaker, and Newlove (1970) found that early field experiences improved verbal fluency and coherence of preservice teachers in field experiences significantly more than

preservice teachers not involved in field experiences. Sandefur (1970) concluded that prospective teachers who had early field experiences were more democratic, understanding, stimulating, original, alert, responsible, systematic, and confident than prospective teachers who did not. He also found that those with early field experience obtained higher grades in student teaching and showed greater gains on the Professional Education section of the National Teachers Examination than those with no field experience.

Denton (1982) studied 139 undergraduate students in courses on methods of teaching and found that students with early field experience achieved greater cognitive gains and met a greater number of objectives in subsequent coursework than a control group of non-early field experience students in teacher education. He concluded that the early field experience provided a "meaningful set" or frame of understanding for subsequent coursework, thus "contributing in a substantial way to the preparation of a teacher" (p. 23). Hedburg (1979) studied preservice teachers enrolled in an educational psychology course to compare the achievement on the final course examination between students who spent part of the course time in a field-based setting with those who did not. In a parallel course, the experimental group spent one-third of the regular class time in field work. On the final examination, the experimental group

performed just as well as the control group despite having spent considerably less time in the psychology class.

Early field experiences gave prospective teachers the opportunity to clarify their own beliefs as well as develop a sense of purpose for teaching (Erdman, 1983). Bennie (1982) suggested that such experiences provided a forum for preservice teachers in which they can both test and affirm their career decisions. According to Seiforth and Samuel (1979), through field experiences, prospective teachers can be exposed to a range of classroom settings along with a variety of teachers and teaching styles thus allowing direct observation of realistic problems and situations.

A number of studies have examined the conditions under which preservice teachers engage in field experiences. Galluzzo and Arends (1989) found that preservice special education teachers spent an average of 166 hours in field work, followed by early childhood and elementary education majors with an average of 140 hours and secondary majors with about 90 hours. McIntyre and Killian (1986) found that elementary education majors were more likely to be involved in early field experiences, to spend more time in these experiences, to begin an induction process into the profession, and to receive more feedback and correction about their work than were secondary teaching majors.

This chapter has presented a review of literature related to teacher education faculty in higher education

institutions, professional development schools, and field experiences in preservice teacher education. The following chapter describes the research methodology.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the beliefs held by selected teacher education professors regarding both their roles in professional development schools and the utility they believe professional development schools have in the preparation of teachers. In order to do this, it was necessary to probe these beliefs through a naturalistic approach which required subjects under study to focus on their experiences in professional development schools and make sense and meaning of their roles in these settings. In this study, the investigator also examined the attitudes and perceptions of the subjects regarding the effectiveness and utility of professional development schools as components of teacher education.

Research Design

The design for this study was naturalistic and employed established techniques for gathering and analyzing naturalistic data (Erickson, 1986; Marton, 1986;Morgan; 1983;Ruscoe & Whitford, 1991; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tesch, 1990). These techniques included extended interviews with the subjects in the study; examination of documentary evidence such as course syllabi, memoranda, scholarly papers

developed for publication, and student guides for experiences in professional development schools. These documents were examined to corroborate beliefs and perceptions stated by subjects in oral interviews. Corroborating data were also gathered through informal interviews with associates of the subjects such as principals and teachers in professional development schools and colleagues. In addition, member checks of the extended interview data were accomplished allowing the subjects to validate and clarify their statements. A follow-up interview was conducted with each subject to further explore the beliefs and perceptions stated in the extended initial interview. In the follow-up interview, subjects were asked to cite specific examples of their behavior which supported their beliefs stated in the initial interview.

The design for this study was adapted from procedures previously utilized by other qualitative researchers. Owen (1988) identified a small number of participants for her study of roles of elementary principals. She used open-ended questions in a single, major interview with each participant and also included a follow-up interview. Her investigation used the interview technique as the sole data collection technique. Likewise, Stillerman (1991) studied a small sample (n=5) and used a series of interviews plus observation and examination of documentary evidence in order to investigate how selected middle school principals defined vision and

perceived themselves as implementers and keepers of vision. Chatman (1991) also incorporated interviews to study several aspects relative to the development of senior level black female administrators in higher education. Spooner (1991) examined how four preservice teachers expressed their perspectives on teaching and how these perspectives changed during student teaching. Her study used short interviews as the primary data source and supplemented that with data gathered from journals kept by the subjects, as well as from informal interviews with cooperating and supervising teachers. Weber (1986) primarily used interviews in her naturalistic study of six teacher education faculty members. The technique of asking subjects to cite specific examples of their behavior that were consistent with stated beliefs was employed by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1986) in their study of belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program.

In each of these cited studies, the researchers developed designs tailored to the purpose of the specific investigation. Various techniques of data collection, primarily interviews, were used to provide information to answer the research questions in each study. Even though none of the studies cited followed the exact design of any of the other studies, collectively they reveal that interviews, varying in length and

number, are appropriate in gathering data from a small number of subjects.

The emergent nature of qualitative research, particularly when built on interview techniques, is a central issue in designing any such study. This was true in the present research. Relying on the suggestions presented by Lincoln and Guba (1985), design decisions continued to emerge throughout this interpretative study. As the inquiry continued, it became gradually more focused.

The researcher relied on Bogdan and Bilken's (1992) premise that a qualitative researcher who uses the interview as the primary data collection technique should have considerable latitude to pursue a range of topics while offering the subjects a chance to shape the content of the interview. Because of the emergent nature of research based on interviewing, some authorities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Seidman, 1991) have suggested that data collection be the first step in a naturalistic investigation. In this study, the researcher began by organizing the data collection and analysis procedure in accordance with established methods for naturalistic research. Throughout these processes, the concepts of latitude, flexibility and emergent design remained present.

Interviewing

Interviewing is an established method of qualitative research. Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggested several purposes for conducting research through the interview method. These purposes include "obtaining here-and-now constructions of persons, events, activities, organizations, feelings, motivations. claims, concerns, and other entities" (p. 268). To Seidman (1991), the fundamental purpose of interviewing is to understand the experience of other people and the meaning they make out of that experience. Interviewing is conversation with a purpose (Dexter, 1970). It has been recognized by educational researchers (Dexter, 1970; Douglas, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Bogdan & Bilken, 1982, 1992; Walker, 1985; McCracken, 1988; Seidman, 1991) as a viable approach to answering questions under investigation.

The term *interview* can be used to describe a variety of activities. For example, a television ratings researcher might telephone randomly selected viewers to ask a few questions about television watching habits; a personnel specialist might ask questions of a job applicant; a researcher might spend hours with one subject either recording everything said by the subject or focusing on a defined area of inquiry for deep probing. For the purposes of this research, the interview

strategy can be described as focused, semi-structured, and open-ended.

Procedure

Sample. The population for this study consisted of four selected teacher education faculty members in two major, doctoral granting universities. These universities were in different states. Teacher education administrators and faculty at both of these universities had previously collaborated with administrators and faculty of various public school districts in designating and establishing professional development schools to facilitate programs for the preparation of teachers. At each university, two teacher education faculty members were identified. At one university, subjects known to the researcher were invited to participate. At the other, several potential subjects were suggested by that university's Director of Teacher Education. In all cases, the researcher made personal contact with each potential subject to explain the purpose of the research and invite participation. After receiving a verbal commitment to participate from a subject, the researcher forwarded a letter to the subject to restate the particulars of the data collection and confirm arrangements for the major interview. At that time each subject was provided a general outline of the interview to allow the subject to be better prepared to focus on the area of investigation.

One of the selected universities had collaborated in the establishment of 15 professional development schools in 1991. Faculty selected from the university for this study had been involved in these professional development schools from the beginning of that collaboration. At the time of the interviews, one subject from this university had just completed two academic years working with preservice teachers in professional development settings and the other had completed one year. Prior to implementation of the professional development school program, the latter subject had served as departmental chair and primary administrator as the program was being developed.

The second university, also a state-supported, doctoral granting institution in a major metropolitan area was affiliated with the Holmes Group, a proponent of professional development schools. This university had also collaborated in the development of professional development schools. However, at the time of the interviews, the structure of the professional development settings was in transition. One subject had worked for several years in professional development settings while the other was in the second year.

Recognizing that access is always an issue in interview research (Measor, 1985), the researcher anticipated the possibility of some problems in gaining access to the teacher educators that would be suitable for this study. This proved to

be true in the latter stages of gathering the data. For example, one potential subject who had originally agreed quite willingly to participate was never able to find time for an interview despite repeated attempts by the researcher over a three-month period to schedule the major interview. Another issue related to access was that of the availability of corroborating data that would help support the stated beliefs of the participants. The researcher enter the data collection process with no guarantee that any such data would be available. Documentary evidence such as course syllabi, internal memoranda, planning documents, and scholarly papers was solicited from each participant. The material obtained varied from participant to participant. Likewise, the value of these items to this research varied among the participants.

Selecting a small sample for interviews allowed the researcher to study the participants in depth. The common factors among the participants were faculty rank of assistant professor or higher at doctoral granting institutions, regular teachers of introductory courses in education and pedagogy, and frequent in-depth involvement in professional development schools where the subjects worked with preservice teachers. These common characteristics provided the homogeneity important to reducing extraneous variables

so as to allow the research to be focused on the questions under study (Patton, 1987).

The researcher conducted in-depth interviews with four subjects at two universities. Some qualitative studies have selected six or fewer subjects for study, while others have extended the research to over a hundred subjects. About the number of subjects to be included in a qualitative study based on interviews, McCracken (1988) advises that

> The first principle is that 'less is more.' It is more important to work longer, and with greater care, with a few people than more superficially with many of them....The quantitative scientist reels at the thought of so small a 'sample,' but it is important to remember that this group is not chosen to represent some part of the larger world (p. 17).

According to McCracken (1988), the issue, in a qualitative study, is not one of generalizability which would require a statistically defensible sample size. The issue is one of access.

> The purpose of the qualitative interview is not to discover how many, and what kind of people share a certain characteristic. It is to gain access to the cultural categories and assumptions according to which one culture construes the world (p. 17).

It was this principle that influenced the size of the sample.

Confidentiality. Measor (1985) pointed out the importance of maintaining confidentiality when conducting interview research. The researcher assured complete

anonymity to participants in the study. Neither the subjects nor the institutions where they hold appointments are identified. In this presentation, pseudonyms are used. In two cases academic papers prepared by a participant are not cited in order that his anonymity may be preserved.

Instrumentation and data collection. The human being is the accepted and adequate instrument with which to conduct all phases of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McCracken, 1988). In this study the researcher was the instrument and data were gathered primarily through interviews.

The researcher prepared an interview guide based on a set of orienting questions developed from the research questions. Orienting questions cover broad areas to link interview questions with the research questions. The orienting questions, which were not asked of subjects, provided both a framework and a boundary for the interviews.

A pilot interview was conducted with a university faculty member who was not part of the study. After a review of the transcript of that interview, the interview guide was revised. Questions that needed clarification were revised and additional questions were added.

The initial contact with each potential subject was by telephone or in person. This served to introduce the researcher and elaborate on the nature of the study and to

invite the potential subject to participate. Of the four potential subjects initially approached, each was quite willing to be interviewed and appointments with two subjects were made at that time. Because of previous commitments, the other two subjects requested to be contacted several weeks hence to schedule an appointment. Eventually, one of those, after several contacts, was never able to find a mutually agreeable time and it was necessary to approach additional subjects. Following the initial contact, the researcher forwarded a letter of appreciation to each subject with a brief overview of the interview to allow each subject the opportunity to focus his or her thinking prior to the first interview.

The researcher entered each interview with the interview guide--a plan based on the orienting questions. He also realized that the probing nature of interviewing could not be constrained by time or a set of questions on an interview guide. That was because the very nature of naturalistic interviewing requires the researcher to accept and build on what is developed by the subjects.

The interviews were conducted in the campus office of each individual subject by mutual agreement. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed immediately after the interview and written transcripts forwarded to the subject. Follow-up interviews were conducted in each case as soon as possible after initial interviews were transcribed and subjects

were given time to review the transcript. The review of the transcript allowed each participant to clarify or add to any statements in the original interview which may have been transcribed in error or which did not convey the true beliefs of the participant. This was completed prior to the follow-up interview.

The content of each follow-up interview varied depending on each subject's responses during the initial interview. A separate interview guide for each follow-up interview was developed with items drawn from areas in the initial interview that in the judgment of the researcher, warranted further investigation.

The primary orientation of the follow-up interview was to elicit from all subjects examples of their behavior and activities that could reflect their beliefs as stated in the initial interview. This technique was an adaptation of a process developed and described by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1982). In their study of belief systems of university supervisors of student teaching, an interview of approximately one hour was conducted with each of the nine subjects. Subjects were asked for specific examples of how they carried out their roles. In the present study, the follow-up interview was primarily used to elicit specific examples of beliefs that were stated in the initial interview.

The researcher also sought documentary evidence to support the trustworthiness of the study. This evidence included course syllabi and other material produced by the subjects for student use in courses involving professional development schools. Also, archival material in the department, school of education, or program director files was solicited. In addition, material written by the subjects in the form of memoranda, reports, scholarly papers, etc., were obtained. As previously indicated, some of this material contributed to a greater extent than other data collected for corroboration.

Personnel who work in professional development schools were an additional source of data that validated statements made by the subjects. Informal interviews with principals and teachers in professional development schools and colleagues of the subjects lent additional support to the statements made by the subjects. As with the case of documentary evidence, access and availability of these data varied from subject to subject.

Member Checks. Each subject was provided a transcript of each of his or her interviews along with a cover letter containing instructions to guide the review of the transcripts. This served as a modified member check of the data. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the member check is "the most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314) in a naturalistic study. Each subject in the investigation

was able to authenticate the transcripts as accurate representations of his or her true feelings, beliefs, and perspectives. In addition, each subject was able to provide written additions or modifications to the responses and elaborate on these areas in the follow-up interview. In each case, very few modifications were made and in no case did a subject alter the meaning and intent of his or her original statements. This was viewed as a further validation of the statements of feelings, beliefs, and perspectives in the initial interview.

In relation to member checks, Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that among the purposes served are:

> It provides the opportunity to assess intentionality--what it is that the respondent *intended* by acting in a certain way or by providing certain information.
>
> It gives the respondent immediate opportunity to correct errors of fact....
>
> It provides the respondent the opportunity to volunteer additional information....
>
> It puts the respondent on record as having said certain things and having to agree to the correctness of the investigator's recording of them, thereby making it more difficult later for the respondent to claim misunderstanding or investigator error. (p. 314)

In this study, the investigator had each participant verify the data--the actual statements in the major interview.

<u>Analysis.</u> The researcher used a modified constant comparative method and inductive data analysis to analyze the data in this investigation. The constant comparative method was introduced by Glasser and Strauss (1967) as a method to generate theory from data. The constant comparative method, according to Glasser and Strauss (1967), requires the researcher to:

1. Begin collecting data;

2. Look for key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become categories of focus;

3. Collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus with an eye to seeing the diversity of the dimension under the categories.

4. Write about categories being explored, attempting to describe and account for all the incidents in the data while continually searching for new incidents;

5. Work with the data and emerging model to discover basic social processes and relationships.

6. Engage in sampling, coding and writing as the analysis focuses on core categories.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that the constant comparative method proposed by Glasser and Strauss (1967) was not originally intended for use in a naturalistic study. The method was developed as a means not of processing data, but of deriving theory. Nevertheless, Lincoln and Guba

(1985) argue that the constant comparative model is of great value in processing qualitative data. For the purposes of the proposed study, steps 3 and 6 above were modified somewhat in that large samples were not used.

The data were further analyzed by using inductive data analysis defined as "a process for 'making sense' out of field data" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 202). Somewhat similar to the constant comparative method in that data are treated by giving attention to key issues, recurrent events, or activities that become categories of focus, this analysis involved coding and categorizing data inductively. Using inductive data analysis, the researcher coded the raw data. Raw data were any pieces of information (a sentence, paragraph, etc.) that could stand alone. The coded data were then sorted into categories based on similar characteristics (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The researcher's judgment guided this process.

Trustworthiness.

In naturalistic research, trustworthiness is the standard that addresses the issues of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Certain established operational techniques were utilized to support the trustworthiness of this study.

The researcher proposed that credible findings and interpretations would result by using a modification of the prolonged engagement concept. Prolonged engagement is

defined as the "investment of sufficient time to achieve certain purposes, learning the 'culture', testing for misinformation introduced by distortions either of the self or of the respondents, and building trust" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 301). The in-depth initial interview with at least one follow-up interview with each subject served as an investment of the time necessary to achieve the purposes of this study. In addition, follow-up interviews permitted the researcher to not only pursue certain areas in depth, but to check for consistency of responses and test for misinformation which may have been introduced. Because this investigation was designed only to examine beliefs and perceptions of the subjects, it was not necessary to address the issue of each subject's particular culture or setting except as these settings may have been revealed through interviews. Even though no particular minimum or maximum time for each subject was planned, the initial interviews lasted from one and one-half to just over two hours. The follow-up interviews also varied and lasted from forty-five minutes to an hour and one-half.

Credibility was further established by member checks as described previously in this chapter. Each subject was provided a complete written transcript of each of his or her major interview along with a cover letter containing instructions to guide the review of the transcripts. This was done to give each participant the opportunity to confirm

statements put forth in the initial interview as accurate representations of the feelings, beliefs, and perspectives which the subject intended to convey during the interviews. In addition, each subject was able to provide written additions or modifications to the responses or suggestions for the content of follow-up interviews.

The researcher also used triangulation to support the trustworthiness of the study. Triangulation is a process described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) whereby multiple data sources are examined for agreement about particular statements made by subjects. In this study the additional data sources included informal interviews with others who had observed the behavior of the subjects, written documentary material such as course syllabi, memoranda, and papers written by the subjects.

The concept of verisimilitude is also related to the issue of trustworthiness. Verisimilitude is the qualitative counterpart to quantitative validity. According to Shulman (1992)

> Narrative modes, in contrast, are specific, local, personal, and conceptualized. We do not speak of the validity of a narrative, but of its verisimilitude. Does it ring true? Is it a compelling and persuasive story? A good piece of physics demonstrates its validity through meeting standards of prediction and control. A good work of tragedy demonstrates its verisimilitude by evoking in its audience feelings of pity and fear. (p. 23)

The verisimilitude of each of the participants' responses was evident to the investigator because of the passion and enthusiasm with which each spoke. Further, complete readings of the interviews, which are only partially reproduced in the following chapter, revealed consistently open and sincere responses. Moreover, there was an interesting similarity of responses from participants who were each interviewed separately, and who acknowledged that they had not discussed this research with any other participant.

Summary

This chapter has presented the research design for the study and the methodology that was followed to answer the research questions. Through extended interviews and other data sources, the researcher determined the beliefs and perceptions held by the participants regarding their individual roles in professional development schools, and what they believed about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers. Data were analyzed through a modified constant comparative method. Trustworthiness was established through prolonged engagement sufficient to arrive at answers to the research questions, member checks, and triangulation. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS
Introduction

The propose of this research was to investigate the beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding both their individual roles as teacher educators in professional development schools, and the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers. Data were gathered primarily from multiple-extended interviews with the participants. In addition, other data sources such as course syllabi, professional writings, handbooks, memoranda, and validation interviews with others were studied extensively for appropriate supporting information. This chapter presents the results of the investigation.

Prior to gathering data, the researcher identified the two major areas of investigation which were stated in the purpose of the study. These were (1) to determine the beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding their individual roles in professional development schools, and (2) to determine what selected teacher education professors believe about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers. From

those major areas, several orienting questions were developed to provide a framework for designing an interview guide. The interview guide provided some structure for the series of initial interviews, but did not bind or limit the investigator. When a participant's response intrigued the investigator, he used additional questioning to probe that particular area. As a result, while the basic research questions were answered, each participant provided additional information which was related to the study, but differed from additional information provided by the other participants.

This chapter is organized to present data relating to the issues surrounding the orienting questions. This cross-case analysis provides the participants' beliefs about their individual roles as teacher educators in professional development schools, and the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers.

Words are powerful. The choice of words used to answer questions, to describe beliefs, to express both frustration and aspiration conveys a sense of a person's genuine beliefs and meanings. Spoken words are even more meaningful. They are more useful than written words in conveying beliefs and meanings because they are colored by tone, inflection, rate, and other speech characteristics which cannot be adequately described in print. Printed words cannot convey the effect of pauses, of rapid response, of rambling speech, of emotion, of

the way speakers emphasize particular words, of facial expressions and body language, all of which add to understanding what has been communicated. Because readers of this research cannot hear the participants' actual responses which would best convey beliefs and perceptions, many of the recorded words of those participants are reproduced in this chapter. Numerous extended quotations are intentionally included to amplify the researcher's analysis and to share with the reader a greater sense of the participants' beliefs and perceptions. These quotations are presented exactly as tape recorded, transcribed, and verified by the participants. In several cases, the participants' words do not reflect grammatical correctness and thoughts which came faster than spoken words sometimes make the responses a bit confusing to one who can only read, and not hear, the responses. In some cases, subjects stopped a thought in mid-sentence and began a new one. Quotations which may appear confused and rambling to the reader have been repeatedly verified by checking written transcripts against the recorded record. The quotations are presented exactly as spoken.

For the purpose of clarity, the participants are identified by the pseudonyms Wayne Jacobs, Elaine Gragg, Kathryn Pope and Sarah Henry. To encourage those involved in the study to provide the most truthful data possible, the

participants as well as other human data sources were promised absolute anonymity. To maintain that assurance, all references to locations, particular schools, specific individuals, and other identifying information are deleted from quotations. These deletions are indicated by brackets. Parentheses are used to add important clarifying words to quotations.

<center>Cross-Case Analysis</center>

Role Perception

This research sought to find out how selected teacher education professors perceived their roles as they worked in professional development schools. The descriptors included words such as *conduit, facilitator, model, helper, colleague,* and *team member.* There were also some differences in perceptions ranging from *segmented* to *maverick.*

Wayne Jacobs.

Wayne used several terms to describe his perception of his role in professional development schools. Among those terms were facilitator, conduit, model, and he believed that in his early years at the university, he was the embodiment of the university in the eyes of educators in professional development schools.

> The role that I played was much broader than that of just student teaching supervisor because to those small [public] schools I was the university. I carried information about registration. I carried information about the research, about what was going on. The first that a lot of our folks (in public schools) around here

> heard about cooperative learning was as a result of our folks who worked in this capacity taking that information out to the schools. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Wayne used that and other examples to show why he described his role as a conduit and an avenue for ideas and innovations. He often provided in-service staff development for teachers who worked in the professional development schools.

> After school they say, 'Hey, Dr. [J.], tell me about this idea that's coming on line, cooperative learning.' Team teaching was a big thing. Differentiated staffing. Now some of them didn't take up those ideas but that's the first that they heard about it and the first explanations they had were from us. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Wayne was asked to cite more examples of how he carried out his perceived role as a conduit and an avenue for ideas. Noting that a conduit or avenue can be a two-way proposition, he recalled two social studies teachers, both of whom he considered to be effective teachers, but with different styles of teaching. He had observed that both teachers organized their social studies lessons in chronological order. Wayne introduced the idea of thematic teaching to both of them.

> I took these ideas out and we had a couple of seminars in which these guys tinkered with the curriculum in terms of doing that. Then coming back the other way, they fed us information about our teacher ed program in terms of what they saw in our products and we used the

information for that particular school to make some rather significant changes in what we were doing at the time. (Interview, 8 July 1993)

In addition to being a conduit for information between the university and the professional development school, Wayne also saw himself as a facilitator and model. He said he taught by example.

> My teaching style is to model in the classroom what I'm asking my youngsters to do. For instance, I don't assign anything that I don't read every word my students hand in to me. and not just say I read it, I comment, I fill the margins of their papers. Feedback. One thing I harp on with our beginners: give your kids feedback. (Interview, 8 July 1993)

In a subsequent interview, Wayne was asked for further examples of how his professional practice reflected his perception of being a facilitator and model. He began by citing the practice of a colleague who went into classrooms in the professional development schools and took part in the activities that had been planned and directed by the preservice teachers. After talking about how that practice allowed the preservice teacher to observe the university teacher, Wayne recalled his own practice.

> Now, in secondary science, if they're having a lab and I walk in, I don't sit on a stool and take notes and do an observation. Generally, I'll tell the student teacher, 'hey, I'll take these two tables," and I'll stand over the kids and try to hone up on some stuff that I'd forgotten and work with the kids and try to model such things as open

ended questions and divergent questions rather than 'What is this?' (Interview, 8 July 1993)

In a telephone interview, a college administrator who was directly responsible for managing the teacher education program at Wayne's school of education confirmed his activities as a liaison and conduit for information.

> He's always had a passion for teaching and seeing good teachers sent out from the university. There's no way our program could be as strong as it is without the things he's done to link up what's done on campus with what's really going on out in the schools. (Interview, 3 September 1993).

Elaine Gragg

Elaine described her role in professional development schools as that of helper. In two interviews she used the words help or helping 28 times to describe her perception of her role as a teacher educator. As an undergraduate, even though she changed her major from physical therapy to teaching, she was motivated by a desire to help other people. She related that her decision to become a teacher educator was influenced by her desire to continue in the helping role.

> I'm very interested in working with preservice teachers from the standpoint of giving them a good solid start in the field. I felt like I had been given a good solid boost...and I felt like I had something to offer to the teaching profession at this level. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

In a later interview, Elaine described some examples of things she had done to provide preservice teachers the solid start in the profession. She spoke of getting out in the schools to try and build the effectiveness of the professional development school concept so that preservice teachers could receive the maximum benefit.

> Getting out there, talking with cooperating teachers, the mentoring teachers about what the program is about. What the requirements are, what the student needs to be doing, where different people tend to fit in all this initially. Getting the kids comfortable in being out in the schools. I think my going out and working with the mentoring teachers the very first week of school is a very positive start for the interns. Getting the teachers to understand where we're going. To understand its a very different type of program. (Interview, 8 July 1993)

Not only was she interested in helping preservice teachers, Elaine made several references to helping practicing teachers, particularly those who work with preservice interns and student teachers. "I see part of my role as trying to help the teacher think about alternatives for the interns--to help them feel a little bit more part of the internship program...." (Interview, 23 June 1993). She went on to talk about helping practicing teachers with new teaching methods and encouraging them to experiment with innovative strategies.

Kathryn Pope.

The concept of helping was evident throughout Kathryn's interviews, although she chose to describe herself

as a *colleague* and *team member*. Her primary focus was on providing leadership for developing a teacher education effort that combined university faculty, public school teachers, and preservice teachers in a partnership aimed at readying those preservice teachers for competent independent practice.

> I worked in four schools in the capacity of working with teachers and being a liaison between the two of them and then our university as well, and with the principal--anybody that was involved with our student teachers. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

This description is interestingly close to the one given by Wayne a month earlier and several hundred miles away.

Kathryn saw herself as a colleague and a team member. Despite being the leader, she wanted every member of the team--university and public school faculty, and teacher education students--to view each other as equals with different responsibilities.

> What I really tried to work on was, we're all colleagues, we're all teacher educators together and that's not easy; for some people it's easy--they make the adjustment--meaning classroom teachers--they have no problem with it and they, a first name basis. Others, I would always be Dr. [Pope]. And just to break down that little barrier. The students, I indicated to the students they could call me [Kathryn] if they wished because we're supposed to be a team. They finally at graduation did it but the graduate student that was working with me was always [Susan] but I was always Dr. [Pope]. But that's just an aside. I think the biggest thing is looking at what teacher education is and making a change in that and getting everybody to be a colleague I think would really

help out more so than what it's been in the past (Interview, 16 August 1993)

In addition to inviting students to call her by her first name, Kathryn repeatedly employed a distinctive term for the public school teacher who worked with her and preservice teachers in the professional development schools. "...the on-site teacher educator, which is the label I am using to talk about the classroom teachers that are working with the interns." (Interview, 16 August 1993). Some 20 minutes later she repeated that phrase which emphasized the importance of collegiality in the professional development setting.

> ...working with the on-site teacher educators which is the terms I use [for] classroom teachers--to identify what their role was in this situation. Because it was a new program we're like trying to identify what their role is. So we had meetings to address that. They're interested in what's their role in this situation, how is it different from a traditional cooperating teacher. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

She used the term on-site teacher educator more than a dozen times in one interview (nearly that many times in a second interview) and never referred to the public school teachers by any other term. It was particularly indicative of the esteem in which she held those public school teachers who worked with preservice teachers. What was the genesis of the term?

> I don't know. I think I probably started it. I don't know where it came from originally. I don't know if I read about it or what. I was involved with a project at

> [another] College and it was the summer student teaching program and they called the classroom teacher a teacher educator, I think. And then we extended it to on-site teacher educator. (Interview, 30 August 1993)

Her use of the word "we," in the preceding statement and in several others, provided additional confirmation of her belief in collegiality. When asked how she worked with preservice teachers in areas outside her area of specialization, Kathryn was again quick to describe the public school teachers as being colleagues of equal status.

> Well, see, I'm not the only teacher educator. The classroom teacher is a teacher educator and they're the experts. So when it comes to reading, our students have had methods courses in the other areas. The faculty are wonderful resources if they need something specific they can go to my other colleagues in the department, but what we also hope is that help is right there on site for them and if they are having problems or want to know about something, the folks in the school will be there. They're teacher educators as well. And that worked in many, many cases. And see, we're still learning and every year it's going to push me. I had a wonderful cohort of students and on-site teacher educators. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

> The label of on-site teacher educator rather than a cooperating teacher. Cooperating teacher and university supervisor--that's a separatist's situation, but the fact they're an on-site teacher educator means that they have a professional perspective and that that's respected by other teacher educators. (Interview, 30 August 1993)

Kathryn extended her idea of colleague and team concept to include the preservice teachers in important roles on her team.

She established various committees made up of preservice teachers to deal with various problems that might arise. Even though these committees served a practical purpose, it was evident that Kathryn was promoting collegiality throughout her teams.

> ...because of this team concept, if I was encountering problems it was a wonderful situation to turn it around and get peer helping. If something did arise or if somebody had a question, I would turn it to their peers to react to rather than me react to, and you listen more sometimes to peers. That's a value of that team effort as well. That really helped out. The other thing that we did was we set up committees. I learned this after the first semester. I had a professional concerns committee and a social committee in my cohort and then we had a math conference that we did and so we had a math conference committee and then I wanted them to visit other sites and other schools so we had a field trip committee. They each had to do these--if anybody had concerns, they were to take it to the professional concerns committee and that committee brought it to me. There was an anonymity that was involved there as well. It gave colleagues a chance--they tried to work it out if they could themselves. Each school had also a representative on it. The professional concerns committee was made up of a representative from each school and so their concerns, they had a spokesman for them from their school. And it could be that person him or herself speaking but I never knew, I just knew it was a concern from that school. So that worked really well. They knew each other. That's the other thing. They got to know each other real well so two years of working together--I'm talking about myself getting to know them--they got to know each other real well and they would help out sometimes. (Interview, 16 August, 1993)

Her various committees are included in her course syllabus and participation on a committee is a requirement for students in her course entitled Teaching and Learning.

Kathryn pointed out other things she did to promote collegiality and a sense of teamwork. For example, she and the classroom teacher would observe together as the intern taught a class. Then they would equally share in the follow-up conference. "They [the classroom teachers] had as much input as I did" (Interview, 30 August 1993). She again mentioned her presence in the professional development school classrooms as an important factor in establishing a relationship based on teamwork. "When you're in that classroom, that makes a difference, too. They (classroom teachers) see you as a team player maybe more" (Interview, 30 August 1993).

In addition, Kathryn noted that she had been an advocate for the classroom teachers with their principals and, thus, had been seen as part of the school team rather than an outsider. She had encouraged principals to provide teachers released time from teaching so that they could participate in workshops related to the professional development schools.

A principal with whom Kathryn had worked in a professional development school confirmed that Kathryn had put into practice the notion of being a colleague. Without being prompted she used the term *colleague* to describe how

Kathryn was viewed by the staff at the professional development school. Asked for an example of Kathryn's behavior, she first mentioned that Kathryn had encouraged those on the professional development school's staff to call her by her first name. "She certainly didn't come in here and act like she was better than the rest of us--sort of the stereotypical university professor." (Interview, 30 August 1993).

<u>Sarah Henry.</u>

Sarah also used the term colleague to describe her role in professional development schools. She noted that it had taken time for the collegial relationship to develop, partly because of the traditional perception of university faculty held by public school teachers.

> Well, there's still some perceptual status stuff there. And every semester I've had new teachers that I've been working with and a few that I've worked with every semester. So, it's just a process of building trust with it. And that will come. I think those I've worked with three semesters see me much more as a colleague now than they did at the beginning. They quit trying to teach to impress me when I walked in the room. They realized that I'm not there to judge their teaching. Sometimes certain ones call me by my first name. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

The use of her first name and the sense of being a colleague was confirmed in separate interviews with a principal and a teacher in one of the professional development schools in which Sarah worked.

Sarah described her role as that of an "active questioner and an active listener" (Interview, 16 August 1993). Although she never used the word *facilitator*, her description of her behavior in a professional development school was a good example of facilitating.

> The other is just to put them in contact with the kinds of experiences that are going to help them during professional development. So as I'm observing someone, if I see they're really not having an opportunity to explore something or see something, I'm going to create an opportunity for them whether it's having them spend some time in another classroom, looking at a different kind of placement the next semester, whatever. What my role is, is to make that experience as broad and as rich as I can and to be as creative as I can (Interview, 16 August 1993.)

Throughout both interviews, she returned to the practice of questioning and a method of guiding her preservice teachers. For example, if she observed an intern having difficulty with some phase of a lesson, she would pose questions to get the intern to reflect on the situation rather than asking how the lesson went.

> I'm not likely to ask them a question like, "How do you think it went?" which already sets up a judgment. I'm much more likely to say, "Tell me what you noticed about the activity." My focus is really trying to get them to think about children's thinking whatever the content area is that they're teaching so I'm always interested in what they notice about children's thinking and how they interact with the activities and that takes the focus off

telling them whether they did a good or bad job which is all relative anyway. (Interview, 25 August 1993)

Sarah, in a second interview, elaborated on things she had done to build collegiality between herself and teachers in professional development schools. She spoke of working directly with classroom teachers to identify the projects they jointly agreed should be part of each preservice teacher's experience. Her goal was to give those classroom teachers a voice in shaping the experience rather than to have them simply provide the setting.

The principal of one of the schools in which Sarah was currently working provided confirmation of Sarah's perception of her role as a colleague.

> One of the things that [Sarah] has been involved with quite extensively is bridging that gap between the university and the school system. She has been a person who has physically been involved -- mentally and emotionally with what's going on at [our school]. She is very much in tune with the culture of our school. She's very much in tune with the curriculum, the special emphasis on communications skills. She's very much in touch with what's going on here. And what that facilitates is her working very well with her students and helping them understand sometimes why things are not as cut and dried as what we read in the textbooks. (Interview, 30 August 1993)

Summary.

The participants generally used similar words to describe how they perceived their role as university faculty working in professional development schools. The words focused

primarily on relationships with other people involved in the process. The primary focus was on the preservice teachers, but there was also a strong focus on working well with the administration and faculties of the professional development schools. Wayne also described an inclination to give attention to issues surrounding the teacher education program structure. All of the participants perceived their individual role as one of close involvement with faculty and staff at the professional development school and not a separate and detached role focusing only on the university program and the preservice teachers in that program.

The Ideal Role

The researcher investigated what the subjects believed the role of education faculty should be in professional development schools. The purpose of this area of investigation was to develop a concept of an ideal role based on the experiences of those who had actually carried out the role. Each of the respondents had been able to shape his or her own role in the professional development schools. This fact may account for the general similarity in what their role had been in practice and what they believed the role should be.

Wayne Jacobs.

Wayne had far more experience in professional development schools than the other subjects. Consequently, he had more experiences upon which to draw when he

suggested that education professors in professional development schools should be a new kind of instructional leader. His concept of the ideal role was that of a model.

> I see these folks as another kind of instructional leader in the school. I'm not talking about leader in terms of showing the way, but I'm talking about leader in terms of being able to model the kinds of things that need to be occurring in the schools. Carrying the ideas out, not just dumping the ideas at the doorstep of a school administration and the faculty, but actually taking part in the implementation of these notions. For instance, I would expect that the university personnel working in a professional development school would be able to walk into a fifth grade classroom and literally model what the innovation happens to be and if it's something like concept attainment or a new kind of inductive model or a new kind of personal or social model like synectics which is not really new, but its new to a heck of a lot of schools--they ought to be able to model that in the school. They're going to have to be an instructional leader and instructional model in addition to being a conduit for information. (Interview, 23 June 1993.)

In a paper submitted for publication in a major journal on teacher education , Wayne described a 1990 case study in which he developed a mentor-intern strategy guided by a university faculty member. In this study, he worked closely with both a cooperating teacher and a preservice teacher to develop skills in implementing cooperative learning in the classroom. Because neither of the teachers in the study had any experience in using this strategy, Wayne was closely involved in the process, for it was he who had to model and

foster the teaching behaviors necessary for effective cooperative learning to take place.

In his conclusions, Wayne identified the importance of the university faculty member in this process. "The many supportive comments made by the participants throughout the study indicate that having another professional consistently close by was an important factor in the study's progress" (Because of the confidentially promised to each participant and to others who provided corroborative data, the citation for this paper is not provided). Wayne's participation as a supportive modeler in the school setting, as described in his paper, is consistent with his belief that university faculty should be modelers, and not simply carriers of information.

Kathryn Pope.

Kathryn's responses were similar. Throughout her initial interview, Kathryn identified with the classroom teacher in the public school. It was evident that she enjoyed being in the elementary classroom where both she and her preservice teachers worked with students and teachers. Her satisfaction with her role may have stemmed from the fact that she had almost complete control in shaping it. "I was very involved in setting up what the program was going to be like so from that baseline on, it was like you're on a track that you didn't veer much from" (Interview, 16 August 1993). It was clear that she was fulfilling what she believed the role to be.

For Kathryn, her role in the professional development school has allowed her to extend her university teaching.

> I was able to teach the methods course in the schools and I did some demonstration lessons with children in a classroom and the preservice teachers sat around and even some of the classroom teachers and observed this and with my explaining to them that I don't know these students and I may be saying the right things but you're all going to pick up what could be done differently and so forth. Plus we were looking at new ways of teaching math and getting at children's thinking in mathematics. Then that group of children left--we did this on two or three occasions--and then another class came in and the preservice teachers then were able to take one or two students or however they wanted to do it. I let them work in pairs or they could work alone. They tried out some of the same things that they had seen me do with students and so they got to observe children in a group with a teacher--me in this case- working with them and they had a chance to try it out and modify it if they wanted to or just to see if it would work for them (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Elaine Gragg.

Elaine, relatively new to college teaching and still in the process of developing a sense of her role, felt she had been compelled to be more of an evaluator because of constraints on her time. She stated that her role as an evaluator should be minimal and that she would prefer to be "more of a facilitator--someone who has the expertise to bring in, not only talking from my perspective, but bring in other people who have expertise in our field" (Interview, 23 June 1993).

In a follow-up interview, Elaine noted again that time limitations worked against her in trying to achieve her desired role as a facilitator. Nevertheless, when asked about specific instances where she had started to build that role, she described her attempts at facilitating.

> I began getting the students moving in the fall on the kinds of experiences, basically setting the stage for the interns to get out into the school and begin experiencing the different kinds of things that they are required to experience. We have a little book. It happens to be a blue book of experience that they have to accomplish by the middle of the year. And again, making sure everybody's aware of what they are doing, setting up meetings with other places with the interns to go so that they get those experiences. Giving them the opportunity to come back and talk about it. I would like in the future to do more where we pull together the interns and the teachers. The problem with that is that unless we do it at 7:30 in the morning, which is not a good time of the day; lunch time is not a good time because they don't always have the same lunch and most of them don't want to do without lunch anyway. After school is not a good time because this one's a coach or that one has this responsibility and the students aren't there in the afternoon in the fall so really you're restricted to the mornings. It's not easy to call faculty to a meeting at 7:30 in the morning when there's very little that they receive as a benefit. Most of them are willing to do it but I try to keep that to a minimum. Generally those meetings I try to make something more of talking about the program, moving people in the right direction, attending to questions that they might have. I usually have one right at the beginning of the year, one about two weeks later after they've started, one about maybe a month after that again to see if any problems have

arisen that deal with the program, not their specific intern.(Interview, 8 July 1993).

Elaine saw facilitation from a different perspective than the two previous participants. Her notion was that a facilitator made things happen by organizing, planning, and scheduling rather than by being an example in the professional development school classroom. She rarely mentioned the students in those classrooms and focused almost entirely on feelings about the program, about herself and about preservice teachers.

<u>Sarah Henry.</u>

Like Kathryn, Sarah had much control over shaping her role. Accordingly, she saw little difference in what her role was and what it should be. As previously described, she functioned as a colleague who works both with cooperating teachers and preservice teachers. "Ideally, my role would be both staff development and supervision but it basically is supervision" (Interview, 16 August 1993). Sarah explained that her staff development efforts had been limited because public school teachers already had demanding schedules and simply lacked time for additional staff development.

<u>Summary.</u>

The participants were quite similar in their responses about the ideal role for a university faculty member working in a professional development school. Except for Elaine who had less control over her assignment than the others, the

participants generally concluded from their experience that the ideal role should include facilitating teacher education and enhancing what was taking place in public school classrooms. They believed that teaching by modeling was important. Elaine reflected a greater orientation than the others toward managing and refining a program as opposed to working with individuals in the school setting.

Elaine's perceptions were consistent with the other participants, however, for her this ideal role was a notion born less from experience than from a theoretical construct. That is to say that the other three participants had developed and confirmed their beliefs through practical experience, whereas Elaine had less of that practical experience upon which to base her beliefs.

Professional Frustrations

A particularly important question in this research dealt with frustrations of university faculty in carrying out their roles in professional development schools. Although one case revealed professional adjustment influences, the common frustration was lack of time to fully accomplish all the things the participants wanted to do. Both Wayne and Elaine, who taught at the same university, expressed more concern about conflicts with the internal power structure at their institution than did Kathryn and Sarah.

<u>Wayne Jacobs.</u>

Wayne spoke with enthusiasm about the "tremendous amount of autonomy" he had in working in professional development schools. "Now the only parameters that we had put on us were those parameters put on us in terms of the student teachers, but not what we could do in the schools" (Interview, 23 June 1993). One frustration he experienced was a constraint on time.

> Most of the frustration and most of the obstacles came from campus. Time constraints. The folks who were making decisions that we had to live with. Policy makers were rarely on-site in the schools. The policy makers back on campus were divorced from the notion of what we were doing. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

For Wayne, lack of time was really a minor frustration. When the word frustration was used in questioning, he quickly spoke of public school administrators. In two separate interviews, he spoke harshly about principals in particular.

> I guess one of the biggest frustrations I've had is administrators--school administrators, especially principals who I haven't been able to sell my notion of what teacher education ought to be. Where you have a principal who will bargain with you on the front end, 'I'll be glad to work with you, Wayne, but I want the major say in who the cooperating teachers are going to be.' In other words, 'I want veto power because I want to pass that around and I know you, you'll want to stay with three, or four, or five people who you perceive to be the best models for your student teachers, but then I have to live with the folks who don't get student teachers.' And I haven't been able to sell them on the notion that we

were going the wrong direction. So, frustrations come generally from the administrators. (Interview, 23 June, 1993)

Principals who insisted on rotating the assignments for supervising teachers and I really got frustrated in some schools. The principals would say 'these people see this as an honor and a privilege and if the lady across the hall has a student teacher , they think they deserve one, too.' But that's not true. They may not have those skills that make them different. 'I've got to keep harmony in this house and that's just going to be.' So we just check out of some schools. One in particular I remember very well: 'I'm the principal of this school and I'll make the decisions.' I said, 'all right I've got no problem with that except that I've got some student teachers who paid their tuition for the very best that I can give them and we're not giving them the best that we've got." He'd say, 'I know that, but that's the way it's going to be.' (Interview, 8 July 1993)

Even though he did not categorize it as a frustration, it was apparent in two interviews that Wayne perceived that his work in professional development schools had resulted in limitations on his professional advancement--a topic that will be subsequently presented in this chapter. He mentioned, in both interviews, differences in the salary scales for professors who taught only on campus and those who worked primarily off-campus. He cited inadequate campus office space provided to professors who worked in professional development schools. "You put your time in the public schools rather than on this campus you're going to pay a price." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Elaine Gragg.

Elaine was completing her second year as a university faculty member. Her frustrations grew from trying to meet all of the professional expectations in a system to which she was trying to adapt. Without being asked, she described frustrations with a number of people in public schools whom she believed perceived her as a student teacher supervisor rather than as a teacher educator who actively used public schools as a laboratory for training preservice teachers in all stages of development. In contrast to the other participants, Elaine did not reveal the enthusiasm for working with preservice teachers in school settings. She spoke far more of frustrations than of accomplishments. In a follow-up interview, she cited a case of a problem with a principal.

> I think it stemmed from that teacher because I would talk to the teacher and then the principal would reiterate those exact same words. And then I'd back up here on campus and well, the principal would talk to the person who was in charge of that particular intern program and there was no problem. And I'm like, 'Wait a minute. You just gave me a list of the things to find out for you from the very person you talked to and you told that individual there was no problem?' Those kind of things are not appreciated. Those kinds of things do, to me, increase tension, increase frictions. Like I said, I'm choosing not to go back to that school for a while for those kinds of reasons. (Interview, 8 July, 1993)

She talked of her lack of experience compared to other faculty in her college and the fact that she is younger than

most other faculty members and, more importantly to her, younger than most of the public school personnel with whom she worked.

> And that's real hard. A lot of them don't want to hear what I have to say. I think part of that is because I'm new, I'm younger than most of them. And that frankly is a problem I'm finding. I didn't think it would be but I'm very rapidly finding that it is. 'We've done this umpteen years and we just don't want to hear what you have to say. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

> She expressed frustration in working with her colleagues.

> "...but being that I was a first-year person here, and they said, 'Okay, you can state your opinion, but lets get real--we've got five other people who've been here for a long time and if that's what they want to do, that's what they're going to do" (Interview, 23 June 1993).

But her major frustration was lack of time.

> For me right now it's (lack of time) the biggest thing. As an assistant professor the big thing is publish or you're out of here. Publish or perish is the rule. My teaching load has been extremely high--much higher than was originally negotiated--because of the demands of our program. I'm trying to scramble to get my career up and going and also teaching three or four courses on top of supervising interns an academic semester. That's an awful lot and I feel confined in what I'm doing. It leads to a lot of frustration and the new college issues are a frustration for everybody and I've seen a lot of tempers flying. I've seen a lot of friction and particularly in this last academic year and I've heard a lot of the senior faculty say, 'This is the hardest year and a half we've ever been through.' And I haven't known anything else, so all I can do is echo what they say. This is the hardest

time that they've experienced and so being in the midst of this, not knowing what could be different, is somewhat interesting. In some ways it helps alleviate the concerns but in other ways elevates them to, it's like, "Why just I don't have the time to get done what I need to do, get written what I need to write." So I sometimes feel like its partly me trying to figure out where I'm going and partly the situation I'm finding myself in. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

It was evident from Elaine's comments that she would prefer to teach in the university classroom and conduct research rather than spend part of her time working in public schools with preservice teachers. Even though she stated that she enjoyed working with preservice teachers, she described herself as a research scientist and admitted that she would prefer to spend the bulk of her time on her research. For Elaine, working in professional development schools appeared to take time away from things she preferred doing.

Kathryn Pope.

Kathryn clearly enjoyed being in the professional development school. Her biggest frustration was lack of time to do all the things she wanted to do with her preservice teachers. She spoke with a smile when asked about obstacles she encountered. She initially worked with 34 undergraduates in three professional development schools while teaching courses on the university campus. Too many students, according to Kathryn, unless that was all she had to do. But, interestingly, she did not focus on frustrations, but

wanted to talk about the positives of the program so much
that she even forgot the question during the original
interview.

> 34 students. Far too many. I mean without hesitation.
> The...we...I had a super team. I mean the teachers I
> worked with and the preservice teachers were just
> marvelous. I am so excited about the teachers we've
> graduated from our program that are going out and
> going to have their own classroom and I right now could
> identify easily a large number of them and match them
> up against lots of experienced teachers. With the strong
> experience they have going in and not only that, they've
> had chances to work with different classroom teachers so
> they've had this rich experience and they've used it.
> They've learned from it. What was the original
> question?
>
> Interviewer: The original question was on professional
> frustrations.
>
> Oh, okay. so the problem was I wouldn't give up those
> 34 if I had to re-do it but it's just far too many. If you're
> going to have a team and a cohort, 25 is ideal. We're
> having to have larger numbers again because of
> financial, I think, you know, the kinds of resources that
> are available. But to really help preservice teachers and
> to work with classroom teachers, 34 was just too many.
> (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Like all the participants in this study, Kathryn observed
public school teachers who continued to use outdated methods.
She mentioned this when asked about other limitations and
obstacles she had encountered while working in professional
development schools. Her tone was one of kindness and
understanding, however, as opposed to consternation.

> Oh, yes. Some of the teachers are still really traditional.
> Other teachers are really over...teachers are required to
> do so much and so much paperwork and they have
> some of the problems in the schools today they're really
> severe problems that children bring to school. So
> teachers, some teachers are just not as flexible as other
> teachers. Maybe that's another way to put it. Some are
> not quite as receptive to making changes. Some their
> communications skills need to be strengthened. I had
> frustrations in that sense. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Kathryn, who had earlier emphasized the team concept and the sense of collegiality, took the emphasis away from her frustrations and volunteered observations about the frustrations that others encountered. She identified a need for improved communications.

> Students, some of the students, preservice teachers had
> frustrations. Some of the on-site teacher educators had
> frustrations. Communications is the big area and
> getting people to talk. They'll go all around an issue
> before they address it, and sometimes never address it
> and then you have to come in. Fortunately the
> preservice teachers were open with me and kept me
> apprised of things and some of the on-site teacher
> educators were as well. But the biggest frustration was
> the time. The time factor for many teachers and feeling
> that stress. Another frustration was the lack of
> communications that did take place in a few instances
> with the preservice teachers and the on-site teacher
> educators. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

She expressed some frustration over her interns not getting all the experiences she believed they needed. For example, to overcome the problem of teachers relying too

heavily on worksheets, Kathryn developed specific assignments for her interns and explained to the cooperating teachers, the necessity of having these assignments carried out. That technique avoided problems that could have arisen had Kathryn directly challenged the cooperating teachers' methods. Some of the classroom teachers benefited from seeing different strategies. "... some of those same teachers would come back and say, 'Hey I really liked what so-and-so did today. I'm going to try and do that next year,' so they were receptive" (Interview, 30 August 1993).

Kathryn recalled a specific incident when her frustration, as well as that of the preservice teacher, stemmed from an inflexible classroom teacher. The case illustrates her response to a frustration, but more importantly, her overriding concern with collegial relationships. The situation eventually led to moving the student to a new situation.

> We started first with conferences and would sit down together, the student teacher and myself and the teacher and just an open discussion. 'How are things going?' And of course neither one would really speak up and so then I would try to ask them questions that would bring out the concerns that I knew each one had and then leaving the door open for each to contact me and in this case the student called me several times and I went and talked individually with the teacher to try to see what that teacher's feelings were and then finally decided that we would make the move. But we didn't talk in terms of the teacher's role; it was more in terms of the needs of the student to work with a different group of students. So we never really addressed the situation.

After we made the decision to move, the student stayed for I think it was another two weeks there and then moved to a different school and the move made a big difference. The person was very happy. We also moved to a different grade level so it wasn't like we were really switching because of the teacher. (Interview, 30 August 1993).

Sarah Henry.

Sarah was also frustrated with a lack of time for professional activities. For her, the lack of time precluded the extensive, interpersonal interactions she believed were important to professional growth.

Oh, if I had to pick a frustration, Larry, I guess it would be that we don't take as much time to sit down and talk to each other as we could profitably spend. The time crunch again. All the things you have to do to juggle the time. I think we're learning a lot every year but each team is a little more isolated than I'd like it to be. On an individual level I seek out other colleagues and make time to talk with them and I meet with faculty who are doing the methods courses that semester for my students. I do that because I believe we need to do it whether or not the program is set up to facilitate that. I see us taking longer to discover things that aren't working as well and figuring out solutions to them than I'd like us to take. (Interview, 23 August 1993).

Like others in this study, Sarah felt that some public school personnel were not ideal in contributing to the full effectiveness of professional development schools. Neither her tone nor her words carried any sense of criticism of these teachers as had those of Wayne and Elaine.

There are classrooms that if you had your pick of classrooms there are a few that I would not chose to put students in. I would like some more time to be able to meet with the teachers at the schools we have. But I think all of that is part of the way schools function. Nothing that hasn't been able to work out. Even with rigid, traditional teachers, we're able to point out that they have something really worthwhile to offer the students. Sometimes you have to search and find out what that is. (Interview, 23 August, 1993)

Summary.

In each case, the participants were asked to identify frustrations without suggesting any specific possible frustration. A lack of time to do all the things the participants wanted to do was the common frustration. Wayne did express greater frustration with some public school administrators and Elaine, who also mentioned a problem with a principal, was primarily frustrated because the time demands seemed to be career roadblocks at this point in her life. Both Wayne and Elaine seemed frustrated more so by the politics of their own institutions than did Sarah or Kathryn who never expressed disagreement or frustration with policies and practices at their university. All of the participants expressed some dissatisfaction about incidences when preservice teachers had been placed with teachers whom the participants felt were not the best from whom the preservice teachers could learn.

Influences On Beliefs

What external influences impacted on the beliefs about their roles in professional development schools of the

participants in this study? Subjects were asked to describe the major influences that had shaped their beliefs about their professional lives. Except for Wayne, one of the influences had come from another person.

<u>Wayne Jacobs.</u>

Initially a high school science teacher, Wayne entered graduate school in order to qualify for higher paying positions in education. He considered public school administration or college teaching as possibilities. Because of the graduate programs available to him, he earned graduate degrees in curriculum and teaching and began a career as a professor of education. But he continued to consider himself a teacher first. With a quick response, he said that the perspective of a classroom had been the single factor that shaped his beliefs about himself. "The fact that I am a classroom teacher first and everything that I do is shaped or molded by that idea first--how does it affect [this student] or [that student] out there in that classroom." (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Wayne elaborated on how he viewed college teachers in general and how he fit into the role.

> I think there are two kinds of people in this business, at least one way to characterize it: those who started out to be college professors, that's their life, that's the domain in which their heads and hearts operate. But I'm not that way. There's another group of us, I think, who are at heart classroom teachers. I think I mentioned to you over lunch that in medical schools everybody starts out

> with that common ground--you're an M. D. first. Now that's by certification or licensure. We're not all that way in this college. Some of us don't even, who are licensed, don't even buy into that idea. They may be licensed, but they are college professors. I am a classroom teacher who happens to be a college professor. There's a difference. I just took down my [state] certification. Generally, I keep that right up there on the wall. (Interview, 23 June, 1993)

At the time of the second interview, Wayne had finished rearranging his office and had returned his public school teacher's certificate to a display location on the wall.

Throughout two lengthy interviews, Wayne related numerous events and cited examples of things he had done in professional development settings as opposed to things related to those schools but which were done on the university campus. It was clear that he liked being in those schools. Another section of this chapter describes Wayne's beliefs about being a second-class academic citizen which he believes resulted from his devotion to the public schools.

Elaine Gragg.

Elaine said the major influence on her had come from a single person, "Very strongly, one person" (Interview, 23 June, 1993). She related her observations of her own high school teachers whom she now believes had been limited by less than optimal teacher education.

> I had a couple of teachers in high school who wanted more, but didn't always know how, and now I can look back and see that, as a student I couldn't; as a student I

saw these teachers and I just thought, 'Ah' and they really were, especially since most of them came through teacher education at a time where didactic teaching was what was taught and what they saw, so my experience was didactic but the methods teacher--the professor that I had for my methods course--made a statement and it has had a profound impact on my thinking and that is, 'What I'm showing you, what we're doing,--well basically you could do anything you want in your classroom so long as you can argue why you're doing it.' And my understanding of that statement has grown tremendously as I have grown as a professional and I have obviously interpreted that for myself which may be different from the way that it was originally stated. Knowing that you can defend what you're doing, knowing that or having a strong enough feel for what it is your students are doing and where they're going, being willing to try things out, being open-minded to new ideas and willing to try them. This notion of being a reflective practitioner, I mean I never heard that term until I was in graduate school as a doctoral student, but that was part of it. You thought about what you did and if it didn't work you tried something else. If it didn't work then you tried it in a different way and you tried to figure out why. (Interview, 23 June, 1993)

Only in her second year as a university professor, Elaine had been cautious about putting her philosophy to a major test. Asked about times when she had done something that might have been controversial, she admitted she had been particularly tentative about doing that in the public schools. She did recall some reactions from her university students.

My students sometimes look at me funny. They look at some of the things I do and sometimes you can tell they're wondering, 'Why did you do that? What was the reason?' In that setting I talk a lot about reasons for

doing things. But I know I have reasons for what I'm doing. (Interview, 8 July, 1993)

With some additional probing, she did cite an example of practicing her philosophy of justification.

> I did have an occasion out in the schools to talk about reasons for some of the assignments that I've given, particularly within the methods classes they have to do out in the schools, and it wasn't that the person was necessarily negatively concerned about the work but was more interested in knowing how this was affecting students. A couple of science teachers in particular asked me for references for things they were interested in doing out in the schools because they wanted to know about them and now I've got a couple that are very interested, but they don't have very many opportunities for professional growth in the setting they find themselves. In my opinion if we are going to have a professional development school, that's one of the primary things we need to attend to at this stage of the game. (Interview, 8 July 1993).

Kathryn Pope.

Kathryn had been an elementary classroom teacher for a number of years prior to teaching in college. Prior to her current university appointment, she was, for several years, on the faculty of a small private college and she had also held an adjunct appointment for a semester in a large southeastern university. During all those experiences, she worked with children and it was that contact with children that primarily shaped her beliefs.

> You can get all the theory and all of the content but until you really work with children and learn from

children--you have to really find out what children know in order to help them learn. The same thing is true with preservice teachers. If you're going to help them you really have to know what they're thinking about so I mean it's always been kind of a focus of mine. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

As she continued to explain how experience working with children had influenced her, Kathryn expressed a perspective similar to one Elaine had expressed about reflective teaching.

I think by listening to others and trying to always hear and learn from them it directs what you do yourself. I'm very much involved now with this cognitive guided instruction project. That's always been my own theoretical approach, it's just now there's a name for it. I'm learning so much more from doing that. But I think its working with colleagues and working with children and then using what I'm learning and applying an on-going assessment. I'm always evaluating. (Interview, 16 August, 1993).

Sarah Henry.

Almost all of Sarah's professional experience had been at the university level. Most of that experience had been in teaching courses in child psychology and developmental psychology. Thus, without the public school classroom background of the other participants, Sarah related that her perspectives had been shaped by her broader life experiences and by "people in the education field that I've been particularly taken with because of what I see as the success of their ideas" (Interview, 23 August 1993). In identifying

specific people who's ideas had influenced her, Sarah expressed similar perspectives as had Kathryn about constructivist thinking.

> Well, Vito Perrone for one. The people who, there's a long list of names, but they're people who really recognize the dignity of each person and see learning as an active process. I guess if you were going to pick a philosophy for them they'd either be constructivists or transactionalists but they start with what children know and what the student knows. (Interview, 23 August 1993)

In a follow-up interview, Sarah expressed examples of practices she had embraced as a result of the influence of others in the field.

> I think having students read first hand material rather than second hand material. Having them really put their own voice into their work. Taking time to listen to them and to engage them in conversation--thoughtful conversation--not just covering content. In fact I'm probably a lot less focused on covering content than I used to be and I probably cover more than I used to but I do it in serendipitous routes according to what the students bring in and they always drive me to a point further than I would include. My belief in working with the teachers in the schools--I think I always had a strong belief in the need to observe children because there is a lot to be learned from observation but they've given me some other thoughts about the observation in school.. The notion of reading together with your colleagues--becoming learners ourselves and sharing our reflections. (Interview, 30 August 1993).

<u>Summary.</u>

Their were two major influences on the development of the roles of the participants as they worked in professional development schools. The primary influence was contact with public schools through experience as a teacher. Both Wayne and Kathryn were quick to express their experiences as teachers. All of the participants were influenced by the ideas of others, but for each participant, these experiences had come through different avenues. Elaine had been strongly influenced by a mentor. Sarah and Kathryn had been influenced by the ideas of nationally recognized persons associated with professional development schools. This was particularly so in Sarah's case because of her limited background both as a classroom teacher or in teacher education methodology.

<u>Role Influences By Participants</u>

The research investigated how the participants influenced the development of their own roles as teacher educators in professional development schools. Each of the subjects had come from different educational and experiential backgrounds. Two had many years of experience in higher education, but only one of these had been directly involved in the field experience component of teacher education during those years. A third participant, an assistant professor, was relatively well established as a teacher educator although not

yet tenured and the fourth was a recent doctoral graduate just beginning a faculty career in higher education.

Wayne Jacobs.

When asked what he had done to shape his own role, Wayne talked about the freedom he had to become part of the faculty at the professional development schools. He believed that his professional success in those schools depended on his being accepted by the school's faculties and administrations.

> The only limits I had on my control was my own limitations. I think every one of us who were coordinators sized what the school was like. I could get away with, if you will, a lot more at [one high school] than I could at [the other]. The nature of the faculty, the nature of the administration--so one of the first things I had to do, or all of us had to do, was make an assessment of what's the climate, what can I get away with here, how far can I push these ideas? Most of us found we could do a lot better job by melding into the faculty rather than keeping ourselves either consciously or unconsciously aloof. It was so dependent on the administration and the degree to which the faculty would accept you as a colleague. The more they accepted you as a colleague, as someone who--if you had--if you were seen as someone that they could respect because you could probably do the job in the classroom, I can't think of any limits that would be established. You had to have credibility. The freedom that you had was dependent on your credibility with the faculty. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Wayne also expressed the value of being physically in the professional development schools. Because of the latitude he had, he could have spent less time in those schools, but for

Wayne, it was important to be there and he talked about the benefits to the development of his own professional career.

> Unless you're dead, unless you're brain dead, I don't see how you can live everyday, all day going from classroom to classroom to classroom supervising, giving feedback, answering questions from teachers and that sort of thing--you're completely immersed in the school. How you could go through that and not be impacted, and have your future role or activities not impacted by it I don't understand. It has a lot to do with, if you're serious about your business, and you come back out of those schools onto the campus, you're a different person, you're a different professional because your orientation is different. The need is different. Now, it's got a lot of impact on you, about the way you perceive yourself and your role. I think that experience helped shape the kind of professor that I am. That close connection or tie not to [this high school or that middle school], but to [a particular teacher's] seventh grade social studies class, that's how close you get or even to [a particular] kid--I know some of those kids in those classrooms. And you can't help but be a different person. The fact that you're not in just one classroom, but you're in dozens of classrooms gives you a perspective that is really unique. I don't think there's very many folks in this college who have the perspective on education and teaching, at least in [this part of the state], as did those past coordinators because they've been so many places and so many different situations. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Elaine Gragg.

It would have been easy for Elaine, a Ph.D. at a major research university, to describe her professional self as fully in-charge of her career. Not attempting to put the best face on the early stages of her career, she presented an honest assessment of her progress. It was not self-effacing, but

rather realistic in that she could have described the professional life she would like to have had at that point. Elaine recognized adjustments she could make in light of her current situation. Unlike the other participants, she had joined a professional development school program that was somewhat organized when she arrived. Others had already shaped the program and she felt the need to adjust to the program and the setting rather than being a controlling influence.

> Right now I think I have done more reacting than acting. I also have to make that transition between student teaching and professional development schools. I had virtually no time to do that so it's taken me a while--that was not something that was attended to when I got here. The faculty here were trying to do that when I came and had been through the several years of piloting. I'm still trying to find my own way, too as where my role fits...what all I can do...how this can work. And, there doesn't seem to be a lot of sharing about that here. There's some but not very much, especially in secondary. I think the elementary people do a lot more collaborating with what they're doing. Their set up is very different and if you haven't had a chance to meet with one of the elementary people, I would recommend strongly that you try to contact...I would contact [one of our faculty members] because he's basically in charge of that group. They have a very different thing but we're pretty isolated in what we do. I'm coming to grips with this and I need to get a better handle on all of the potential. Some of my responsibility is to educate teachers, but that's only to the point where I currently understand it. I know there's something beyond that. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Earlier in the same interview, Elaine spoke of having
made some improvements in the program because of needs
she had identified. "Upon my arrival, I had to do some
changing of the program because our program needed some
upgrading" (Interview, 23 June 1993). But her description of
activities that followed that statement were expressed in terms
of "we" and "our" which indicated that perhaps she had not
been as in control of the upgrading as her statement
indicated. During the second interview, she described what
she had personally done to upgrade the program. It consisted
of revising courses on campus and was only indirectly related
to professional development school operations.

Throughout her interviews, Elaine addressed many
challenges she faced--time, research expectations, acceptance-
-as she "scrambled to get my career up and going" (Interview,
23 June 1993). It was clear that her circumstances had
precluded the opportunity for her to have significant control
over shaping her role as a teacher educator in professional
development schools. Each of the other participants in this
study had been a key player in the development of his or her
professional development school program and thus had been
in far more control over role development than had Elaine.

Kathryn Pope.

Far more contented than Elaine with her control over
her role, Kathryn had been a shaping force from the inception

of the professional development school program at her university and felt she had been allowed considerable flexibility in what she did.

> Oh, I think I had a lot of discretion and that was kind of nice because it was beginning the program. I was very involved with setting up what the program was going to be like so from that baseline on it was like you're on a track that you didn't veer much from. I think when you're in the developmental stages of it you're thinking along one line and because it was a new program we were--[another professor] was the other team cohort leader--and we were really kind of given the flexibility to see what works. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

To check for consistency of responses, the second interview provided a format for respondents to cite specific examples of the basis for a particular belief. Kathryn related the following example of shaping her own role:

> [Two other professors] shared one team and I had the other team. We generally had the same objectives for the course, but what we did within the course was an individual choice and [they] in their first inquiry seminar did a lot with video taping with their students and evaluation of the video tape. I did not do that in my cohort until the third semester. So that's what I was talking about with flexibility. And then also how we met, when we met in seminars. What we did within our seminars -- we could meet the individual needs of our own cohort members because our group -- theirs had middle school students in it and was a little more unique than ours. That's another example of the flexibility that we had. (Interview, 30 August 1993)

Sarah Henry.

Sarah had been chair of her department at the time the professional development school program was being developed at her university. In that capacity, she wrote the proposal for the program and facilitated the departmental discussions and actively solicited input. She described that developmental process as a total faculty effort. Even though she portrayed that process as a collaborative endeavor, she nevertheless, felt a sense of control over her own role.

Throughout her interviews, Sarah never referred to university or department mandates that directly related to her work in professional development schools. Asked specifically to identify things she would rather not do, her only response referred to instruction provided in the university classroom. "I'd rather not teach the six-point lesson plan as one case in point. It's a terribly stifling and uncreative thing focused in some directions that are not as helpful as they might be" (Interview, 25 August, 1993). She quickly moved on from negative issues and refocused her responses on her students. As a final thought in response to the question about doing things she would rather not do, Sarah moved from answering the question to addressing another of her challenges in preparing preservice teachers. She described that challenge as, "...to try and make sure that when they're thinking about curriculum they know about other ways to think of objectives

and curriculum and assessment." (Interview, 25 August 1993).
Even though her statement seems unresponsive to the
questions, it is more indicative of her focus on attending to the
needs of her students than expressing her disagreements with
policies or procedures.

Summary.

The most common description of how each respondent
had influenced his or her individual role in a professional
development school centered around freedom and autonomy
to mold the program. Except for Elaine, who had to adjust
herself to an in-place program, the respondents all spoke of
their own experiences of freedom of choice about how the
program, and thus their roles, would be developed. The
respondents also drew on practical experiences in the schools
as one basis for shaping their own roles.

The Usefulness of Professional Development Schools

In addition to probing professors' beliefs about their
personal roles, this research also examined the participants'
beliefs about the utility of professional development schools in
teacher education programs. First, the participants described
how experiences in these settings contributed to the
development of teachers. Then they addressed how
professional development schools contribute to teacher
education in ways beyond those in more traditional programs
in which the only significant field experience is student

teaching. Finally, the respondents expressed their beliefs about ways professional development school programs should be refined to increase effectiveness.

Wayne Jacobs.

In speaking of professional development schools per se as opposed to his work in them, Wayne was skeptical. With most of his professional career behind him, his view was retrospective. It was less optimistic than the other participants. Continuing to refer to the "conduit" aspect of his role, Wayne described the feedback from teachers in professional development schools who provided information that led to altering and improving the university teacher education program. As the one who had collected that feedback and channeled it back to the university, he said that not all of it was taken seriously.

> But some of it was and we literally altered programs to the degree than we could convince the professors that were on campus and never got into those schools. Especially those that were part of the policy making bodies. Of course, some of them were not always willing to listen because they were divorced from those kinds of things. Yes, we had impact--not nearly as much as we should have. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

The note of dissatisfaction over not achieving all that might have been was evident in Wayne's words and tone of voice. His other comments about overall professional frustrations and believing he was perceived as a second-class professor,

coupled with this admission that more positive impact on teacher education could have been realized through professional development schools tended to support Wayne's underlying belief that these settings have great promise for developing teachers.

In a subsequent interview, Wayne again cited the fact that feedback from public school teachers in the professional development schools had been influential in reforming his university's teacher education program.

> There was a flood of information from the schools on do's and don'ts before these people went out to student teach. We got that kind of feedback all the time. When we began planning a substantial change in the teacher ed program, we invited them back specifically to give us feedback about the preparation program. About what they saw in our graduates. So that would be a kind of feedback that they gave us. (Interview, 10 July 1993).

Elaine Gragg.

While Wayne's experience had been at one university over several years, Elaine had worked in and with professional development schools in her doctoral program. With the benefit of that additional experience, she was able to compare her current situation. She began by explaining how the program had operated at her former university and acknowledging that her current situation had not yet had sufficient time to have the impact a professional development school concept can have.

The student teaching, they were placed wherever. But the field placement in the fall when they were taking their mega-methods-- all their science and math and all these methods classes at the same time--and I think everybody picks the word 'mega-methods' to explain that--but anyway they were all out in one of two schools and there were some, I guess, 60 students 65 elementary school majors--elementary teachers out in these two buildings. They would put groups of two or three preservice teachers with the same teacher or small group of teachers and it worked beautifully. Those preservice teachers contributed to the school. They would develop materials. They would get kids involved in new kinds of things, but at the same token the teachers were given some time and places to go and develop their own things. The teachers were able to give to them some neat ideas for them to take with them into student teaching. So I saw a lot of give and take. The faculty at [that university] was very integrated into those two buildings but this was only field placement--this was not student teaching and they didn't go back and student teach there because there wouldn't have been enough room to student teach there. I thought that experience, given the reaction of most of the students, was an extremely positive experience. Those two particular schools were in [a particular location]. The experience was very positive. The schools themselves were very enthusiastic and I don't know whether it was the district or whether it was the principal or some combination of the two made sure they had some of their most creative teachers in those two buildings. One was very close to the campus which was very close to [a major city] kind of a lower middle class working class area and the other again was in a more working class area. It wasn't your upper middle class, upper class student population. So, that, I thought, was very, very positive. Here, we haven't gotten that cohesiveness yet. I was in a program after it had been going multiple years and it had been going on for a good 18 years and they had over that time

> developed that. We haven't had enough time.
> (Interview, 23 June 1993).

The enthusiasm with which she described the professional development schools in which she had previously worked gives evidence that she knew the concept could have a positive impact on preservice teachers. Still, her experiences in her current position have brought her to recognize that individuals, and not the concept, provide the keys to success.

She identified communication as a critical factor in the success of a professional development setting. Her descriptions of communications in her current sites included words such as "isolation," and "never got together." Again, she attributed many of the difficulties she was currently observing and experiencing to a relatively short amount of time in which to fully develop the program.

Sarah Henry.

As previously described, both Kathryn and Sarah experienced a greater degree of ownership of their professional development school programs than did Elaine and, to a lesser extent, Wayne. Through conversation with Kathryn, it was apparent that she was a strong proponent of both the collaborative environment and the practical experiences that were characteristic of her professional development schools.

> Well, they certainly have provided us with this field
> experience component that is a real strength in our

program. 10 hours a week for three semesters of being in the schools and having different locations where they can be. And then having the on-site teacher educators and the university teacher educators work together. The preservice teachers have recognized the importance of classroom teachers' roles and I think professional development schools have helped that. The evaluations from the preservice teachers from the field experiences were just without question very, very valuable. That's a big impact in itself. And to be able to do it in school where the teachers--our students had a full year in one classroom. They started the year where they were doing their student teaching so by the time they got to student teaching--traditionally it was you worked your way in slowly and maybe get in four to six weeks of full-time teaching. Ours were ready. Some of them started the first week of the semester. So in terms of providing our students with a very rich experience, it's far richer than if we didn't have a professional development school. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

To the question of utility of professional development schools, Sarah's response typically focused on student outcomes.

I think that, well I know that if you ask our students at the end of a semester what has been the most important part of that semester to them in term of their professional studies that they'd very quickly say the internship--the time they spent in the schools. They don't always agree with what they see being taught, but to learn how they would not want to do something is often as important as seeing it modeled in a way they were taught. Because they have experience in three or four different classrooms depending on where they do their student teaching. They see a variety of styles as well as three different grade levels. Two or three different schools. I think it's that actual hands-on contact with children and the teachers. It's a very rich

> part of their experience and it's the reality testing base for what they're learning in their classes. Seeing what works and what doesn't. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

This response, like several others, sounded remarkably similar to those given by Kathryn. Yet when specifically asked, neither acknowledged having discussed their interviews with the other.

Summary.

In general, the respondents believed that professional development schools provided an essential component to preservice teacher education--that of field experience. Although field experiences have been part of teacher education for many years, the participants supported the notion of carrying out this field experience in a special setting where there could be more teaching, reinforcement and support from university-based teacher educators.

Wayne provided a more skeptical perspective about the utility of professional development schools. His many years of experience as a teacher educator combined with his work in professional development sites brought a perspective to this study that was not common to the other participants. Sarah, Elaine, and Kathryn each looked forward to a career of possibilities, whereas Wayne, not many years away from retirement, had much less to look forward to. His perspective was influenced by several years of trying to achieve an ideal situation only to experience many ideas he believed to be

valuable not implemented. His strong emotions about possibilities were evident throughout the interviews. One example is presented in the following section.

The Ideal Professional Development School

The participants were asked to describe their ideal professional development school. The purpose of this inquiry was to develop some picture of how these subject's believed, based on practical experience, such a school should be structured and operate.

Wayne Jacobs.

What would Wayne's ideal professional development school look like? He passionately described it in conceptual rather than concrete terms.

> It's not a place. It's a spirit. It's a commitment to something that is almost spiritual. I'm suggesting that there is a feeling about 'I want to help you, I want to be with you, we are together as partners in this endeavor, which is to make this school--[a particular] Elementary School out here--can we together make this school a different kind of place? ' In this place, we're going to have all kinds of folks here. As a professor, I'm going to have my beginning initial certification students out here. Hell, they haven't been in an elementary school in eight years, but I'm going to have them out there working, I'm going to have my graduate students out there working. You'll have some parents in. We're in this together to make this school become whatever it can become. It takes a kind of commitment and a kind of spirit that I think is unique and so I don't see it as necessarily a place. It is a spirit of cooperation and collegiality with a common purpose which is growth of the institution which includes the kids. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

In more pragmatic terms, Wayne described the ideal situation for a faculty member in a professional development school. He believed the faculty member should have limited assignments on campus in order to maintain credibility as a professor. His sense was that a person in an administrative position would not have the status necessary to get the cooperation of campus-based faculty. His notion of the faculty member being a conduit of information and an instrument of change rang through again.

> You've got to maintain links on both sides, but the majority of the time is going to have to be spent in schools. So you're going to have to have someone who has a role on campus, minimum time commitment enough to maintain credibility, and yet spend most of their time in the school where services are actually delivered. You can't deliver services if you're on campus and do the kinds of things that most profs do if you're going to make this thing work. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Following onto this thought, one of Wayne's frustrations reentered the conversation. It reflected both his commitment to teacher education through field experiences and his frustration with attitudes he perceived in university personnel. "If you do this full-time, then you're not going to have credibility on campus. Maybe the answer is just to do away with teacher ed in the university. Hell, forget the university." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Wayne continued to discuss his ideal professional development school in theoretical terms. He suggested that perhaps the public schools rather than higher education should be responsible for preparing future teachers. In his mind, any professional development school structure could not be prescribed in advance.

> Perhaps the most effective way to do it is to let it become an emergent kind of process. We think schools and teacher ed could be better if we work together in this place with these kinds of beliefs and this kind of spirit. We're going to work together and let's see where it takes us for a while and see what happens. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Elaine Gragg.

Elaine proposed a different approach in describing her ideal professional development school. It would not necessarily be a site where every teacher would be involved. In fact, she offered a concept in which professional participants might work in several sites but could be bound together, not by the walls of a building, but by subject areas and a desire to contribute to preservice teacher education.

> I think it would be a group of individuals who are committed to the growth and development of new teachers who are willing to work with these people, to share ideas, who have a commitment to one another whether it be within a building or with no buildings." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Earlier in the initial interview she had mentioned her attempt to "make this professional development school not really a building, not a site, but the group of mentoring teachers from the schools as kind of being a separate school of people if you will." (Interview, 23 June 1993). In this concept, the participants in the "school" would convene frequently to discuss issues and current research literature. The university faculty member, in Elaine's conception, would be a facilitator who's primary role would be to strengthen the skills and abilities of classroom teachers who would guide and teach preservice teachers in field settings. This facilitator would also be a contact with preservice teachers rather than with classroom teachers.

Kathryn Pope.

Kathryn preferred her ideal professional development school to have walls and "all the teachers in the school would serve as teacher educators and any classroom in that school could be used for field experience for the preservice teachers." (Interview, 16 August 1993). Many methods classes for preservice teachers would be taught at the professional development site (a notion that Wayne also proposed), and the building design would provide for observation rooms with two-way mirrors to allow more unobtrusive observation.

She believed that every person in the school--custodian, cafeteria worker, counselor, etc.--should work together to

create the professional development setting. Kathryn admitted she had her doubts if that could ever be realized because of the pressures of time and accountability on public school personnel and because all classroom teachers are not ready or willing to be on-site teacher educators. But the primary focus for Kathryn would be on preparing preservice teachers by giving them more than university classroom theory. She believed that preservice teachers should

> ...see things like how kids think, how students think and react and learn. You can only talk about it in the college classroom but you have to really see it. Why I like that is because all the preservice teachers would be observing the same group of children doing the same activity so when they're talking about it afterwards they all are talking about the same experience. Now they're going to observe differently, they're going to come away with different levels of knowledge about what they observed but at least everybody's talking about the same thing. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Sarah Henry.

Sarah offered some very definite notions about her ideal professional development school. Her response was offered in a fashion quite similar to Kathryn in that both had quick and well defined answers to the question. It was evident that both had given considerable prior thought to what they considered ideal. Sarah's own words best describe her vision.

> It would be a school that looked at education as a true partnership between parents and teachers and the university educators where the ideas of all of those

people were valued and the resources and talents of all of those people were utilized. It would have a structure that allowed for a pretty wide range of differences. It's hard to be a developmental psychologist and not appreciate diversity. You look at diversity and culture and talents and ability levels and all of that and there are just so many ways to honor where the child's at. I probably would not have strict grades. I'd organize it in more developmental levels to allow children to progress at their own rate and move on as they were ready to move on. And a lot more integration across the curriculum and teachers, for sure they would have time to plan and talk together. One of the biggest travesties we do to public school teachers is isolate them from one another and fill them with paperwork and ignore the fact that thinking and reflecting and talking together is part of the preparation and part of teaching--part of being well prepared for your students. There wouldn't be a lot of bells and whistles, but there'd be a lot of engaged learning going on with parents as involved as teachers. And a real sense of equal status between the public school folks and the university folks who are seen as being on a pedestal. (Interview, 25 August 1993)

Each of the respondents indicated a need for commitment from those involved with professional development schools. Wayne's focus had been on the commitment of university faculty while the others spoke of commitment to teacher education from public school personnel. Sarah expressed being less concerned with commitment to teacher education than with strong commitment to something.

I would staff it with people who brought a passion to their interests. I'd probably as likely have a poet on the faculty as a science teacher. I think the poet is going to teach them an awful lot about love of words and

expression of ideas and may do that more convincingly than someone who has a degree in reading. I'm not putting down degrees in the content areas but I think you have to bring a passion for whatever it is you love doing with you and I'd have pretty wide range of things they'd be doing. Things you do with your hands and things you do with your head and things you do with your body and people that represent all of those. (Interview, 25 August 1993).

<u>Summary.</u>

In general, the participants spoke in conceptual terms as they described their individual ideal professional development schools. Even though Kathryn was a bit more specific about what she would want her school to look like, all of the respondents focused on the relationships among those associated with the school. Those relationships surfaced as the common denominator of desirable qualities in a professional development school. Even though each participant might organize the concept of the professional development school in a different way, the key factor was clearly a commitment to other persons associated with teacher education and public school education.

From all of the participants, there was a sense that teacher education must escape the boundaries of the college campus. Suggestions that courses in teaching methods might be better taught at the professional development school site were common. Throughout the data collection, participants

also focused on the notion of equality of participants in the professional development school experience.

The Professional Development School Model

The theoretical literature on professional development schools has provided various descriptions and characteristics that set these sites apart from other schools (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990). But practice sometimes invalidates theory and commonly redefines it. For that reason, the participants were asked if all professional development schools should follow the same model. Each participant expressed belief that institutions of higher education should not adhere to a common theoretical model, but should adapt to needs and circumstances of individual institutions and programs.

Wayne Jacobs.

Wayne had previously described the latitude he and others had in adapting each individual professional site to fit the circumstance. Without hesitation, he said each university should develop it's own model. "...this top down stuff is like trying to fit round pegs into square holes." (Interview, 23 June, 1993). He again referred to the freedom that university personnel at his institution had experienced in being able to "massage that structure [the individual professional development site] any way they needed to, to gain their objectives." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

<u>Elaine Gragg.</u>

Both Elaine and Sarah spoke of the unique characteristics of school districts as a primary reason a single model should not be used. According to Elaine, "If we tried to have a professional development school model that was the only model we would end up hurting ourselves."(Interview, 23 June 1993). She noted that one professional development school project had developed five separate models which could be adapted to individual settings.

<u>Sarah Henry.</u>

Sarah identified several differences between school districts.

> I think there'll be regional differences that are important to pay attention to. The model that you might use in working with an inner city school population would be very different from an Appalachian population, for example. The cultural background of the children, looking at who's coming into your program, there are just too many differences that are important to take into consideration to use just one model. (Interview, 25 August 1993)

<u>Kathryn Pope.</u>

At one point Kathryn used the phrase "true professional development school" to emphasize the importance she placed on everyone at that site being part of a collaborative effort. Her notions of what a professional development school should be had been influenced by the professional literature and, not unexpectedly, her response initially reflected that influence.

Her response also reflected her practical and individual experience.

> I think anybody that's going to set up professional development schools ought to definitely research and find out what other schools are doing and then build on the strengths of each because we're always continually learning. There's another factor, too, and that's the financial support. What the Holmes Group is advocating is really an ideal situation and what Michigan is doing from what I've learned about it is very ideal but they have folks that all they do in their job is to be a coordinator within a professional development school and they're not teaching at the college level and lot of resources that we do not have available so you have to make, you have to take what your resources are and make the most of it and that in itself is going to identify different models. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

Summary.

All of the participants expressed similar beliefs that each professional development school should be organized to meet the needs of the specific population it would be intended to serve. Two participants believed that regional differences would influence the structure of a professional development school while one pointed out her belief that in establishing a professional development school, considerable research should precede that establishment and that the conceptual models should be considered

Possibilities at Smaller Institutions

The literature predominately reflects the establishment of professional development schools in conjunction with

teacher education programs at large research universities. The Holmes Group, which proposed one concept of the professional development school (Holmes Group, 1986), is itself a consortium of research universities, although in recent years other institutions of higher education which prepare teachers, but which are not commonly considered research universities have joined the Holmes Group movement. For example, The Holmes Group Forum, the quarterly publication of The Holmes Group, indicates that such schools as North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University and Hampton University have aligned with The Holmes Group (Holmes, 1992).

Could the professional development school concept succeed in teacher education programs at smaller colleges? This research sought to determine the participants' beliefs about this question. All of the participants were faculty members at large universities with free-standing schools of education. Each of these schools of education had more than 50 full-time faculty appointments, numerous paid graduate assistants in both master's and doctoral programs of study, paid administrative staff dedicated to the schools' professional development school project, and specific funding for operating these projects.

The majority of colleges and universities, however, do not have similar resources. Despite the differences in

resources, the participants in this study, except for Wayne, believed these smaller institutions could develop effective professional development schools to support programs of teacher education. Each of the participants had either first-hand observation or experience with teacher education programs at smaller colleges that were located near the participants' current university. To put parameters on the term "smaller college," examples of smaller colleges were used in the question. Each college that was cited as an example typically enrolled between 1,000 and 2,500 students and, in the college catalog, listed between 4 and 15 faculty positions in education.

<u>Wayne Jacobs.</u>

Without hesitation Wayne emphatically declared that smaller colleges could not develop professional development schools. He believed smaller schools would lack the resources and faculty expertise necessary to properly operate a professional development school. He used a nearby college with an enrollment of less than 2,000 students as an example.

> What our dean calls a 'two-monk college'--the [church related] school out here with two faculty members that are teaching administration, secondary education, early childhood, special ed, vo-tec, the whole business at [the particular college]. They can't do all of that stuff. We have a hard enough time delivering that stuff with the expertise that we have. The knowledge explosion in any discipline is unmanageable let alone two people trying do it all. And, then carrying that information out and

make it effective in a professional development school, they don't have the latitude to do that. Professional development schools are probably going to have to be made from, unless they can privately endow two or three chairs for people who will take care of that. They're not going to take that out of their hides in a small school. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Wayne's pessimism about the potential for smaller colleges to establish professional development schools was not shared by other participants. He had considerably more experience actually working with professional development sites than the other participants which might account for his belief. But his general professional frustration, which was evident throughout the interviews, may have strongly influenced his perspective. It was clear that his frustrations were born from his commitment to preparing teachers and from his desire to provide what he considered the absolute best programs possible.

Kathryn Pope.

Prior to her current faculty appointment, Kathryn had been a teacher educator in a small college located in a large metropolitan area. From her experience in that smaller setting and from her more recent experience in developing the professional development school project at her current university, she was convinced of the possibilities. Kathryn quickly elaborated a specific example with which she had been associated.

My first couple of years here I had a distinguished visiting scholar's grant. And [a particular individual], who is now chair at [a major university] was our scholar in residence. At the time he was still at [a foundation] and then for two years was dual-role between the two. Well, [he]worked with us in our professional development school component and plans, so he's been very much involved with it. That grant involved [the five colleges and universities in the metropolitan area]-- the teacher ed institutions here. [A colleague] at [one of the colleges] worked very closely with me on that grant. Now they've revised their program and they have always been able to select just a couple of schools where they put their student teachers because (of) being a private school. And in a sense they already have professional development schools, they're just not labeled that. So if they can identify schools that will work with them, they could easily have a professional development school in a sense. And I think they've already been doing that. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

Her statement of belief was reinforced with a confirming smile and an enthusiastic tone of voice . She reflected momentarily on her belief that all professional development schools would not fit the Holmes Group model, but could nevertheless be quite effective in the preparation of teachers. Unlike Wayne, she had first-hand experience in seeing the professional development school concept work in a small college.

Sarah Henry.

Sarah also had a quick response to the question. Her belief was based primarily on her observation of an effort at a smaller college in her area.

Sure. And that's another good argument for why there shouldn't be anybody's model. They may need to do it in a different way. But I think the concept of it is doable in many ways. It's as accessible as a concept to the private schools as to the larger schools and colleges. [A nearby] College is doing it. They're doing it very successfully and I think that's certainly a model to look at for a private school. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Elaine Gragg.

Relatively new to her institution and, in fact, to college teaching, Elaine had not had the same experiences and observations of the other participants. Even though she was somewhat aware of the smaller colleges in her metropolitan area, the question to her was approached more generally and in terms of available resources. She observed that her own program did not seem to be particularly well funded and commented that what was being done was "coming out of people's hides." Wayne had used the same metaphor earlier noting that smaller colleges would not do that. Elaine took a different perspective. She believed that the key would be in the level of institutional and faculty commitment--another theme that Wayne had expressed several times.

It depends on how wedded to that idea the group is and I think it depends on the level of commitment of the faculty at the university, on the faculty of the schools, as well as of the administration on both parts. I don't know that resources are necessarily the big thing. Schools have developed professional development schools without giving teachers time off. It's easier if they can give at least some portion of however they're going to

> develop this and whatever the teacher's role is going to be is to have some of those teachers come on as instructors for a year at the university. I think its possible. In large part it depends on the commitment of the institutions. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Elaine, like Wayne, expressed pessimism when considering teacher education in the larger context of higher education. Because the question about professional development schools in smaller colleges had been framed for her in terms of the limited resources at smaller schools, her response focused more on resources than on the intent of the question. Her thinking focused more on her own situation than possibilities elsewhere.

> Teacher education, though just doesn't tend to be a high priority item in most institutions, I don't believe. I don't believe the College of Ed is a high priority item for this university because it doesn't bring in as much money and grants. Now, it's the only place where you have much in the way of summer school. It brings in a lot of funds there. We bring in all kinds of funds through the evening school. But I don't think Colleges of Ed get that kind of respect in general. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

In a follow-up interview, Elaine had the opportunity to confirm her belief that smaller colleges could develop professional development schools. The follow-up question did not address resources. She again used the word *feasible* when she expressed her belief that smaller colleges could establish professional development schools.

<u>Summary.</u>

Only one participant did not believe that small college teacher education programs could feasibly establish professional development schools. That participant was adamant in expressing that belief. The other participants all believed that professional development schools could be successfully established and effectively utilized by small colleges. The lone dissenter was one with a long background at a single major university where there had been reduced interaction with smaller college programs. Those who believed that professional development schools were feasible for smaller schools all had experience as faculty members in or close working relationships with smaller colleges.

Impact on Careers

Faculty careers in higher education can take multiple directions. Some focus primarily on teaching while others are more oriented toward research. Some are combined with administrative and programmatic functions. To a significant degree, these directions are influenced by institutional expectations. For example, at larger research universities, much value is placed in a faculty member's record of research and publication. At smaller institutions the research expectation may be de-emphasized or non-existent.

All of the participants in this study were faculty members at large universities where research and publication

were major expectations for faculty. In only her second year in her current position, Elaine had little doubt about what was expected of her. "As an assistant professor the big thing is publish or you're out of here. Publish or perish is the rule." (Interview, 23 June 1993). Two of the participants in this study were tenured faculty members; the other two were not. How, in their opinions, had working in professional development schools impacted the individual careers of the participants?

<u>Wayne Jacobs.</u>

Throughout the interviews with Wayne, his frustrations were evident. His frustrations were not born from a perception of a personal failure to achieve, but rather from his beliefs that the structure of teacher education had not achieved all that he believed could have been achieved. More than once he spoke of the commitment to teacher education he, and others, had made while sacrificing personal professional gain. In Wayne's mind, working in professional development schools had worked against his own professional advancement.

> Well, I don't think it's enhanced my development as a professional. It's probably inhibited it. I predict that there will be some of this, in quotes, in professionals who work in professional development schools, is that I think at least for some segment of time in the evolution of professional development schools these people are going to be looked upon as second class citizens. I don't think

there's anyway to avoid that. Because when I would come back, even after I was tenured and would come back to meetings I didn't have my foot in the door in terms of the power structure, in terms of the decision making bodies and that sort of thing. Hell, I was in the schools all the time. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

At the time of the interviews, Wayne had increased his on-campus teaching activities. He noted that prior to doing that, he felt that he was looked upon as a second-class citizen "by my own colleagues." He pointed out clear examples that had led him to that belief. "And you have to fight a little harder for office space. I think we could easily document a difference in the pay scale. I don't think there's any doubt about that." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Several times he repeated the notion of the sacrifices made by those at his university who worked in professional development settings. He believed that the culture of the large university contributed to the second-class citizenship he perceived. "You put your time in the public schools rather than on this campus you're going to pay a price." (Interview, 23 June 1993). Despite his general pessimism about the career impact of working in professional development schools, Wayne returned to one of his main themes throughout the interviews--that of commitment. "Thank God, in this college we've had some people who were willing to pay the price." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

In order to confirm the consistency of responses, participants were asked, in follow-up interviews, to cite specific examples of circumstances that led to particular beliefs. Wayne had little hesitation in citing examples of being a second-class citizen on his university campus. His examples included his observation of others who worked in professional development schools.

> Just with the salary schedule for the years I've been coordinator. An assistant professor as coordinator and then look at the mean (salary) for assistant professors in this college. Now you don't need more than that. Same tenure of service. But (faculty in professional development schools) weren't publishing books. A lot of the research that they did they were presenting at ATE. They were presenting a lot of papers and that sort of thing, but not of the substantive kind ordinarily that would get you higher up on the reward ladder. Here they want refereed journals, they want the hard stuff. I'll be honest with you. I don't think I could make it at this university today. I don't think I could get tenure. (Interview, 8 July 1993)

More important to Wayne, however, was the notion of commitment. In this same response about second-class citizenship, he shifted immediately from the previous thought to the concept of commitment to teacher education and cited typical behaviors. His transition was something of an explanation of why he and other teacher education faculty in professional development schools lacked the time for research and writing. His enthusiasm for working with preservice teachers rings clear.

But what are you doing? From dawn to dark...from the time schools opened until, those schools closed, you were out there with your kids. I mean you have 15 to 20 youngsters (i.e. preservice teachers) that were screaming. The more you observed, the more feedback you'd give them, the hungrier they'd get. You can't say 'no' to these guys. They'd say, "I'm going to do this lesson tomorrow and you know we talked about concept attainment, man, I want to do this. Could you come tomorrow?" How can you turn a kid like that down? I don't turn them down. As a result, when it comes to the evaluation time, even though I was doing the evaluating, when I sent them on to the dean, he passed them on. I made damn sure the word got out about what our people (teacher education faculty) were doing. Inviting people to our meetings. We met every Tuesday and we look for ways to change the program. Every quarter we got as many cooperating teachers--the student teachers would take over their classrooms--and we would bring the cooperating teachers back here and get their feedback. We'd do workshops on a new observation system or we'd do some simulation with competency, and all that sort of stuff. We'd invite the folks on the campus to come see what we were doing. But it isn't the same as a publication record. You can probably go to a dozen other institutions, state supported institutions in the state and it wouldn't be the same. But this is THE university. And our people would say, 'Well, if that's the way it is, that's the way it is but I like working here and they stayed and they stayed and they stayed. (Interview, 8 July 1993).

Kathryn Pope.

Even though she had been a teacher educator for

several years, Kathryn's actual experience in a professional

development school was limited to just a few years. She

became involved with the professional development school

movement at her university somewhat by default as the primary faculty person for elementary education. She admitted that, had those circumstances been different, she might have volunteered to work in professional development schools. In her first interview, she spoke only in positive terms about the effect on her career.

> Well, I have just learned a tremendous amount in terms of what's taking place in the schools, the changes, keeping current. That's a real plus. I've been able to do research with teachers and that might have been available to me, but not as readily as it is with a professional development school. So research-wise I have extended my knowledge. I've learned a lot about preservice teachers and having a team that you really get to know and work with for two years you really get an understanding about--you have more understanding, let me put it that way--of preservice teachers' needs in their program. Seeing what's happening in the schools you have a little more empathy for some of their experiences. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

Asked about how teacher education had been different at a smaller college nearby where she previously taught, Kathryn pointed out that the experience of working with students in a more intense way in the professional development setting had allowed her to get to know students far better than at her previous school where students varied from year to year. Thus, she felt able to concentrate her efforts on meeting the specific needs she was better able to identify in her students.

Clearly, Kathryn's professional development school experience had a significant and, in her mind, positive impact on her teaching, In the short term, she considered the career impact positive because the experience had made her a better teacher. Unlike Wayne, she did not express a concern about lack of rewards. She focused on the benefits she perceived as a result of her experiences.

> I think being in teacher ed--you know they always joke about the ivory tower--it has existed without question, but it's crumbling, at least for me. I think I'm trying to force it to crumble more. I think working with teachers and knowing what's happening--I've been out of the classroom myself for maybe five, six, seven years, I'm not sure, but in five and six years--even in three or four years--the changes that are taking place with children in the schools and if not in the schools seeing these things and seeing the behavior problems that teachers have to work with or all sorts of problems they didn't have three or four years ago, I don't know how you could prepare preservice teachers as well without knowing all of that. So I think being able to be in the schools and have it linked with my job has kept me very much aware of what our preservice teachers need to know about as they're getting ready for their own classes. I think that's an important part of it. There's lots of other things but that's a major issue. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

The "crumbling ivory tower" was an interesting metaphor. Sarah had also used the ivory tower phrase during her Interview and in much the same sense. During a follow-up interview, Kathryn was asked to cite examples that led to her conclusions.

I think maybe the demand by area schools of wanting to be a professional development school might be one example. That they want to be a part of preparing preservice teachers. I brought teachers into my methods class here and they shared things they were doing in their classrooms so taking our methods classes into the schools and teaching there. It's no longer (that) this (university) environment (is) where people come for the education. It's not separatism, I guess. (Interview, 30 August 1993).

Sarah Henry.

"It wasn't something I was jumping for joy to do but once I started doing it, I was pleased that I was doing it," (Interview, 23 August 1993) was how Sarah described her initial response to working in professional development schools. She used the phrase "imposed by circumstances" in explaining how she became connected with the project. Nevertheless, she, like Kathryn, looked on the entire experience as having positive personal benefits.

I certainly have gotten a lot of rewards, personal rewards and tangible ones--my own growth, as a result of doing this, so I have no regrets. But was I standing up volunteering? I had a pretty full plate with what I was doing. It meant not doing some other things. But It certainly made sense in terms of the department. We're all members of a community so you look at what is good for the common good and go from there. (Interview, 23 August 1993).

One professional benefit Sarah cited was that her perspectives on preservice teacher education had been broadened.

> I think it certainly has changed (my) identity. I certainly didn't see myself as--I saw myself as contributing to teachers' understanding, but more their understanding of how children think and the developmental processes, than of themselves than I did thinking of myself as making a contribution in curriculum and how we assess children's progress and I think working with the PDS concept has certainly given me more of a linkage in that direction. (Interview, 23 August, 1993)

As had Kathryn, Sarah used the ivory tower metaphor when asked specifically about how working in a professional development school had contributed to her own growth. Follow-up questioning confirmed that neither had discussed the interviews for this research with the other. In fact, neither was, at the time, aware the other was a participant. Sarah had been almost exclusively a university classroom professor, and thus in the ivory tower. Experience in professional development schools changed her perspective.

> I had a lot of thoughts about public education that were from a theoretical socio-philosophical perceptive and being in the schools every week you tend to see things with a different lens. Even though I don't always agree with the style I see, I certainly appreciate the dedication and hard work that people are putting in. I don't see any lazy teachers out there. There may be some but I haven't encountered them yet. (Interview, 23 August 1993)

Elaine Gragg.

Throughout the interviews with Elaine, she spoke more in conceptual terms rather than from experiences. She did

have experience in professional development schools and as a faculty member. But compared to the other participants, her's were quite brief experiences. In several cases, she mentioned her lack of experience. She had been thrust into a role not totally of her own choosing and generally expressed a sense of being nearly overwhelmed with all the professional demands that she faced.

Earlier in the first interview she described her efforts as having to "scramble to get my career up and going," (Interview, 23 June 1993) and she acknowledged her understanding of her university's expectations in terms of publication of research. Her duties in professional development schools had been one of those time-consuming factors that, to some degree, had gotten in the way of career enhancement. Elaine's somewhat rambling response to a question about how her work in professional development schools had contributed to her career generally addresses the question. It is reproduced here in its entirety because how she responded is indicative of the chaotic world in which she operated. Her work in a professional development school had contributed to that chaos.

> It hasn't. I think it could. I think it has the opportunity. As I mentioned before, I'm a research scientist, I am a teacher educator. Sometime those two are antithetical to one another and sometimes they are very, much integrated. When, and I hope it a 'when' and not an 'if,' one would get to a point of really getting the professional

development school idea off the ground, and a lot of people here are arguing against it, a lot of people just don't want to see that happen, they want to go back to the old four-year program. I think if we go that direction, if we set it up such that it is more a partnership and not just a way to house interns and we incorporate all aspects of education which includes the research, then I see my role as being much more active. The research I'm proposing to do and hoping to get [a particular] School to do next year is going to be with a teacher who is not going to be supervising interns. Right now the particular research I'm doing is more basic research. It's not very applied. When I get it to a point where it can be applied, then it should fit right into a professional development setting where we get the interns involved, we get the teachers involved and we begin moving on it and we allow all of those parties to be active participants in the research project. There are times when I would hope within a professional development school setting we could do some basic research with a person or a small group of people--that may not be something that's going to be wed into the whole program. But then you do have to have some part of your research agenda that is applied where everyone can feel a part of it where they're trying to implement some of the ideas that were brought out from the basic stuff that was already done and if it's done in that setting and then they begin to apply it, they got to see the whole process. And whether we do in a building or whether it becomes something that's done across buildings with the same group of teachers, to me makes no difference. There are pluses and minuses on both sides. Pluses is you get to see a whole lot more kids and a whole lot more environment, a whole lot more different environments. Minuses, it's harder to get them together. They can't go in between classes and share with one another something that's happened and move on so the communication would be harder. But I'm not sure that the pluses or minuses on either one outweigh the other. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Summary.

Participants were never asked to elaborate on their concept of *career.* However, the various responses provide some clue as to what the participants considered to be the parameters of that term. In one case, working in professional development schools was perceived as a hindrance to achieving status, having influence, and being financially rewarded as a college professor. In two cases the participants felt that they had derived personal benefit from experience in professional development schools. The implication was that by having enhanced their own expertise and understanding through this work, their professional careers had been enhanced. Another participant saw potential for career enhancement, but had yet to actually experience it. The three participants with greater university experience expressed commitment to students above personal rewards.

Impact on Faculty Research Efforts

All of the participants in this study were faculty members at large universities where faculty were expected to conduct research and publish results. This was determined from comments by the participants and other knowledgeable individuals who were contacted in the course of gathering data. Wayne's speculation that " I don't think I could make it at this university today. I don't think I could get tenure," (Interview, 8 July 193), and Elaine's belief that at her

university, "the big thing is publish or you're out of here. Publish or perish is the rule." (Interview, 23 June 1993) are both evidences of the understandings these participants held.

Because professional development schools have been touted as places where educational research could be conducted (Holmes Group, 1986), the researcher investigated the participants' beliefs about faculty research in these schools. Specifically, participants were asked how their work in professional development schools had facilitated their own research agenda. How had their experience confirmed or modified the proposition that faculty should use professional development schools as places for educational research?

<u>Wayne Jacobs.</u>

Wayne recalled some positive experiences in conducting research at professional development schools. He mentioned a recent study he had conducted on the perceptions of science teachers. His findings had been published in the *Journal of Educational Research.* "I don't think I would have had access to the places that I had access without my role as coordinator. It really greases the skids" (Interview, 23 June 1993). (To insure the confidentiality guaranteed to the participants, this article is not cited, but has been reviewed and confirmed by the investigator.)

Wayne said he generally felt comfortable going into professional development schools and proposing research

because he often found both administrators and teachers willing to cooperate and support his projects.

> It facilitates opportunities. You'll get some teachers to help in a project and a principal who'd say, "Yeah, [Wayne], just tell me what you want done. Just make sure you clear it with [Jim] downtown." [Jim Smith] who is Director of Research and [Jim] was very careful about who goes into schools and what they do, thank God. But you get that cleared and "Hey, just tell us what you want. Tell us how we can help you." You bet. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

He was also quick to point out some potential problems if professional development schools were flooded with researchers.

Asked about conducting research on innovative educational practices and programs, Wayne believed such research efforts would be better received in professional development schools than in more traditional schools. "There's a mind set that will go with parents of the kids, 'Hey, this is what this school is about'." (Interview, 23 June 1993). He cited work done by an associate in another state that Wayne believed could not have been conducted in other than a professional development school.

Kathryn Pope.

In speaking about her own research, Kathryn, a yet-to-be-tenured assistant professor, never spoke of her research as a burden or an obligation she felt compelled to fulfill. Rather, she exuded her typical enthusiasm even before being asked

about conducting research at professional development school sites.

> You know what I think? If people can have a marriage within their work of the things that they like, they are so fortunate. I feel very fortunate in some ways because my research is with cognitive guided instruction in mathematics. We're looking at changing preservice programs to include that because we know it works successfully with inservice teachers but it's never been done with preservice teachers. So I'm being funded to work in a project that's right in the area that I teach and it means being in the schools and a part of the project is classroom teachers who are on the team and I'm working closely with them. They also happen to be our on-site teacher educators. So I have a super marriage because I get to do my teaching and work with the preservice teachers trying out the new things and finding its really working and my research is linked to it. If you can get that kind of marriage--I pinch myself on occasions. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

Very early in the first interview, Kathryn had referred to the three traditional areas of faculty responsibility at large universities--teaching, research, and service. She expressed her belief that, in education, the three were inseparable. She was convinced that "the research especially in teacher education has to be done in the schools." (Interview, 16 August 1993). Asked about her own choices of professional activities, Kathryn said she would prefer to continue teaching, conducting research, and working in professional development schools. Then she spoke specifically about how the

professional development schools had facilitated her own research agenda.

> Well, my research agenda is looking at how children learn mathematics. A significant component of it is preparing teachers to teach children mathematics. So working with a preservice teacher and being able to do it in the school setting where they can work with children and do case studies, that's the linkage that I've had. The past two years I've been gathering data that's all on this and it's all been done through the professional development schools and through the courses that I'm teaching. Now I could do it in the math methods course but its so nice to have a linkage with the classroom teachers at the same time. My research has been being in the professional development schools and working with teachers. A couple of the teachers have kept logs about their work with preservice teachers. That's data collection to me. Students have been video taping in their professional development school classrooms. That's data. Keeping journals. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

Admitting that she probably could have gathered data in settings other than professional development schools, Kathryn returned to her belief that these sites were intended for research. "The professional development schools are supposed to be helping gather data. The ideal would be that the teachers would gather data in the future and they'd become more researchers." (Interview, 16 August, 1993). That led to a question about limitations on conducting research in professional development schools. Again, Kathryn referred to her expectations of these schools. An interesting exchange followed.

One of the key factors is that the PDS is supposed to be committed to research. So if people want to do research, it'd be easier for them to do it in a school that has that kind of commitment to begin with. It's part of their improvement as a school. Let me back up. Fortunately with changes in data analysis and improvements in how you analyze data and the orientation to qualitative research mixed with quantitative research, we have techniques that will let us gather data in classroom settings, lab type, classrooms as laboratory settings, and then evaluate, assess, and analyze that data. Now that we have those kinds of techniques we can do more research in the schools. So I'm coming through a back door here.

Interviewer: The key word you used a minute ago was *supposed*. PDSs are supposed to be places with that kind of commitment?

Right. That's the expectation.

Interviewer: Has that been your experience?

Un-huh. You asked a couple of minutes ago about the limitations. The limitations come about in terms of the time commitment that would be involved and teachers already being overworked and requested to do so much and on top of it all they're going to collect data. Let's be real. That's what they will say. So that's a real limit unless you have extra resources of folks going in and video taping. I mean because we're gathering data on children's thinking. That means taping what takes place in the classroom so that's audio tapes or video tapes. You have technology that's not up to date for that type of thing and having the equipment even with our preservice teachers' video taping there were problems because schools don't have video tape and the equipment, the cameras and so forth, they don't have

the video cameras. Those are real limitations if you're trying to gather data.

Interviewer: What about trying out and/or refining innovative programs?
I don't know if one can make the comparison because I think it comes back to the folks that you're working with. You can get some principals that are just looking for improving the schools and they're willing to really try all kinds of new techniques and the same with teachers and you can get other principals and teachers who are not receptive so you could go out and find a school that's not a PDS school but a very eager, innovative, interested teacher and principal and you could do research in that school. It doesn't have to be a PDS school. It comes down to the personnel of the school and what they're goal is and what they want, how involved they want to be. I'm answering your question through a back door again. (Interview, 16 August 1993)

It was evident that Kathryn had some well-defined positions on educational research and doing that research in professional development schools. Her comments, as well as data from other sources, clearly indicated her research orientation. For example, the syllabi for two teacher education courses Kathryn was teaching addressed research issues that particularly focused on research in schools. A graduate student who worked with Kathryn also confirmed her research activities in professional development schools.

Elaine Gragg.

Elaine was also an assistant professor who had not yet reached a point in her career to be considered for tenure. By her own admission, establishing her own career was an

important issue for her. She believed that research and publication were vital if she were to keep her faculty appointment: "the big thing is publish or you're out of here." (Interview, 23 June 1993). In her short time in her current position, she had not accomplished as much toward her research agenda as she would have liked.

Time for research had been limited for Elaine, partly by her assignment to work in professional development schools. She indicated that she would like to have two full days a week to devote to her own research. "In reality, one of those two days is Saturday or Sunday or evenings or whatever. There are multiple factors getting in the way of my personal professional growth I feel here." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Elaine conceded that the professional development school work was a minor part of the time issue. Much of her time was spent with individual student needs.

> My students sometimes need more of my time but if I give up that time which I tend to do then I'm going to loose most of the day. I lost half a day yesterday and I was at home. [Taking] Phone calls about what we'[re doing with this program. Friday will be my only full day this week to work at home on my own research and scholarly endeavors and even then I've got a student coming there to pick up some stuff that he needs to do. You get in the bind and sometimes, yes, you're being nice, and sometimes, yes, you're hurting yourself and where does that hit? So, I don't want to say the professional development schools are causing it. Part of it is myself. Saying "no" is a real hard thing to do. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Elaine came to her current faculty position from full-time doctoral study during which she had worked as a graduate assistant in well-established professional development schools. Her current School of Education was in the process of revising the field experience component of preservice teacher education and the revised program was in its infancy compared to the one from which she had come. Thus she had a different perspective on research in these sites from the other participants. Asked about conducting research in professional development schools, she focused on her current situation.

> Only after several years of really getting it started. I don't see that anybody in the first two to three years--it's like a new business. A new business, it's two to three years before you're in the black and it may take another two to three years before you scratch out all that red that you had the first couple of years. A professional development school you need very desperately well established people to get it started. You need--the bulk of the work in my opinion is to get the contacts with the people who are at the point in their career when they can afford to do that. Yes, I think it's critical for me to be a part of this but for me to take on the primary is going to affect my development and my career and that's something I have to struggle with. I don't see anybody doing much research other than the research directly associated with the development of the professional development school. And there's a lot of that out there now. That's not a new thing. And if it's not a new thing, it's not something a junior faculty member needs to be pursuing. That's something, "Okay, you're well established in your field. You can go do that." And it's also partly the questions I'm interested in. But I really

don't see anybody getting much scholarly work done
until the hurdles of getting the thing going are mostly
hopped over. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Elaine's rambling comments reflect her difficulty in seeing
professional development schools in any other light than her
own current circumstances. She had recognized her need to
conduct research as well as her professional desire to do so.
But time contingencies had moved research from an enjoyable
activity to a less pleasant chore. At one point, Elaine
described herself as a research scientist which indicated her
positive leanings toward conducting research. In the same
interview she noted that "my research shouldn't be a nag and
lately it's become that way," (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Sarah Henry.

All of the participants in this study presented varied
backgrounds and varied current circumstances. Sarah was the
only associate professor interviewed. A tenured faculty
member, she had considerable experience in higher education
both as a teacher and an administrator. Research and
publication were clear expectations at her school of education
and her university.

Sarah commented that the promotion issue was one she
could choose to be concerned about or not. With a well-
established career and several publications credited to her,
Sarah pointed out that her professional circumstances

combined with her involvement in professional development schools had changed her research focus.

> I think its changed some of the research I'm doing and because my research draws much more on qualitative measures than quantitative, it takes a lot longer to do the data analysis and I don't agree with seeing how many articles you can crank out a year--journal pollution. I'd rather see a good solid piece of research that you might have spent three years working on and it comes out and says something and has a contribution to make rather than chopping that up into 11 different articles because it makes your vita fat. And in that sense, I certainly will be publishing some work coming out of the inquiry team but I won't do it until they're into their first year or through their first year of teaching. There's nothing to say. (Interview, 26 August 1993)

Sarah said that the professional development schools in which she worked had facilitated her research and noted that she was currently doing research which she would not have done had she not been included in the professional development school project. And her current research on preservice teachers had been influenced by the professional development school. "It's because my thinking and interest have changed. The setting facilitates it," (Interview, 26 August 1993).

Summary.

The participants all believed that professional development schools are sites where educational research can be conducted. These sites, according to those questioned in

the study, provide appropriate settings and allow greater access for researchers. The participants expressed a common belief that professional development schools are not essential to the conduct of educational research and they pointed out that such research could be done in other schools not established as professional development schools. But it was clear from each participant that education research can be facilitated at a professional development site. In addition, professional development schools can influence the research focus.

The Future of Professional Development Schools

The professional literature, as presented in Chapter 2, reveals decades of efforts to improve teacher education. Part of that improvement effort has been to include field experience components in various forms. The professional development school concept is the latest revision of the field experience component in teacher education.

Based on their study and observation of and experience in professional development schools, the participants in this study expressed their beliefs about the future of professional development schools. These beliefs are important in validating many of the other beliefs stated throughout the interviews. For example, even though he clearly had a commitment to teacher education, Wayne expressed many pessimistic notions born out of his own frustrations.

Characteristically, his response in this area was less than positive. The responses ranged from optimism to uncertainty to pessimism.

<u>Sarah Henry.</u>

By far the most optimistic of the participants, Sarah expressed her belief that the future for professional development schools is bright. She pointed out that by having more intense field experiences in professional development schools, institutions using such sites are being "held to a different level of accountability, and the direction, the participation, it informs them about the realities of what's documented." (Interview, 25 August 1993).

Asked about the future for professional development schools associated with her own university, Sarah continued to express optimism. Her optimism about the concept is significant because earlier she had expressed her initial reluctance to become involved with the experience. Speaking specifically about her own program, she seemed convinced of its importance to preservice teacher education.

> I think it's (the future) going to be very good. I think they're (the professional development schools) going to get stronger and stronger. I think it's the most visible part of our program. When you look at the School of Education, I wouldn't want to in any way imply that any program was less important than any other program but the one that the dean gets asked about the most is probably and is probably the most visible to people in the undergraduate teacher ed program. That's what the

legislators care about. But a lot of other people associated with the school doesn't mean it's any more important or a better program than others in the school. But it's the part that's most visible and in many ways most noticeable. This is absolutely the right direction for it to go. (Interview, 28 August 1993)

Kathryn Pope.

During the entire interview process, Kathryn had been the most optimistic of all the participants. For the most part, her eyes sparkled and she punctuated her responses with an enthusiastic smile. But on the question of the future for professional development schools, she was less positive. She had spoken with excitement in her voice as she described her own experiences and those of her students, but about the future, she seemed unsure.

She described the professional development school movement as "a national trend," She finally admitted that "I think they're here to stay," but just before that had qualified her response by pointing out that "if the research shows that preservice teachers are going to be stronger as a result of it, it's going to last." (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Regarding her own setting, Kathryn believed the future would be hard to predict. She noted that the public schools that had been associated with her university had committed to continue with the project. Then she related a specific example of the interest from those in professional development schools.

Probably one of the best responses [is] to give you an outcome of the experience that I had at [a school] in [a neighboring city] that has two teachers there that were on the [research] project with [another university] with me. So we were putting in for another grant where [a faculty colleague's funding] foundation--she wanted to have a [related] strand--wanted to have a school identified that would be like a site-based school where [a learning approach] would be demonstrated. We brought it up at one of our team meetings, meaning the [research project] team, that's my second team. One of the teachers got so exited about it and went back to the school, talked to the principal, talked with the folks there, got some of the teachers involved, and decided they really wanted to be the site for the [research project] school. We started with all the procedures with that and brought it back to the department which meant we had to take it to the committee and then to make a long story short it was decided that if--it would mean they would have to drop out for a year from the professional development school program so that they could get everybody trained as [research project] teachers and then they would come back in. Well, there wasn't a guarantee that could get back in a professional development school because some other schools wanted to be involved and if there wasn't room for them they couldn't be back in. Well, they gave up the [funding source] grant idea so that they could remain a professional development school. So there is just real interest there. We have other schools that are calling us. They want to become professional development schools. I think [the associate dean of the school] is having to say "no" to some of them. I mean there's a real interest in this area. (Interview, 16 August 1993).

Despite some ambivalence and her reluctance to endorse professional development schools as strongly as had Sarah, Kathryn's response conveyed the tone of optimism. Sharing the experience in the example just related is indicative of her

notion that the future appears positive for professional development schools associated with her current situation.

<u>Elaine Gragg.</u>

Elaine began answering this question by admitting that in general, she had read far less than she should have about professional development schools. Her answers were generally based on her two years as an assistant professor and immediate prior experience while working as a doctoral level graduate assistant.

Her following comments reflect some of the frustration of her current situation in terms of developing new approaches to teacher education.

> I think they have a place in the future. I think the way they're developed in the particular area is going to have an awful lot of impact on their success or failure. I think a lot of people are going to initially become frustrated because change is hard and they give up too soon. It's comfortable to do the same-old, same-old. I do think they have a potential. I don't think that's the only way for people to be educated as teachers. I think it is one way--and we're looking at it as a building and not the way I'm talking about it here, because we may have to use a different term than professional development school because people will read that and not know what we're talking about. Most people will see "professional development school" and they see a building or a small group of buildings that are doing this same kind of thing. I think they have a future. I would hope that there are multiple options in that it doesn't become the only way we deal with interns. Again, if we're looking to go with buildings I could...in the elementary I think that works much better than it does in the secondary and I

know there are a few people now beginning to examine the issue of professional schools in secondary settings. But it came out of an elementary school model. Elementary school is nothing like high school. If high schools change, maybe the professional development school model will work more like it was done in elementary schools, but the way they are right now, I don't see that we're going to be able to--we're going to have to change the model and we're going to have to be flexible. So, yeah I think there's a future but, no, I don't think that's going to be *the* way of the future. I think it's going to be *a* way and I hope that other models (of professional development schools) appear other than the current two that we have, two or three that we currently have. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

<u>Wayne Jacobs</u>

Typical of many of his expressed perceptions, Wayne believed that there was a grim future ahead for professional development schools.

I can't be optimistic. I just can't be optimistic. If I had to predict, I'd say there probably ought to be a few pockets of really successful schools and I think this is really going to be more contingent upon the schools than it is the colleges. I don't see this happening wholesale. (Interview, 23 June 1993)

Without prompting, he began to explain his reasons for pessimism. Although he did not directly mention his own commitment, this response reflects a belief that many who work in public schools lacked the same level of commitment that he held and that he had described in himself and in a few others.

I guess it's the traditional, or the nature of tradition--the traditional schools and its role and I don't see them taking on--because I think that's the way they'll perceive it--taking on one more burden to have to deal with. I think [this city] is a microcosm of what we're going to see around the country. I can name two high schools perhaps two middle schools and a handful of elementary schools out of seventy or eighty schools there are in this area and this community, that really are into the spirit of working with, and I'm talking about really with, build togetherness, real commitment to working with this college in terms of developing the kinds of programs that are advocated by AACTE and professional development schools. There are those who are looking over their shoulder at their superintendent saying, "I'd better do this," but that isn't going to get the job done. That's acquiescence, that's not willing participation. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Wayne continued by explaining what he believed would be necessary to insure a brighter future for professional development schools if these sites were to become the boons to teacher education that proponents had suggested.

To get the kinds of programs delivered that the professional development schools promised , it's going to take more than acquiescence. It's going to take a lot of hard work. I was charged by the Institute for Teacher Ed, [a colleague], he's director of it, to develop a paper on internships--for integration of teacher ed students into teaching. We spent a whole year studying--wrote a hell of a paper, an awfully good paper--and as we got this paper out, there were a half a dozen schools who really--probably not that many--who took these ideas to heart--by the way it's really well-done, the research base on it--but there were some who saw these ideas as powerful and then could help get their new faculty members integrated into their faculty much more

effectively. But, it was just one more thing to read. It's one more series of meetings. And school faculty, especially administrators see themselves as really bogged down in "stuff." And I think they see, and maybe rightfully so, teacher ed as one more bit of "stuff." So, the future of professional development schools? Very spotty, and the same goes for [this area]. (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Wayne provided a copy of the in-house and undated paper on induction. It was a committee report on induction to teaching. Even though it focuses on the transition from preservice teacher to first-year teacher, the paper reflects both the sense of pessimism and commitment imperative that prevailed during Wayne's interviews. A statement from the introduction to the report, "We did not complete our task in a confident mood," set the tone for the paper. The issue of commitment was addressed in the paper's conclusion: "What is more likely to bring success to this, or any induction plan, is the spirit that accompanies it."

Summary.

To the great majority of the questions posed to the participants, there was general agreement of beliefs. There was commonly at least one perception or belief that significantly differed from the other participants. But on the issue of the future for professional development schools, more uncertainty was detected. Participants generally believed that professional development schools could have a positive future if certain conditions were met, such as validation by research

and commitment to education by all parties to the partnerships.

Summary

This chapter presented a cross-case analysis of the participants' perceptions and beliefs about the research questions of this study. Data were responses to interview questions, interviews with those having first-hand knowledge and observation of the participants, and relative printed sources including course, syllabi, papers, and reports. General findings of this research include the following:

1. The participants generally used similar words to describe how they perceived their role as university faculty working in professional development schools. The words focused primarily on relationships with other people involved in the process. All of the participants perceived their individual role as one of close involvement with faculty and staff at the professional development school and not a separate and detached role focusing only on the university program and the preservice teachers in that program.

2. The participants were quite similar in their responses about the ideal role for a university faculty member working in a professional development school. The participants generally concluded from their experience that the ideal role should include facilitating teacher education and enhancing

what was taking place in public school classrooms. They believed that teaching by modeling was important.

3. A lack of time to do all the things the participants wanted to do was the common frustration. Other frustrations mentioned included institutional politics and occasional disagreements with public school administrators primarily over the placement of some preservice teachers. In two cases, both from the same institution, there was evident dissatisfaction with institutional politics that was perceived as having a negative impact on overall career development. This dissatisfaction did not seem to impact on the perceptions of the role in the professional development school.

4. The two major influences on the development of the roles of the participants as they worked in professional development schools were prior experience as a teacher and influences by the ideas of mentors.

5. The participants reported similar circumstances regarding the freedom and autonomy each had in establishing and framing his or her professional role in the professional development school. Each indicated considerable independence in the decision-making process.

6. In general, the respondents believed that professional development schools provided an essential component to preservice teacher education--that of field experience. Although field experiences in one form or another have been

part of teacher education for many years, the participants supported the notion of carrying out this field experience in a special setting where there could be more teaching, reinforcement and support from university-based teacher educators.

7. The participants spoke in conceptual terms as they described their individual ideal professional development schools. They focused on the relationships among those who were associated with the school. Those relationships surfaced as the common denominator of desirable qualities in a professional development school. Even though each participant might organize the concept of the professional development school in a different way, the key factor was clearly a commitment to other persons associated with teacher education and public school education.

8. From all of the participants, there was a sense that teacher education must escape the boundaries of the college campus. Suggestions that courses in teaching methods might be better taught at the professional development school site were common.

9. All of the participants expressed the belief that each professional development school should be organized to meet the needs of the specific population it would be intended to serve. Two participants believed that regional differences would influence the structure of a professional development

school while one pointed out her belief that in establishing a professional development school, considerable research should precede that establishment and that the conceptual models should be considered

10. With one exception, the participants expressed a belief that professional development schools could be established by small college teacher education programs. Those who believed that professional development schools were feasible for smaller schools all had experience as faculty members in or close working relationships with smaller colleges

11. Participants were never asked to elaborate on their concept of *career*. However, the various responses provide some clue as to what the participants considered to be the parameters of that term. In one case, working in professional development schools was perceived as a hindrance to achieving status, having influence, and being financially rewarded as a college professor. In two cases the participants felt that they had derived personal benefit from experience in professional development schools. The implication was that by having enhanced their own expertise and understanding through this work, their professional careers had been enhanced. Another participant saw potential for career enhancement, but had yet to actually experience it. The three

participants with greater university experience expressed commitment to students above personal rewards.

12. The participants all believed that professional development schools are sites where educational research can be conducted successfully and appropriately. Participants expressed the belief that these sites provide appropriate settings and allow greater access for researchers. Even though they expressed a common belief that professional development schools are not essential to the conduct of educational research, it was clear from each participant that education research can be facilitated at a professional development site. In addition, professional development schools can influence the research focus.

13. On the issue of the future for professional development schools, more uncertainty was detected. Participants generally believed that professional development schools could have a positive future if certain conditions were met, such as validation by research and commitment to education by all parties to the partnerships.

Chapter 5 presents the conclusions drawn from the data based on the researcher's analysis. It also presents a discussion of findings and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate two areas of beliefs and perceptions held by selected teacher education professors regarding both their individual roles they held as teacher educators in professional development schools, and the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers.

This study was prompted by the researcher's interest in the professional lives of teacher educators and by the dearth of research in this area. Because of the growing utilization of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers, the setting of professional development schools was selected as the specific aspect of teacher educators' professional lives to be examined.

The research questions were:

1. What are the beliefs and perceptions held by teacher education professors regarding their individual roles in professional development schools?

2. What do teacher education professors believe about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers?

Because research on teacher educators has been almost exclusively quantitative, the naturalistic paradigm was chosen as the research methodology for the present study. For example the work of Ducharme and Ange (1982), Wisniewski and Ducharme (1989), and Galluzzo and Arends (1989) all dealt with percentages of teacher educators who hold particular attitudes or spend their time in particular ways. At the outset, it appeared that an investigation that looked through the eyes of teacher educators would be useful for others who wished to examine their own professional development and experiences as teacher educators.

Research studies which typically utilize a naturalistic inquiry approach investigate the ways people make sense out of their lives (Bogden & Bilken, 1992). Such research focuses, not so much on numbers, but on understanding particular circumstances, situations, or relationships (Lincoln & Guba, 1981). According to Wolf and Tymitz (1977), naturalistic research examines "slices of life" to reach an understanding of how people feel, what their concerns are, and what they believe and perceive about the events and circumstances under study. This is done through interviewing subjects, examining their writings, interviewing others who observe the

subjects, and observing their actions in settings related to the study. Such was the form of this study.

This study was based on in-depth interviews of four teacher educators who were faculty members at large, doctoral granting institutions in the southeast United States. The participants were directly involved in professional development schools and worked closely in those settings with preservice teachers and with public school teachers and administrators. Data were also gathered from the participants' writings, course materials, and interviews with others associated with the participants' work in professional development schools.

Practical experience in actual field settings has been a common facet of teacher education in the United States. From on-the-job training, to more formal laboratory schools, the short-lived portal schools, and the emerging professional development schools, experiential learning has been recognized as a vital component of teacher education.

Discussion of Findings

Data that was gathered in response to the first research question--What are the beliefs and perceptions held by teacher education professors regarding their individual roles in professional development schools?--revealed the following:

<u>Role Perception.</u>

The participants generally used similar words to describe how they perceived their roles as university faculty working in professional development schools. Words such as *conduit, facilitator, model, helper, colleague,* and *team member* were used by the participants to focus on relationships with other people involved in the process. All of the participants perceived their individual roles as one of close involvement with faculty and staff at the professional development school and not just a separate and detached role attending solely to the university program and the preservice teachers in that program.

There was a clear sense of commitment to working closely with preservice teachers in field experiences expressed by all of the participants. Three of the participants spoke with considerable enthusiasm about working with both these preservice teachers as well as practicing public school teachers. One participant, with relatively little experience as a faculty member, expressed slightly less enthusiasm than the others, possibly because she lacked the experience in higher education than the other participants. However, this appeared to be due primarily to adjustments associated with being a relatively new faculty member and to tensions created by institutional expectations.

The enthusiasm for working in professional development schools expressed by the participants appeared to have derived from the experience of actually working in the schools. For example, two of the participants implied that prior to working in professional development schools, they had less enthusiasm for this role. After much time spent working with teacher education students and practicing teachers in these schools, a strong sense of pleasure and commitment was evident.

The Ideal Role.

The participants were quite similar in their responses concerning the ideal role for a university faculty member working in a professional development school. The participants generally concluded from their experience that the ideal role should include facilitating teacher education and enhancing what was taking place in public school classrooms. They believed that teaching by modeling was important.

Each participant expressed a strong orientation toward the needs of classroom teachers and would-be teachers. When describing the ideal role for a teacher educator working in professional development schools, three of the participants spoke specifically and without hesitation of various things they had done in the schools with students and teachers. The fourth, with less experience to call upon, spoke more generally and in programmatic terms, yet continued to express a

primary orientation to the preservice teacher. Her practice was to meet the needs of preservice primarily through planning, organizing and scheduling rather then through more direct interaction in technique and methodology with preservice teachers.

Professional Frustrations.

In continuing to analyze the data, the issue of professional frustrations emerged as one of the most significant findings of the study. Despite the enthusiasm with which the participants spoke of their work in professional development schools, it became evident through continued data analysis that the participants were affected by the tensions that have historically plagued higher education faculty in general and teacher education faculty specifically. A review of this phenomenon is presented in Chapter 2.

The most common professional frustration mentioned was the lack of time to do all the things the participants wanted to do or felt that they had to do. Other frustrations mentioned included institutional politics and occasional disagreements with administrators primarily over the placement of some preservice teachers.

Two participants, both from the same university, expressed less than positive feelings about their status as faculty. Both voluntarily spoke of pressures to publish and earn tenure as well as having to fit into a system that offered

fewer rewards to education faculty, particularly those engaged in field work, than arts and science faculty.

Elaine commented that lately her research had become "a nag" indicating that it was something she felt compelled to do rather than wanted to do. Wayne spoke of "paying a price" for working in professional development schools rather than being engaged in more academic pursuits. He also highlighted the disparity between tangible rewards for education professors and for professors in the arts and sciences at his university. Both Wayne and Elaine, who held appointments at the same institution, were frustrated by a lack of institutional support for their efforts in professional development schools and by conflicts with some public school personnel and with university colleagues and policy makers.

Even though the other two participants did not directly address issues of institutional pressures and politics, when specifically asked about frustrations, these two focused only on frustrations within the professional development school setting and made no reference to frustrations created by pressures from within their university.

Nevertheless, in other portions of the interviews, both of these participants reflected an awareness of traditional pressures at larger universities. Kathryn mentioned the three expectations--teaching, research, and service. Both she and Sarah talked about their own research agendas. Even though

she was tenured, Sarah indicated that academic promotion was still a possibility and would be related to her research production if she were to be concerned with promotion.

Clearly, all of the participants felt certain frustrations associated with their work in professional development schools. Their expressions of these frustrations reinforce their stated beliefs about their roles in professional development school. In these roles, all expressed strong commitment to preparing preservice teachers and circumstances that interfered with success in this pursuit became frustrations. Elaine's perspective was a bit different in that her primary concern was over-all career success which she believed hinged more on achievement in the research and publication arena than on her work in professional development schools. She stated the belief common in the literature that teacher education is not a high priority item for most universities. She believed that to be true of her own university.

Influences on Beliefs.

The two major influences on the development of the beliefs of the participants as they worked in professional development schools were prior experience as public school teachers and the influences of mentors' ideas.

Three of the participants had been public school teachers. The fourth had been influenced primarily by the ideas of others in the field of education, but only after these

ideas had proven successful in practice. Of the four, Wayne spoke most passionately about the influence of experience as a public school teacher. What had primarily shaped his was "The fact that I am a classroom teacher first and everything that I do is shaped or molded by that idea first." (Interview, 23 June 1993).

Role Influences by Participants.

The participants reported similar circumstances regarding the freedom and autonomy each had in establishing and framing his or her professional role in the professional development school. Each indicated considerable independence in the decision-making process.

Except for Elaine, who had jumped on the professional development school train as it was pulling out of the station, the participants had been able to shape their roles because they had been directly involved in organizing and implementing what was done in the schools. Elaine's very junior status and the fact that a professional development school structure was in place prior to her appointment gave her less opportunity to control the shaping of her own role.

The ability to control and shape the professional school role seemed to have an impact on the participants' satisfaction. Despite the frustrations previously identified, the subjects, except for Elaine, seemed content and pleased with their work in professional development schools. It is reasonable to

conclude that the contentment resulted from the opportunity to shape the role in the professional development school. Elaine seemed a bit annoyed with adapting to a structure that she perceived as having been imposed upon her.

Data gathered in response to the second research question--What do teacher education professors believe about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers?--revealed the following:

The Usefulness of Professional Development Schools.

In general, the respondents believed that professional development schools provided an essential component to preservice teacher education--that of field experience. The participants supported the notion of carrying out this field experience in a special setting where there could be more teaching by preservice teachers, plus frequent, consistent reinforcement and support from university-based teacher educators.

Sarah noted that the field experience component was a "real strength" of the teacher education program at her university. Responding to a question in another area, Wayne described preservice teachers as being quite stimulated by field experiences. He pointed out that he had been able to make considerable alterations in existing teacher education programs as a result of feedback and observation in professional development sites. Not only did preservice

teachers benefit from these field experiences, future students would benefit from improved teacher education programs as a result of what had been learned from professional development schools.

Sarah observed that her preservice teachers would most likely cite the experience in professional development schools as the most important part of their professional studies.

The Ideal Professional Development School.

The participants spoke in conceptual terms as they described their individual ideal professional development schools. They focused on the relationships among those who were associated with the school. Those relationships surfaced as the common denominator of desirable qualities in a professional development school. Even though each participant might organize the concept of the professional development school in a different way, the key factor was clearly a commitment to other persons associated with teacher education and public school education.

Wayne noted that "It's not a place. It's a spirit." he elaborated that the spirit should be built on a strong helping relationship between the teacher educator and the preservice teacher. Elaine suggested considerable flexibility pointing out that a site could be a professional development school for only one subject area--science for example--which would not require the participation from each staff person. Kathryn, on

the other hand, envisioned a site where every staff person would contribute both to the education of the school's own students and to the preparation of preservice teachers. Sarah's ideal site would have differentiated staffing, less traditional structure, and more emphasis on learning.

Whatever the organizational structure, the ideal site for each subject would be built on notions of strong partnership forged by clear and frequent communication.

From all of the participants, there was a sense that teacher education must, to some degree, escape the boundaries of the college campus. Suggestions that courses in teaching methods might be better taught at the professional development school site were common.

The Professional Development School Model.

All of the participants expressed the belief that each professional development school should be organized to meet the needs of the specific population it is intended to serve. Two participants believed that regional differences might influence the structure of a professional development school while one pointed out her belief that in establishing a professional development school, considerable research should precede its establishment and that the conceptual models (such as that originally proposed in 1986 by the Holmes Group) should be considered.

None of the subjects seemed strongly aligned with the Holmes Group (1986;1990) formula nor was Goodlad's (1984; 1990a) concept mentioned. Kathryn did mention the Holmes Group's (1986;1990) concept only to emphasize that each university should develop a structure that fits the needs of the preservice teachers and the available resources.

Possibilities at Smaller Institutions,

With one exception, the participants expressed a belief that professional development schools could be established by small college teacher education programs. Those who believed that professional development schools are feasible for smaller colleges all had experience as faculty members in or close working relationships with smaller colleges.

Wayne was emphatic that smaller colleges lacked the resources to properly establish and operate what he perceived a professional school to be. Wayne's perspective was shaped by many years at a large major university with little direct association with smaller colleges. The other subjects, however, were optimistic about the possibilities.

Those who believed that professional development schools were feasible for smaller institution did not express concerns over resources, but focused on the needs of preservice teachers, and developing partnerships and clear lines of communication. Two of the subjects mentioned successful professional development schools used by smaller

colleges in the subjects' same metropolitan area as examples of feasibility.

Impact on Careers.

Participants were never asked to elaborate on their concept of *career*. However, the various responses provide some clue as to what the participants considered to be the parameters of that term. In one case, working in a professional development school was perceived as a hindrance to achieving status, having influence, and being financially rewarded as a college professor. In two cases the participants felt that they had derived personal benefit from their experience in professional development schools. The implication was that by having enhanced their own expertise and understanding through this work, their professional careers had been enhanced. Another participant saw potential for career enhancement, but had yet to actually experience it. The three participants with greater university experience expressed commitment to students above personal rewards, such as higher salaries, academic promotions, and professional recognition.

The issue of tension between the university and teacher education faculty resurfaced as participants reflected on how work in professional development schools impacted their careers. Wayne believed that his professional progress had been inhibited. He predicted that faculty who work in

professional development school will continue to be looked upon as powerless, second class citizens across the campus.

Elaine indicated that her work in professional development schools had not yet benefited her career, but she acknowledged that there was potential for positive impact in the future. Her sense of positive impact was related to successful research and not to activities related to developing preservice teachers--another admission of the recognized tension that exists between the university and teacher educators.

<u>Impact on Faculty Research Efforts.</u>

The participants all believed that professional development schools are sites where educational research can be conducted successfully and appropriately. Participants expressed the belief that these sites provide appropriate settings for and allow greater access by researchers. Even though they expressed a common belief that professional development schools are not essential to the conduct of educational research, it was clear from each participant that educational research can be facilitated at a professional development site. In addition, professional development schools can influence the research focus.

<u>The Future of Professional Development Schools</u>

On the issue of the future for professional development schools, more uncertainty was detected. Participants

generally believed that professional development schools could have a positive future if certain conditions were met. For example, a condition such as validating by research that preservice teachers prepared in professional development school are likely to be more effective beginning teachers, would support the utility of these schools. Participants also cited the need for commitment to education by all parties to the partnerships.

In responding to this area of investigation, the participants had to blend their personal experiences with the literature on professional development schools. All expressed some optimism that the future could be bright in certain locations. However, there was generally less confidence that professional development schools would flourish nationally. This thinking is somewhat in line with Sarason's (1990) observation that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Conclusions

Professional development schools present to teacher educators opportunities and challenges that are somewhat different from the old laboratory schools or the short-lived portal schools. As reflected in the literature and reported by the subjects in this study, there is a greater sense of partnership between the university and the public school that serves as a professional development site. Successful

maintenance of that partnership falls on the shoulders of those teacher educators who work in these sites. Not only must the partnership be nurtured but at the same time, preservice teachers must be prepared to become effective practitioners.

Maintaining that partnership, preparing competent graduates, and meeting expectations of the university presented to the subject of this study a significant challenge that highlights the traditional tensions between the university and teacher education faculty. Throughout this research, those tensions were evident, particularly in the cases of Elaine and Wayne. Both Sarah and Kathryn alluded to institutional expectations but expressed far less dissatisfaction with their situations than did Elaine and Wayne.

Interestingly, the two subjects with obvious dissatisfaction with institutional politics held appointments at the same institution. The two who expressed little dissatisfaction and actually conveyed pleasure and enthusiasm over their professional development school roles were faculty at another university. Were levels of satisfaction a function of the particular institutions represented or of the personalities of the subjects selected for this research? The sample for this study was not large enough to draw any conclusions about this question, nor was this area part of the original research questions.

Although not an intended outcome, this research again documents the institutional tensions with which education faculty in large universities must contend. Teacher educators who consider working in professional schools should be aware of institutional expectations--even implicit expectations--and the possible effects on career advancement and personal satisfaction.

Implications For Practice

The primary consumer of the present research will be the professor of education (or prospective teacher educator) who wishes to develop or expand his or her own frame of reference for professional practice. Insight into how others function in similar circumstances can be beneficial in negotiating the rigors of a new or developing career.

Also, college and university leaders in teacher education who are considering establishing a professional development school should consider more than just a structure and organization for such a partnership. They must consider and understand the critical factor of the higher education faculty member who will become the heart of the program. This research contributes to that understanding.

Finally, with awareness of the relatively few investigations into the lives of higher education faculty, particularly in teacher education, this study can stimulate further research.

Recommendations For Further Study

The review of literature revealed that relatively little research into the professional lives of college-level teacher educators had been done. The studies that had been done were primarily survey-based and addressed quantitative issues such as the amount of time devoted to teaching, research, and service. Heretofore, there has been very little research addressing how teacher educators make sense out of their professional lives and no research has been conducted concerning teacher educator life in a professional development school. Hence, there is much opportunity for future study. As a result of this study, the investigator offers the following suggestions for further study.

Similar research questions should be investigated using participants from institutions with characteristics differing from those in the present study. Smaller higher education institutions--both public and private--would provide appropriate settings. Teacher educators in such settings are likely to be affected by different professional expectations than those in this investigation. The tensions of institutional politics may differ markedly from those of major, doctoral-granting universities.

Investigation into the day-to-day professional lives of teacher educators in professional development schools is also recommended. Such investigation should focus on how the

subjects conduct, manage, and balance their professional lives. The present study focuses on beliefs held by the subjects and was not intended to describe their lives. Case studies such as these can provide valuable insight for other practitioners who are examining their own professional lives.

Insight into the evolving lives of teacher educators working in professional development schools could be gained through longitudinal studies. These studies should examine how beliefs and perceptions change over time and identify the forces contributing to the changes. Such foreknowledge would be beneficial as teacher educators mold their professional lives.

Because limitation on time was the primary frustration mentioned by the subjects in this study, further research into this area is warranted. How do teacher educators become successful time managers, if such is possible, when given or assuming additional responsibilities in professional development schools? How do teacher educators working in professional development schools cope with problems caused by lack of time to appropriately accomplish necessary duties? Those who struggle with time management would surely benefit from such research.

Two of the participants in the present study presented themselves as much more content with their roles in professional development schools than did the other two. Both of the more contented participants were from the same

institution and both would be considered mid-career professors. The other two participants--both working at a different university from the more contented participants--seemed less satisfied. One of these was nearing the end of a career and the other was a young, recent Ph.D. early in a first-university appointment. Therefore, further research about the relationship of career point and professional satisfaction in a professional development school role is recommended. Based on the present research, the institutional setting might also be a major factor affecting a teacher educator's professional satisfaction. Research in this area is also recommended. Such research should focus on the effect of institutional politics on the effectiveness and morale of teacher educators who work in field-based settings. Research that compares levels of satisfaction between those appointed at large, major universities (as were the subjects in this study), and subjects appointed at institutions where more emphasis is placed on teaching and less on research and publication would be valuable for those making career decisions.

Finally, it was observed that the two participants who reflected more positive orientations toward their roles in professional development schools were associated with what appeared to be a stronger professional development school partnership than the other two participants. Because the

sense of partnership has been cited as an important element in the success of a professional development school concept (Holmes, 1986; Sedlak, 1987), it would be appropriate to investigate the relationship between strength of partnership and teacher educator satisfaction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdul-Haqq, I. (1989). The nature of professional development schools. *ERIC Digest* 4-89. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Abdul-Haqq, I. (1991). Professional development schools and educational reform: Concepts and concerns. *ERIC Digest* 91-2. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Allison, C. (1989). Early professors of education: Three case studies. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* (pp.53-93). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Applegate, J. H. (1987). Early field experiences: Three points of view. In M. Haberman & J. M. Bacus (Eds.), *Advances in Teacher Education* (Vol 3, pp.75-93) Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Applegate, J. H. & Lasley, T. J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2), 15-18.

Anderson, N. A. (1987). *Effects of early field experiences on the attitudes of elementary preservice teachers.* Tampa, FL: University of South Florida. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 671).

Austin-Martin, G., Bull, D., & Molrine., M. (1981). A study of the effectiveness of a pre-student teaching experience in promoting positive attitudes toward teaching. *Peabody Journal of Education, 58,* 148-153.

Bagley, A. (Ed.). (1975). *The professor of education: an assessment of conditions.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bauer, N. J. (1991a). *Professional development schools: A reflective analysis.* Paper presented at the Spring Conference of the New York State Foundations of Education Association, Binghampton, NY. April.

Bauer, N. J. (1991b). *Professional development schools: Initiating a conversation.* Paper presented at the spring Conference of the Confederated Organization for Teacher Education, Syracuse, NY. April.

Beecher, R. M. & Ade, W. E. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2), 25-30.

Bennie, W. (1982). Field-based teacher education: A reconsideration. *The Teacher Educator, 17*(4), 19-24.

Benton, E. S. & Osborn, J. (1970). Early field experiences in an education curriculum. *The Journal of Educational Research, 13,* 119-125.

Berliner, D. C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(6), 2-8.

Blanchard, B. (1982). The mental health of college and university professors engaged in teacher education. *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis, 19,* 249-268.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brainard, F. (1989). *Professional development schools: Status as of 1989.* (Occasional paper No. 9). Seattle, WA: Washington University, Center for Education Renewal.

Brennan, S. & Simpson, K. (1993). The professional development school: Lessons from the past, prospects for the future. *Action in Teacher Education, 15*(2), 9-17.

Burch, B. G. (1989). Perceptions of the role and scholarly reputation of the education professoriate. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.). (1989). *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burgess, R. G. (Ed.). (1985). *Field methods in the study of education.* Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* New York, NY: Author.

Carter, H. (1981). *Teacher educators: A descriptive study.* Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center.

Carter, H. (1984). Teachers of teachers. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (pp. 125-144). Norwood, NY: Ablex Publishers.

Caslovka, A., Sims, A., Staples, B., Zietlew, K. Jackson, N., & Perry, J. (1992). Teachers tell the truth about school change. *Instructor, 101*(5), 24-27, 32-34.

Chatman, C. T. (1991). *Personal perspectives of major factors that influenced the educational, personal and professional development of senior-level black women administrators in higher education: Implications for future black women administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Clark, D. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3), 42-45

Clarken, R. H. (1993). Clinical and field-based experiences to prepare teachers for wholistic practice. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Atlanta, GA. April.

Clifford, G. J. & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Colburn, A. (1993). *Creating professional development schools*. Fastback 352. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Commission on Teacher Education. (1946). *The improvement of teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Conant, J. (1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Counelius, J. S. (1969). (Ed.). *To be a phoenix: The education professoriate.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Crawford, S., Smith, P. G., Thacker, D., Turner, M. C. & Watkins, S. (1993). Building a school-university relationship: The emerging role of clinical professors, *Contemporary Education, 64,* 255-257.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1985). *Models for the preparation of America's teachers.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1990). *Research that informs teachers and teacher educators.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Cruickshank, D. R. & Armaline, W. (1986). Field experiences in teacher education: Considerations and recommendations. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37,* 34-40.

Cruickshank, D. R. & Cruz, J. (1986). Trends in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 49-56.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 3-13.

Denemark, G. (1984). *Educating a profession.* Paper presented at the annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education, Ft. Worth.

Denton, J. J. (1982). Early field experience influence on performance in subsequent coursework. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2), 19-23.

Dewey, J. (1896). The university school. *University Record, 5,* 417-442.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In R. D. Archambault, (Ed.), (1969). *John Dewey on education, selected writings.* New York, NY: The Modern Library, 169-181.

Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Dishner, E. K. & Boothby, P. R. (1986). The bold "old" step: Return to laboratory schools. *New Directions For Teaching and Learning - Improving Teacher Education,* Fall, 49-57.

Dixon, P. N. & Ishler, R. E. (1992). Professional development schools: Stages in collaboration. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(1), 28-34.

Douglas, J. D. (1985). *Creative Interviewing.* Beverly Hills, CA. SAGE Publications.

Ducharme, E. R. & Ange, R. M. (1982). The education professoriate: A research based perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(6), 30-36.

Ducharme, E. R. (1986). Teacher education: What do we know? *ERIC Digest* No. 15. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Duffy, G. G. (1994). Professional development schools and the development of teachers and professors. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75,* 596-600.

Elbe, K. E. (1971). *Career development of the effective college teacher.* Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors and Association of American Colleges.

Elbe, K. E. (1972). *Professors as teachers.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Ellner, C. L. & Barnes, C. P. (1983). *Studies of college teaching.* Lexington, ME: D. C. Heath Company.

Elliott. P. & Mays, R. (1979). *Early field experiences in teacher education.* Fastback No. 125. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Erdman, J. I. (1983). Assessing the purpose of early field experience programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(4), 27-31.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Whittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119-161). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Evans, H. L. (1991). A framework for designing field experiences: A Jamaican study. In L. G. Katz (Ed.) *Advances in teacher education,* Vol 4. (pp- 155-172). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Evenden, E. S. (1933). *National survey of the education of teachers: Vol. VI. Summary and interpretation* (Bulletin 1933, No 10, Office of Education, U. S. Department of the Interior). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Farris, P. J. & Smith, B. J. (1993). Professional development schools: Teacher education's last hurrah? *Contemporary Education, 64,* 261-262.

Field, T. T. (1990). *Establishing professional development schools: Forging school/university partnerships in West Virginia.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. April.

Field, T. T. (1991). *Toward a shared vision of educational reform: Establishing professional development schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Atlanta: GA. March.

Fountain, C. A. (1993). A clinical continuum: Integrating preservice and inservice educational delivery systems. presented at the International Conference on Teacher Education. Tel Aviv, Israel. June.

Galluzzo, G. R. & Arends, R. I. (1989). The RATE project: A profile of teacher education institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(4), 56-58.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990a). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990b). Connecting the past to the present. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds), *Places where teachers are taught.* (pp.1-39) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. I. (1993). *Educational renewal.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1981). *Effective evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers

Harris, R. C. & Harris, M. F. (1993). Partner schools: Places to solve teacher education problems. *Action in Teacher Education, 14*(4), 1-8.

Hazlett, M. (1989). Education professors: The centennial of an identity crisis. In R. Wisniewski and E. Ducharme (Eds.) *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* (pp. 17-48). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hedberg, J. (1979). The effects of field experience on achievement in educational psychology. *Journal of Teacher Education, 20*(2), 75-76.

Henry, M. (1983). The effects of increased exploratory field experiences upon the perceptions and performances of student teachers. *Action in Teacher Education, 5*(1), 66-70.

Hill, G. E. (1977). *Prof.* New York, NY: Vantage Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group..* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles of design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group, (1992). *The Holmes Group Forum. 6(2).*

Houston, W. R. (Ed.) (1990), *Handbook of research on teacher education.* New York, NY: Macmillan, Inc.

Howe, K. & Eisenhart M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher. 19(4)*, 2-9.

Howe, M. C. & Browne, K. A. (1970). *National survey of campus laboratory schools.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Howey, K. R. (1989). Research about teacher education: Programs of teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(6)*, 23-26).

Howey, K. R. & Zimpher, N. L. (1990). Professors and deans of education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education.* (pp. 349-370) New York: NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G. W. & Nash, R. J. (1976). *Educating a profession.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Huffman-Joley, G. (1993). Professional development schools: meeting the challenge of change. *Contemporary Education, 64,* 213-214.

Hycner, R. H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies, 8,* 279-303.

Ingle, R. B. & Robinson, E. W. (1965). An examination of the value of classroom observation for prospective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education. 16,* 456-460.

Ingle, R. B. & Zaret, E. A. (1968). A comparison of classroom observations and tutorial experiences in the preparation of secondary school teachers. *Educational Leadership, 2,* 164-168.

Ishler, R. & Kay, R. (1981). Exploritory field experiences: A survey of institutional practices. In C. Webb, N. Gehrke, P. Ishler, & A. Mendoza (Eds). *Exploratory field experiences in teacher education.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Jackson, C. L. (1986). *Status of laboratory schools.* Jacksonville, FL: Florida Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 671).

Joyce, B. (1987). Reflections on teaching teachers. In J. F. Soltis (Ed). *Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group report* (pp. 80-83) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kern, S. J. (1991). A professional development school: Getting started. *GATEways to Teacher Education*, 4(1), 13-19.

King, I. L. (1993). Working together toward excellence in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Los Angeles, CA. February.

Klausmeir, R. L. (1990). Four decades of calls for reform of teacher education: The 1950s through the 1980s. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 17*(4) 23-34.

Koerner, J. D. (1963). *The miseducation of american teachers.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Kowalski, T. J., Glover, J. A., & King, D. (1988). The role of the laboratory school in providing a research base for teacher education. *Contemporary Education, 60*(1), 19-22.

Lakebrink, J. M. (1991), *Teacher preparation in professional development schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Atlanta, GA. February.

Lanier, J. E. (1984). *Research on teacher education.* (Occasional Paper No. 80) East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Lanier, J. & Little, J. W. (1985). Research in teacher education. In M. C. Whitrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, 3rd. (pp. 527 - 569), New York, NY: Macmillian Publishers.

Levine, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Levine, R. (1990). Recurring themes and variations. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds), *Places where teachers are taught.* (pp.40-83) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. *Teachers College Record, 92*, 105-122.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lindsey, M. (1969). *Inquiring into teacher behaviors of supervisors in teacher educaion laboratories.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Locke, L. (1989). Qualitative research as a form of scientific inquiry in sport and physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60*(1), 1-20.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Liberman, A. & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. *Teachers College Record, 92*(1), 105-122.

Lumpkins, B. & Parker, F. R. (1986). *The inservice roles fulfilled by campus laboratory schools.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Nashville, TN (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 665)

Marton, F. (1986). Phenomenography--A research approach to investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought, 21*(3), 28-48.

McCracken G. (1988). *The long interview.* Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications.

McGeoch, D. M. (1971). *The campus laboratory school: Phoenix or dodo bird?* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 046).

McIntyre, D. J. (1983). *Field experiences in teacher education: From student to teacher.* Washington, DC: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher education.

McIntyre, D. & Killian, J. E. (1986). Student interactions with pupils and cooperating teachers in early field experiences. *Teacher Educator, 22*(2), 2-9.

Measor, L. (1985). Interviewing: A strategy in qualitative research. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.). *Strategies of Educational Research.* (pp. 55-78), Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Moore, K. D. (1991). Professional development schools: Classroom teachers' perceptions. *Teacher Education and Practice, 7*(1), 45-50.

Moore, K. D. & Hopkins, S. (1993). Professional development school: Partnerships in teacher preparation. *Contemporary Education, 64,* 219-222.

Morgan, G. (1983). *Beyond method: Strategies for social research.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Morris, J. E. (1983). The director of student teaching/field experiences: Characteristics and responsibilities. *The Teacher Educator, 18*(4), 11-18.

National Commission on Excellence in Education, (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1990). *NCATE standards , procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units.* Washington, DC: author.

Neufeld B. & Haavind, S. (1988). *Professional development schools in Massachusetts: Beginning the process.* The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

Neufeld, B. (1992). Professional practice schools in context: New mixtures of institutional authority. In M. Levine (Ed.) *Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nicklin, J. L. (1995, February 2). Education-school group issues scathing, self-critical review. *The Chronicle of Higher education*

Nolan, J. (1982), Professional laboratory expereinces: The missing link in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(4), 49-53.

Nowicki, J. J. (1991). *Learning to be a teacher: Perspectives about the teacher training process from those who teach and those who wish to.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association. October.

Nystrand, R. O. (1991). *Professional development schools: Toward a new relationship for schools and universities.* (Trends and Issues paper No. 3) Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse of Teacher Education.

Olszewski, W., Hoffman, D., & Borchardt, E. (1991). *Attention to climate: A case study of two decades of personalized and field-based teacher preparation.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-western Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL. October.

Ornstein, A. C. (1985). Research on teaching: Issues and trends. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(6), 27-31.

Owen, J. D. (1988). *An investigation of the curricular and instructional leadership roles of elementary principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Page, J. A. (1983). Laboratory schools: Updated or outdated? *Education, 103*(4), 372-374.

Page, F. M. & Page, J. A. (1981). *The development of research as a role in laboratory schools.* Farmville, VA: National Association of Laboratory Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 628).

Prestine, N. A. & Bowen, C. (1992). Benchmarks of change: Assessing essential school restructuring efforts. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Anaylsis, 15*(3), 258-319.

Patterson, L. E., Sutton, R. E., & Schuttenburg, E. M. (1987). Plateaued careers, productivity and career satisfaction of college of education faculty. *The Career Development Quarterly, 35*, 197-205.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative Education Methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Prince, J. (1991). Rethinking the laboratory school: Teacher training through a mainstream academic partnership. *National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 15*(2), 30-40.

Professor X. (1973). *This beats working for a living: The dark secrets of a college professor.* New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House.

Quinn, P. J. (1986). *Do field experiences make a difference in the training of preservice education students? Let's find out!* Jamaica, NY: St. John's University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED No. 278 634).

Raths, J., McAninch, A., & Katz, L. (1991). A plight of teacher educators: Clinical mentalities in a scientific culture. In L. G. Katz (Ed.) *Advances in teacher education*, Vol 4. (pp. 37-49). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Rucker, W. R. (1952). *A critical analysis of current trends in student teaching.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate school of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Ruscoe, G. C. & Whitford, B. (1991). Quantitative and Qualitative perspectives on teacher attitudes: The third year. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. April.

Rushcamp, S. & Roehler, L. R. (1992). Characteristics supporting change in a professional development school. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(1), 19-27.

Sandefur, J. T. (1970). *An issultrated model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates.* Washington, DC: American Associationof Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's to late?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sarason, S. B. (1993). *The case for change: Rethinking the preparation of teachers.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Scannell, D. P., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G., Dieterle, L., Egbert, R., and Nielson, E. (1983). *Educating a profession: Profile of a beginning teacher.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Scherer, C. (1979). Effects of early field experience on student teachers' self-concepts and performances. *Journal of Experimental Education, 46,* 208-214.

Schlechty, P., Ingerson, D. & Brooks, T. (1988). Inventing professional development schools. *Educational Leadership, 46*(3), 28-31.

Sedlak, M. W. (1987). Tomorrow's teachers: The essential arguments of the Holmes Group report. In J. F. Soltis (Ed.) *Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group report.* (pp. 4-15) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in the social sciences.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Seidman, E., Schneider, H & Cannon, P. (1991). *East Longmeadow school district University of Massachusetts-Amherst professional development school: A collaborative effort.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 572.

Shanker, A. (1987). Tomorrow's Teachers. In J. F. Soltis (Ed). *Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group report* (pp. 113-119) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shulman. L. (1992). Toward a pedagogy of cases. In J. H. Shulman (Ed.), *Case methods in teacher education.* (pp. 1-30) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sieforth, B. & Samuel, M. (1979). The emergence of early field experiences. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *57*(1), 10-16.

Smith, C. W. (1991). Laboratory schools/professional development schools: Are they, can they be one in the same? *National Association of Laboratory schools Journal*, *6*(1), 8-17.

Soder, R. & Sirotnik, K. A. (1990). Beyond reinventing the past: The politics of teacher education In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds), *Places where teachers are taught.* (pp. 385-409) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Soltis, J. F. (Ed.) (1987). *Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes group report.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sowards, W. (1969). Florida State University model for the preparation of elementary school teachers. *Journal of Research and development in Education*, *2*(3), 22-30.

Spooner, M. M. (1991). *An interpretive inquiry into student teachers' reflections of instruction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Stallings, J. A. (1988). The Houston teaching academy: A professional development school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. April.

Stallings, J. A. (1991). Connecting preservice teacher education and inservice professional development: A professional development school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. April.

Stallings, J. A. & Kowalski, T. (1990). Research on professional development schools. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education.*, (pp. 251-263), New York: NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Stillerman, K. P. (1991). *How five successful middle school principals in North Carolina define vision and how they perceive themselves as implementers and keepers of vision.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. L. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sunal, D. (1980). Effect of field experiences during elementary methods courses on preservice teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Science Education, 17*(1), 17-23.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewski, T. S. & Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. *Interchange, 10*(4), 12-29.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools.* New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Theobald, N. D. (1990). The financing and governance of professional development or partner schools. (Occasional Paper No. 10). Seattle, WA: Washington University Center for Educational Renewal.

Tom, A. R. (1991). *Restructuring teacher education.* Fastback 325. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundations.

Troyer, M. (1986). A synthesis of research on the characteristics of teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 6-10.

Van Mannen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* London, Ontario, Canada: The State University of New York Press.

Van Til, W. (1985). *Laboratory schools and the national reports.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Laboratory Schools, Denver, CO.

Veldman, D. J., Menaker, S. L., & Newlove, B. (1970). *The Porter Project: Teacher aides in a secondary school. A preliminary report.* Austin, TX: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education.

Walker, R. (Ed.). (1985). *Applied qualitative research.* Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing Company.

Waxman, H. C. & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Effects of early field experiences. In J. D. Raths & L. G. Katz (Eds.). *Advances in Teacher Education* (Vol 2, pp. 165-184). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishers.

Webb, C. D., Gehrke, N., Ishler, P., & Mendoza, A. (1981). *Exploratory field experiences in teacher education: A report of the commission on exploratory field experiences of the Association of Teacher Educators.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 482.

Weber, S. (1986). *Teacher education: The professor's point of view.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. April.

Wheeler, R. & Giese, R. (1988). Teacher education faculty perception of Holmes Group membership. *Action in Teacher Education, 10*(2), 11-16.

Whittrock, M. C. (Ed.). (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching* . New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Williams, E. I. (1942). *The actual and potential use of laboratory schools in state normal schools and colleges,* Contribution to education, No. 846) New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.

Willower, D. & Culbertson, J. (1964). *The professorship in educational administration.* Columbus, OH: University Council for educational administration.

Winitzky, N. (1991). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 576).

Winitzky N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education. 43*(1), 3-18.

Wisniewski, R. (1989). The ideal professor of education. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.). *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wisniewski, R. & Ducharme, E. R. (Eds.). (1989). *The professors of teaching: An inquiry.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wolf. R. L. & Tymitz, B. (1977). Toward more nautralistic inquiry in education. *CEDR Quarterly, 10,* 7-9.

Woloszyk, C. A. & Davis, S. (1993a). Restructuring a teacher preparation program using the professional development school concept. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Los Angeles, CA. February.

Woloszyk, C. A. & Davis, S. (1993b). Implementing institutional change through the professional development school concept. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Los Angeles, CA. February

Yarger, S. J. (1989). Research about teacher education (RATE): Introduction to an ongoing study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(4), 53-55.

Yarger, S. J. & Smith, P. L.. (1990). Issues in research on teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed). *Handbook of research on teacher education.* (pp.25-41). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Yinger, R. J. & Hendricks, M. S. (1990). An overview of reform in Holmes Group institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 21-26.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experience in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(6) 45-55.

Zeichner, K. & Tabachnick, B. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 8*, 34-54.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Major Research Questions

1. What are the beliefs and perceptions held by teacher education professors regarding their individual roles in professional development schools?

2. What do teacher education professors believe about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers?

Component Orienting Questions

1a. How do teacher education professors perceive themselves as they work in professional development schools?

1b. What do teacher education professors believe they should be doing in professional development schools?

1c. How do those beliefs differ from reality? Why?

1d. How have teacher education professors influenced the development of their individual roles?

2a. In the opinions of teacher education professors, how do experiences in professional development schools contribute to the development of preservice teachers? How well do these experiences contribute?

2b. What do teacher education professors believe professional development schools contribute to preservice teacher education beyond more traditional methods?

2c. How should professional development schools be refined to improve usefulness to preservice teacher education?

Interview Guide

BACKGROUND

1. Tell me how you got into teacher education.

2. Tell me how you fit into the professional development schools in which you work.

3. How were you involved in establishing professional development schools here?

4. Describe what you do in professional development schools?

PERCEPTIONS

1. How do you define your role in professional development schools?

2. What to you think your role should be?

3. What is it that maintains the difference between what you see as your actual role and what you think that role should be?

4. What will it take to bridge that gap?

5. (If no difference in roles is perceived) What did you do to shape or develop your role in professional development schools?

BELIEFS ABOUT SELF

1. In general, how do you see yourself as a teacher educator?

2. What has shaped your beliefs about your professional self?

3. How has your work in professional development schools affected your view of your professional self?

BELIEFS ABOUT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

1. How have professional development schools in your experience impacted preservice teacher education? Preservice teachers? What evidence of the impact have you observed or experienced?

2. How has your experience in professional development schools met your expectations for teacher education?

3. How has you experience in professional development schools contributed to your own professional growth?

4. Should each university associated with professional development schools follow the same model, for example the one proposed by the Holmes Group, or should each university develop its own model?

5. What is the future for professional development schools in general? In your own setting?

6. Given the relatively meager resources that smaller colleges have for teacher education, is the professional development school concept a feasible possibility in those settings?

7. What would your own ideal professional development school be like? How would it differ from what you've experienced? What would it take to realize that ideal professional development school?

8. Research and publication are given expectations for many university faculty members. How has your work with professional development schools affected your meeting those expectations in your own setting?

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUBJECTS

Dear   ,

     I would greatly appreciate your help in connection with research for my doctoral dissertation at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am conducting interviews with teacher education faculty who have experience in professional development schools. I want to investigate how these educators perceive their roles in professional development schools as well as their beliefs about the utility of professional development schools in the preparation of teachers.

     I would like to interview you as part of my study. Based on the pilot study I have completed, the interview should take no more than an hour and a half to complete. I will tape record the interview and afterwards provide you a written transcript. You will be asked to review the transcript and expand or modify your responses if you desire. This is to insure an accurate representation of your beliefs and perceptions. After your review of the transcript, we may also agree that a follow-up interview would be useful.

     Rest assured that all subjects will remains anonymous and if it appears appropriate, institutions will not be identified.

     Relatively little research has been done in this area of investigation. Teacher education professors appear to be the least studied of the components of preservice teacher education and interest in professional development schools is growing. This research can provide deeper insight into the faculty on the front lines of teacher education

     A return envelope is enclosed for your reply. I do hope you will be able to fit this request into your busy schedule. As soon as I receive your reply indicating your willingness to participate, I will call you to schedule a time for the interview. With gratitude for considering my request, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Larry G. Julian