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ABSTRACT
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This study of leadership in five rural teachers' centers provides a detailed definition and job description of the leader's work in established (three-nine year old) small grassroots centers.

The study offers concrete findings to support the widely accepted belief that effective professional development programs begin with the individual teacher's needs rather than with institutional requirements. It documents the functioning of an experienced rural teachers' center network through a study of its leadership.

A collaboratively developed participant questionnaire and interviews of leaders provided the means to identify specific leadership roles, functions and activities "most important" for the coming year. A weighted, stratified vi
sample of teachers, administrators, school board members, parents/community and teachers' center staff completed the survey.

Non-statistically tabulated results showed that leadership time should be almost equally divided between three major roles: administrator, developer and teacher/advisor. Within these roles attention should be given to eight major activities in this order of priority: 1) developing new ideas for courses, workshops and other professional growth activities; 2) managing the center's resources and scheduling all activities; 3) communicating regularly with policy boards, administrators, teachers' center staff and volunteers; 4) fund-raising to make the center self-supporting; 5) acting as an advisor in the teachers' center by connecting people with information, resources and other people; 6) teaching a course or workshop; 7) visiting schools to discuss new curriculum ideas and arrange workshops; and 8) producing a monthly newsletter and speaking at community functions.

Since small group leadership roles consist of combined activities and personal factors, participants identified the following skills and characteristics as most important in an effective leader. These are: 1) creativity and follow through on new ideas, 2) skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults, 3) public and human relations skills, 4) administrative and management skills, and 5) knowledge of the field of education.
With regard to the advisor role this study found that rural leaders should concentrate on networking to connect people and resources, and providing creative educational alternatives. Least emphasis is placed on demonstrating or modeling teaching techniques in classrooms. Rural teachers found the leaders' human relations ability and general creativity to be more important than curriculum expertise or experience as a master teacher.

Major implications are 1) that this study's findings should apply to leadership in other small but not necessarily rural teachers' centers which are experienced, 2) further research is needed to ascertain whether a) rural teachers' centers should provide in-school advisories, b) whether the classroom is really the best starting place for teacher development with advisory support, and c) whether expertise in child development or in adult development is more important in those who work to facilitate the professional development of educational personnel.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In an era of declining school population and shrinking educational resources, improving the instructional role of classroom teachers on-the-job has gained significance. The past twenty years have witnessed a rapid growth in programs for the professional development\(^1\) of educational personnel (Nicholson and Joyce et al., 1976; Lawrence, 1974; Edelfelt, 1975). One type of program that holds great promise is the teachers' center.\(^2\)

This study of rural teachers' center leadership defines and describes the roles and characteristics of five leaders of small rural centers which are more than two years old. It compares participant perceptions of the work with leaders' views, to determine job priorities for the next year. In theoretical terms it field tests a humanistic developmental model of professional development to see what aspects are truly valued in on-going rural networks for innovations and problem-solving (Parker, 1977).

\(^1\)To avoid confusion, the term "professional development" is used throughout this study as a synonym for other commonly used words like "inservice training," "inservice education," "staff development," "continuing education."

\(^2\)Smith, W. L., claimed that, "Probably no other new educational concept offers up such a rich array of names and acronyms as the teacher center" "A * By Any Other Name." Journal of Teacher Education, 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974), p. 2. In this study the term and spelling "teachers' center" is used throughout.
In 1974, Schmeider and Yarger called the teachers' center "one of the hottest educational concepts on the scene today" (p. 5). The teachers' center movement has spread rapidly in the United States. Over the past fifteen years it has captured the fancy of classroom teachers at the grassroots level, all the way to federal policy makers at the top of the educational hierarchy.

A timely concept. That the teachers' center has great appeal is no surprise if viewed in the light of current research on professional development. Major studies by Lawrence (1974) and the Rand Corporation (1975, 1977, 1978) suggest quite conclusively that the most effective programs to improve instruction provide (among other things) concrete, teacher-specific on-going training in teachers' own classrooms given by local consultants with local materials development. Both these studies and Edelfelt and Lawrence's (1975) review of the literature on inservice education concluded that motivation and actual learning are improved when teachers have a major voice in determining their own professional development programs. ¹

¹Recent research has further confirmed this view (Huffman, H.A. "The Identification of Critical Components in a Staff Development Program Based on the 1976 Recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of English." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1978; Clark, H.M. "Teacher Attitudes Toward In-Service Training: An Exploration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1978; Henson, C. M. "A Comparison of a Faculty Planned In-service Program." Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1978; Hruska, M. "Reconceptualizing Inservice Education: A Teacher Designed Staff Development Program." Ed.D. disserta-
Most teachers' centers do claim to offer teachers just such a voice, as well as many voluntary options for participation (Devaney & Thorn, 1975). One type of teachers' center, called "grassroots" in this study, places particular emphasis on the issues of teacher control and voluntarism (Devaney & Thorn, ibid.; Buxton, 1979; Martin, 1977; Devaney, 1977; Watt, A., 1978).

British Roots and American Branches

Teachers' centers are not an American invention. They began in England during the 1950s (James Report, 1972) and have spread to other European countries and Japan (Devault, 1974). The British concept of a teachers' center as a place for relaxed professional exchange where teachers could find support for developing curriculum (Thornbury, 1974), crossed the Atlantic on the heels of the "open education" movement in the early 1960s (Yeomans, 1972; Weber, 1971). The idea took root in the mid 1960s and soon began to spread, changing form and structure as different groups molded the idea to their own particular needs (Schmeider & Yarger, 1974; Devaney, 1976; Yarger, 1977). In true American style, both the name and the substance of the teachers' center underwent local modification, University of Massachusetts, 1977.) (Bunker, R.M. & Hruska, M. Inservice Education: One Approach. Massachusetts: State Department of Education, 1978; Rubin, L. J. Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Perspectives for Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971(a); Edelfelt, Roy A., and Johnson, Margo, eds. Rethinking Inservice Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
In 1974 Schmeider and Yarger found it virtually impossible to define or describe "the" American teachers' center.

At the federal level, 1978 marked the first year of funding under the new Teacher Center Program (Education Amendments of 1976) for sixty teachers' centers. Thirty-nine more projects were funded in 1979, and a much smaller number were added in 1980. No new funds for teachers' centers have been allocated at this time. About fifteen of the Office of Education supported teachers' centers are located in rural areas.¹

This federal Teacher Center Program is distinguished by the requirement that the Policy Board, which must control the program, is to be composed of a majority of full-time classroom teachers (Federal Register 1976). Yet there are no guidelines for staffing these teachers' centers and no mention of specific qualifications for the position of director (ibid).

Two major types of teachers' centers. Teachers' centers are a "hot issue" (Schmeider & Yarger, 1974) because they appeal to many important groups of educators; federal research and development planners, university teacher educators, professional teacher organizations, local district administrators and classroom teachers themselves. Since each group has a

¹Information obtained from the Teachers' Centers Exchange of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
different agenda for the professional development of teachers, it is not surprising to find great diversity in the form, function and purposes of teachers' centers. Although there are several typologies for teachers' centers (Schmeider & Yarger, 1974; Joyce & Weil, 1973; Feiman, 1978), the present study begins by offering one new distinction. This is the distinction between those centers whose programs flow largely from the top-down, and those which grow from the bottom up (Watt, A., 1979). That is, between centers which attempt to respond to the concerns of everyone: administrators, higher education, the federal government, teacher unions and individual teachers; and those that focus much more narrowly and specifically on the needs of classroom teachers.

The comprehensive type of teachers' center is strongly supported by the federal government (Lovett & Schmeider, 1976; Joyce & Weil, 1973), higher education (Yarger, 1974a, 1979; Jenkins, 1978), and teacher unions (Kemble, 1977; Leiter and Cooper, 1978). This approach sees in the teachers' center a perfect opportunity for collaboration among the major educational groups just mentioned. All want to upgrade teacher performance. Yarger (1977) sums up this collaborative approach as one that requires:

- high levels of teacher input in program development;
- the need to focus on the improvement of classroom skills; the need for shared decision-making; and
- the need for the development of unique and sometimes creative instructional delivery systems (p. 28).

The intention of this approach, in simplified terms, is to
combine the expertise of all powerful and concerned groups of educators to provide a comprehensive program for the professional training of teachers (Joyce & Weil, 1973; Schmeider & Yarger, 1977). The teachers' center is the site for this collaboration among teachers, administrators, higher educators and federal research and development groups.

The other major type of teachers' center focuses mainly on voluntary programming by and for teachers. Such centers are not comprehensive. They are not systematic. Programs aren't fed in from the "top-down" but are instead generated from the "bottom-up" (Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Feiman, 1978; Buxton, 1979; Devaney, 1977; Mai, 1977; O'Brien, 1977; Weber, 1978; Alberty & Dropkin, 1975; Zigarmi, 1978; Watt, A., 1979). This is the "grassroots" approach championed by the Teachers' Centers Exchange.¹ Devaney views the teachers' center as just one of many approaches to professional development; one based solely on individual need, the personality of the teacher and the reality of the classroom. Devaney and Thorn (1975) cite Berman and McLaughlin's Rand study findings (1974) as strong evidence supporting the ideas that 1) teachers' own intrinsic personal and professional needs are the single

¹Since 1972 the Teachers' Centers Exchange staff, under the direction of Kathleen Devaney, have documented, described and linked together teachers' centers (labeled "grassroots centers" in this study) sharing certain premises reflecting a belief that teachers know best what they need to learn and are often their own best resources for each other. The Teachers' Centers Exchange network has expanded from 46 active contacts in 1974 to 254 active contacts in 1979, with a total of 552 centers relating in some way to its network (See Chapter II, pp. 50-52 for further details).
greatest motivator for lasting growth; 2) that teachers themselves are the richest source of useful ideas for improving instruction in classrooms; and 3) that teachers are their own best resources for growth (Devaney & Thorn, Feiman, ibid).

Closely associated with grassroots teachers' centers is the advisory concept (Devaney & Thorn, 1975). Advisors are facilitators of teacher growth who assist only at the request of a teacher and within the framework of a teacher's self-identified needs. Advisors often work with teachers individually rather than in groups (Thomas, 1979). The advisor role differs from other staff development roles in that it is strictly non-evaluative, non-judgmental, and is designed to support individual teachers in solving their own concrete classroom problems (Katz, 1974). But, even though there is a philosophical match between grassroots teachers' centers and advisories, advisories are expensive services to provide, particularly in small teachers' centers with low budgets.

Grassroots teachers' center programs are controlled by teachers and are often much smaller in size and scope than comprehensive teachers' centers.\footnote{The location of the apostrophe in "teachers'" underscores the concept of teacher ownership of grassroots centers.} Because both the philosophical and psychological perspectives closely match the best that is now known about the professional development of teachers, it is important to study the grassroots teachers' center. But why study grassroots teachers' centers in rural
areas?

Rural teachers' centers and rural school reform. Educational reform in rural America has always received less assistance and attention than reform in urban America (National Seminar on Rural Education, 1979; Sher, 1976; Schmeider & Yarger, 1974a). In rural states a host of problems confront those who would provide programs to support the professional development of teachers. Limited state funding (Taylor, 1978), a traditionally weak federal lobby (Rosenfeld, 1976), dispersed and small populations, lack of collective bargaining, rural poverty and conservatism (Moe & Tamblyn, 1973), and the socio-cultural conditions of rural life (Sher, 1976)--all these themes bear on the slow pace and small number of school reforms in rural areas.

Literature on rural professional development programs is scarce,¹ and there has been almost nothing published on rural teachers centers. Research on rural teachers' centers includes one dissertation (Ricketts, 1978) describing a statewide plan for the development of an eight-site teachers' center in Alabama, and two case studies of one rural teachers' center in Vermont (Watt, J., 1978; Dunne, 1979). The Teachers' Centers Exchange has helped to start a Rural Teachers' Centers Network and has described several rural centers in two Directories (Lance et al. 1977, 1978). No attempt has yet

¹Of the 1124 ERIC entries on inservice education in July 1978, only 43 contained rural inservice as major descriptors.
been made to find out how established rural teachers' centers actually function from the perspective of those who participate in them.

Focus on leadership. Rural teachers' centers are necessarily small teachers' centers, with small budgets, small staffs and small teacher populations. As in other small groups (Hare, 1962; Olmsted, 1959) the leader's role is pivotal to both the character and the operation of the organization. Moreover, the literature on diffusion of educational innovations (Miles, 1964; Goodlad, 1977; Parker, 1977; Rogers, 1962; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) suggests that as an innovation grows older and faces the issues of being taken into its host system, leadership roles and functions may need to change.

This developmental approach to leadership is supported by situational leadership theory (Gibb, 1968; Hersey & Blanchard, 1972) and by Sarabin's (1968) writings on role expectations and role enactment. In small groups and rural networks (Berry, 1977; Parker, 1977) leadership functions are likely to be heavily invested in one person at the "hub" of the network (Goodlad, 1977). In primarily informal networks like teachers' centers, both the characteristics/skills of the leader and leader's behavior interact with each other (Gibb, 1968; Miles, 1978) to play a large part in determining

---

1The Rand Study described by Berman & McLaughlin calls this the institutionalization/continuation phase (Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. 8: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1978.)
the overall character of the teachers' center (Sarbin, 1968; DeVault, 1974). The leadership of a small grassroots teachers' center should directly reflect both the expressed needs of participants and the overall philosophy and skills of its leadership (DeVault, 1974). However, small group situational leadership theory has not been tested on small teachers' centers.

As yet there are no research studies on leadership in rural teachers centers as networks for educational reform, although Miles (1978), Kadushin (1977), and Parker (1977) have drawn attention to the importance of applying network theory to the study of teachers' centers. Moreover, leaders of established rural centers have themselves expressed confusion over their job descriptions. Several have asked for help in gaining clarity about which of their leadership activities are most important in centers which have been in operation for several years or more.¹

**Statement of the Problem**

Current research on professional development programs for educational personnel indicates that locally-based, small scale, teacher-controlled, ongoing, classroom-oriented programs based on teacher defined needs and interests show the most promise for school improvement (Berman & McLaughlin/

¹A preliminary questionnaire was circulated among five rural centers. The leaders found the idea of defining, describing and comparing their roles and functions difficult, interesting, and of great potential use (Watt, Anne S. "The Role of a Rural Teacher Center in Developing and Delivery Inservice Education Programs." Developer. Newsletter of the National Staff Development Council, March 1979).
Rand Study, 1978; Lawrence, 1974; Devaney, 1975, 1977). Since grassroots teachers' centers have been hailed as a promising format for this approach (Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Feiman, 1978; Yarger, 1974; Leiter & Cooper, 1978; Zigarmi, 1978), and since, in small groups the leader's work is pivotal to the development of the organization, it is now time to formulate the central problem to be addressed in this study of grassroots teachers' center leadership. This study will attempt to find out what rural participants think the leaders' job priorities should be in established teachers' centers. It will study participants' perceptions of leadership to determine what leadership skills and characteristics are necessary for the work. Moreover, it should find out the extent to which it is appropriate for leaders of small rural centers to function as advisors.

 Renewed national attention to the special circumstances of rural education reveals far fewer opportunities for professional development among rural teachers than for their urban counterparts (Sher, 1977; Dunne, 1977). There are only a handful of rural teachers' centers. A few have been in existence for three to nine years. Others have been recently funded through the federal Teacher Center Program of 1976. Yet very little research has been conducted on rural teachers' centers despite one author's contention that these centers may have great impact on rural school reform (Dunne, 1978). Because professional development programs have never fared as well in rural as in urban areas, (Burdin & Poliakoff,
research on rural projects is sorely needed.

Moreover, as the Teachers' Centers Exchange notes in its request for proposals for research on experienced teachers' centers of January 1979,

Because there has been little research on successful practices in experienced teachers' centers, much of the expertise these centers offer is based on intuition, trial and error learning, and personal observations and judgments (p. 1).

Thus a leadership study of small teachers' centers which are experienced should be of particular interest at this time. Although the movement is fifteen years old in this country, no one has yet studied its leadership. Even the Federal Regulations for the 1976 Teacher Centers Program gave no guidelines for the qualifications required for staffing the centers, despite one writer's conviction that "the success of the endeavor depends to a very large extent on the efficacy of the core staff" (San Jose, 1978, p. 7).

In small rural centers with a core staff of one or two professionals, leaders have to do almost all the work. They have to perform a whole range of functions from management of paperwork to one-to-one advising, to planning, teaching and coping with funding. Thus the issue of determining the importance of the rural teachers' center as a vehicle for the professional development of teachers, may be approached through a study of participants' perceptions of leadership in these small centers. Three important and basic questions will be:

1) What are the leaders' most important roles, functions and
activities in small rural teachers' centers? 2) What personal skills and characteristics are needed for leading these rather new, distinctly popular but still largely uncharted organizations? And 3) In small centers where leaders also act as advisors, how important is the advisory work of the leader?

**Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study will be to examine and define leadership roles, functions, activities, characteristics and skills in small rural grassroots teachers' centers which have been in existence at least two years.

This will not be an evaluation of leader effectiveness. Rather, a composite description of leadership priorities will be obtained by surveying both participants and leaders of the five oldest known rural centers. The aim is to determine what the leader's job really consists of in a small rural center by identifying and prioritizing the leader's most important roles, functions and activities and finding out what leadership skills and characteristics are most highly prized by both leaders and participants.

The data should provide a clear job description for the leader in a small rural center, and a concrete assessment of participant views on leadership priorities to guide leaders and their constituents in planning for the future.

On a more general level, the data will contribute to studies of rural networks by finding out what specific role expectations and leadership activities are most important
to participants of small informal/institutionalized rural networks. It should also add to current understanding of how rural teachers view advisory services. Against this background, the following specific research questions will be addressed.

1. Which **roles and functions** of a rural teachers' center leader are considered most important by participants?

2. What are the most important **leadership activities** and how do participant perceptions compare between centers and between participant groups?

3. What **leadership characteristics and skills** do rural teachers' center participants and leaders consider most important in experienced teachers' centers?

4. How important is the leaders' **role as an advisor** to teachers in rural teachers' centers?

**Meaning of Terms**

This study follows the definition of **role** found in the Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Role is a "named social position characterized by a set of a) personal qualities and b) activities, the set being normatively evaluated to some degree both by those in the situation and others" (p. 609). **Function** is most commonly described as "to carry on a function or be in action: operate, work" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary). This study divides three major roles

---

1 In the review of the literature it is postulated that small teacher center leadership involves an advisory stance—to be defined in pp. 52-61.
into seven functions, each of which is further divided into its many component activities.

In this study the term established will be used to denote a teachers' center which is in at least the end of its second operational year. Rural will be defined as areas characterized by population sparsity and physical and geographical isolation from educational resources, where the average school district enrollment is 1323 or less. Teachers' Center has been through a continuing evolution of definitions. This study will use Devaney and Thorn's definition (1975):

A teacher center is a program for the continuing education of practicing teachers which aims to be responsive to teachers' own definitions of their continuing learning needs rather than to school administrators' or college professors' or curriculum committees' imposed agendas (p. 3).

This definition omits one aspect of a center that has come to be accepted: that a teachers' center now includes a site or sites, as well as a program. On the other hand it draws attention to the qualities of a teachers' center program that distinguish it clearly from so many of the district or college administrated "top-down" approaches criticized in the in-service literature.

The term "grassroots" will be used for teachers' centers whose programming is mostly controlled from the bottom-

---

by teachers—and whose philosophy rests on the belief that the teacher knows best what he/she needs to know. A teachers' center leader will be defined in this study as a person who is employed full-time as the director of a teachers' center site, and has held that position for at least two years continuously.

This study will define an advisor as an experienced educator who functions as a non-evaluative support person and provider of alternatives in response to teachers' self-identified needs.

**Assumptions on Which the Study is Based**

The teachers' centers which form the sample for this study share certain basic assumptions about inservice education and professional growth which are in part revealed by Devaney and Thorn's definition of a teachers' center, and which are further elucidated by Bunker and Hruska (1978).

The assumptions are that participants in professional growth programs must be actively involved in decision-making to solve their own problems. Their basic needs must be met before they will respond to higher order challenges. Participants benefit most from self-initiated, self-directed programs which start from personal strengths and are sustained, recognized and supported by others.

This humanistic perspective on teacher development leads inevitably to a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" concept of inservice programming. It implies that significant
growth starts from within the individual teacher who is at the bottom of the educational hierarchy rather than in the heads of curriculum developers and educational planners at the top. Moreover, lasting effects are likely to be found where local, concrete, in-classroom problems are the focus for sustained, flexible efforts, as summarized by Berman and McLaughlin in the Rand studies (1975, 1978). A further assumption is that the most effective inservice programming is probably based on voluntary participation and on joint collaboration rather than on mandated attendance (Devaney & Thorn, 1975).

Equally important, but less explicitly tied to theory, are developmental assumptions guiding grassroots teachers' centers (Devaney, 1977; Buxton, 1978). This means "adopting resources to the entry level and mode of learning of each participant," (Buxton, ibid., 75) and recognizing that growth happens in small steps and erratically over extended periods of time (Weber, 1972; Albery & Dropkin, 1975). Another prominent assumption is that teachers pass through stages in their professional development (Katz, 1972; Fuller, 1974; Field, 1979; Devaney, 1977, Feiman, 1979). Although not invariate, the stages tend to involve movement from concerns with practical, concrete, daily realities to curriculum and instructional concerns, to interest in the more abstract issues of children's thinking (Buxton, 1978). While stage theory in teacher development is a relatively unresearched
field, it is a cornerstone assumption of experienced grassroots teachers' center practitioners, including the present author.

Design of the Study

A review of current teacher center literature and discussions with members of the Teachers' Centers Exchange revealed in 1978 only five American rural grassroots teachers' centers which had been operating at least two years, with at least a two year continuity of leadership.

The five centers differed in funding, in age, in program and in numbers of people served. All had professional staffs of one or two at the time of the study. Leaders of the five teachers' centers expressed keen interest in a study of their leadership. They gave five reasons for their interest: 1) that such a study would help them sort out and define their own evolving leadership roles, 2) that they would like to compare participants' opinions of their leadership to their own views, 3) they were interested in comparing their leadership roles with those of other established rural teacher center leaders, 4) that a study of leadership could be used as a needs assessment to provide directions for the coming year, and 5) that the Hawthorne effect would operate,

1Katz' study focuses on preservice stages (Katz, L. G. "Developmental Stages of Preschool Teachers," Elementary School Journal 50, no. 54 (Oct. 1972). Fuller's tackles stages of concern with the required adoption of an innovation (Fuller, F. "A Conceptual Framework for a Personalized Teacher Education Program" Theory Into Practice 13, no. 2 (1974). Martin and Watts and a group of teachers' centers leaders are currently researching this idea with the help of the Teachers' Centers Exchange.
raising participant awareness of (and possibly appreciation for) the complexities of leadership in small centers.

Given the fact that no leader possessed an accurate written job description, and all were interested in others' opinions of what they should be doing, a survey research method was chosen.¹ Such a survey could provide formative as opposed to summative data (Tuckman, 1972). It would collect, compare and interpret opinions on leadership roles and functions in five small rural teachers' centers.

An evaluative survey was determined inappropriate because some centers were not old enough to evaluate; many center participants might feel they did not know enough about leadership to evaluate it; and, finally because an unrequested outside evaluation could be threatening to the leaders themselves. Both interviews and questionnaires were considered as possible methods for conducting this survey of perceptions of leadership. While a questionnaire offered breadth by reaching more people, the interview would provide depth.

Disadvantages of questionnaires (Orlich, 1975) included 1) the complexity of the design process, 2) difficulties in choosing an appropriate sample, 3) the potential for different interpretations of meaning on questions, 4) the impossibility

of determining respondent honesty or accuracy, 5) the potential for a low return and, therefore, biased data, and most important, 6) the challenge to design valid questions that would really provide the data desired.

Despite these disadvantages, the questionnaire was chosen as the research instrument for this study. Three of its common drawbacks were minimized in the following ways. First, a weighted stratified sample of teachers' center participants was chosen by each leader. The sample was weighted to include only respondents who had used the centers "regularly," "sometimes" or "once or twice." This excluded all who had not used the center. The sample was also stratified to include members of five participant groups: teachers, administrators, school board members, parents/community members, and teachers' center staff.

The second way in which questionnaire drawbacks were minimized was that the questions were collaboratively developed and refined by the investigator with the leaders of all five centers. Finally, face-to-face distribution and collection procedures were used to counteract the potential for low return. The process of developing the questionnaire and conducting the research is fully detailed in Chapter III.¹

¹In-depth interviews using the questionnaire format were also conducted with four of the five leaders (the fifth being this writer). Although the findings are not presented in detail, the interviews provided rich detail which assisted in understanding the questionnaire results and which inform the conclusions of this study.
This investigator was well-cautioned by the literature on survey research (Wiersma, 1969; Travers, 1964; Oppenheim, 1966) and one recurring problem. Many surveys have been thrown together with no significant purpose. To be meaningful, Travers (ibid.) stresses that the information-gathering process must be soundly related to theory.

A selected literature review of four areas of research and practice is undertaken in Chapter II. These areas provide a conceptual framework for the study. The first places the grassroots teachers' center in an historical and psychological framework for viewing professional development. The second presents current rural conditions and needs for rural professional development programs. The third reviews research on small group leadership to show the importance of leadership roles and skills to the development of teachers' centers and the fourth offers a sociological perspective on the rural teachers' center as a network for educational reform. Taken together, they provide the conceptual core around which the questionnaire has been built.

Significance

At a time when the educational profession has resoundingly agreed that effective professional development programs for teachers begin with their own concrete classroom problems instead of with concerns of top level policy makers, studies of teachers' centers exemplifying this approach are
timely. Large scale funding of teachers' centers has already peaked.\textsuperscript{1} If the movement is to stay alive in the 1980s, small scale teachers' centers will be more likely to gain local funding than large ones. This study will be the first published research on established rural teachers' centers as well as the first to focus directly on leadership in small centers. It will be a pre-evaluation study designed to be of immediate use to each participating center and to address broader issues of leadership in small and rural teachers' centers in general.

The survey results will have concrete practical value for each site involved. They will show participants and leaders what each group of participants believes the leader should be doing. The results will provide a needs assessment for the emphasis of leadership in the future. The study concludes with a much needed job description for a complex job, a job which, in larger teachers' centers, is divided among several different people. Moreover, it will prioritize leadership, administrative and teaching/advising functions in the eyes of teachers, administrators, parents, school directors and staff themselves. In addition, this study will collect opinions on the leadership characteristics and skills participants value most in the leader of a small, rural, experienced teachers' center.

\textsuperscript{1}The years 1978-1980 saw over fifty large projects funded but no more funds were allocated by 1981.
More generally, this study will contribute to an understanding of how rural teachers view the advisory work of their teachers' center leaders, both in centers and in schools and classrooms. It will provide documentation of how established rural teachers' center networks operate.

This study will also help to determine whether a questionnaire given to a sample of teachers, administrators, parents, school directors and staff holds promise as a leadership research tool in rural teachers' centers.

Finally, the study may have important implications for leadership of other small grassroots teachers' centers which are committed to the philosophy of teacher-initiated, teacher-controlled professional development.

**Delimitations**

The teachers' centers studied here all subscribe to a general philosophical approach to inservice education which values teacher initiated, or "bottom-up" programs more highly than district mandated or "top-down" programs (Watt, A., 1979). The findings of this study will have limited application to district or state directed rural teachers' centers and others which are not substantially under the control of teachers, and whose leaders do not share the assumptions about professional growth on which this study is based.
The study does not pretend to be value free. A descriptive study (based on nonstatistical comparisons of survey data) is not intended to contribute objective data to the field of inservice education. Yet Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel argue that this approach has more value than objective, scientific methodology. They claim that objectivity in even behavioral research is a myth (1976),

... too long with us and too widely perpetuated (It) is particularly destructive to the degree that people in education actually believe it. . . (for) decision-making is invariably a subjective human activity involving value judgments (or weights) placed on whatever evidence is available to the decision maker (p. 19).

Questionnaires always have drawbacks. Although formally piloted, this questionnaire was not pretested for statistical reliability or validity. The small numbers of respondents and the nature of the questions (asking for one person's opinions about another person's leadership roles) precluded random sampling and led to a weighted stratified sampling process. While this improves the reliability of responses on Part I of the questionnaire, responses to Part II would have been more valid if they came from a randomly selected population. Furthermore, the questionnaire is lengthy--eight legal pages. However, all these drawbacks are somewhat offset by the high motivation of both leaders and respondents to cooperate on the study in order to learn more about themselves. Eighty-five percent of the surveys were completed and returned.
Another limitation of this study is the fact that the investigator was the leader of one of the five teachers' centers studied. This difficulty was offset by the fact that she left the position in 1978 when she started the present research. Her personal interest in the results for her center was substantially decreased, yet her knowledge of rural teachers' center leadership was first hand. Thus her past position lends important validity to her current role as investigator.

The sample for this study is very small—five teachers' centers. Yet in 1978 it appeared to be the entire population of well established rural grassroots centers in the United States under continuous leadership for two or more years, and subscribing to a common set of beliefs about professional growth. But because the five centers also differ in major respects (size, scope, and age, funding patterns and program), any generalizations should be considered tentative.

Chapter outline. 1) Beginning with an update on recent trends in inservice education, the teachers' center movement is shown to be a timely and important subject for research. The topic is then greatly narrowed to pinpoint two issues that have received little or no research attention to date: 1) leadership 2) in established rural teachers' centers. Having developed the need for this specific focus on rural teachers' center leadership, purposes are set forth, assumptions noted, the methodology and delimitations described and
finally the potential significance of the study is indicated.

2) Selected literature from four different sources will be reviewed. These include 1) the grassroots teachers' center movement as a timely approach to professional development, 2) rural educational reform, 3) small group leadership, and 4) networks for educational reform.

3) In the first section, the five rural teachers' centers meeting the requirements for the study are briefly described. The second section presents the process by which a questionnaire was developed and administered to two hundred and sixty-one teachers, administrators, school directors, community members and staff in the five centers.

4) The findings are reported. Computer tabulated frequencies and cross tabulations are used to generate tables and present data, discussion and analysis relevant to the first four specific research questions.

5) The results are summarized and concluded by a job description for the rural teachers' center leader in an established center. Implications related to role theory, network theory and rural education are raised. Important suggestions are made for further research to explore the advisor stance.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is divided into four parts. The first, and by far the longest, places the grassroots teachers' center movement in terms of its origins and appeal to different groups of American educational reformers. This is a presentation of an historical and psychological framework for viewing the two major models of professional development: the deficit model and the humanistic-developmental model. It demonstrates how the grassroots teachers' center movement exactly meets criteria established previously for a humanistic-developmental approach to professional growth. This section focuses on the advisory stance in grassroots teachers' centers, reviewing both practice and research to demonstrate the fundamental connections between the advisory stance and the humanistic-developmental model for professional growth.

Part two establishes the need for studies of professional development models, particularly of the above type, in rural areas. In part three, aspects of leadership
theory are reviewed which are relevant to studies of leadership roles and functions in small groups. The fourth part describes educational network theory and establishes the need for further research on on-going networks for educational reform—particularly teachers' centers.

Taken together, the parts of this review establish a clear need for studies of the roles and functions of leaders in rural grassroots teachers' centers as one aspect of the largely untouched area of the leadership in rural educational reform.

**Origins of Teachers' Centers in American Education**

The teachers' center movement of the late 1960s and 1970s is a culmination of forces from every side of the educational scene. Schmeider and Yarger (1974) called teachers' centers "one of the hottest educational concepts on the scene today" (p. 5). Teachers' centers became popular in England, Japan, Germany, and other countries in response to the need for curriculum development and inservice education (DeVault, 1974). In this country educators saw the idea as the answer to many different needs, both educational and political. In their paper entitled, "Concepts of Teacher Centers," Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil (1973) trace American interest in teachers' centering directly to the British experience following Sputnik in the late 1950s. Both the Plowden (1967) and, more specifically, the James
(1972) Report authorized the creation of teachers' centers to assist teachers in understanding and interpreting Nuffield Foundation science and mathematics curriculum materials (Nicholson, et al., 1976; Thornbury, 1974). At the same time the position of teachers' center "advisor" was set up to provide courses and classroom assistance to teachers attempting to move toward the informal classroom methods advocated in the Plowden report (Burrell, 1976).

Open education and the grassroots teachers' center movement.

On this side of the Atlantic educators were seized with the excitement of the British Infant School and began to import British headteachers to lead summer institutes where American teachers could begin to learn the complex strategies of "opening up" their classrooms (Yeomans, 1972). With Ford Foundation support, advisories were soon established to provide continuing support for teachers in some American classrooms (Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel, 1976; Alberty & Dropkin, 1975). By 1968 teachers' centers began to appear too. Early centers were closely modeled on the British assumptions that, 1) basic and effective innovation in the classroom comes about through the efforts of practicing teachers, 2) there exists among teachers a vast reservoir of untapped expertise and experience, and 3) teachers' centers are a neutral place for teachers to reexamine and develop curriculum appropriate to their own students' needs (Burrell, 1976; Devaney, 1974; V. Rogers, 1976).
These teachers' centers were called grassroots centers (Joyce & Weil, 1973), a label which accurately highlighted several common themes which were later described in detail by Devaney and Thorn (1975). Grassroots teachers' centers were generally started and run by classroom teachers. Participation was voluntary. Programs were informal, hands-on and involved making and sharing curriculum ideas. A major philosophical premise was that motivation for growth begins within the individual and change proceeds from the bottom-up rather than from the top-down (Watt, A., 1979).

In their studies of U.S. teachers' centers supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Devaney and her staff at the Teachers' Centers Exchange have found a broader set of premises linking teachers' centers than the tenets of open education. Despite a bewildering variety of form, there seem to be a group of centers sharing the following premises about professional development of teachers (Devaney & Thorn, 1975):

Teachers must be more than technicians, must continue to be learners. Long-lasting improvements in education will come through in-service programs that identify individual starting points for learning in each teacher; build on teachers' motivation to take more, not less, responsibility for curriculum and instruction decisions in the school and the classroom; and welcome teachers to participate in the design of professional development programs (p. 7).

The early teachers' centers often were characterized by independence from the public school bureaucracy and by shoe-
string funding, though at first many of them were given a lift off by foundation grants.

**Teacher unions and teachers' centers.** Another important group of American educators who became powerful spokespeople for teachers' centers during the 1970s was the organized profession. However, this interest was not quick to develop. Eugenia Kemble (1977) of the AFT pointed out that the first centers' emphasis on early-childhood, open-education and working with concrete hands-on materials seemed to exclude secondary teachers. Criticism was also leveled at the informality of needs assessments and programs, unstable funding, lack of evaluative procedures and the fact that grassroots centers rarely included union representation on their governing boards (ibid, 1977).

But, by the early 1970s the organized teaching profession had overcome these hurdles and began to view the teachers' center movement as an extremely promising vehicle in their efforts to secure better conditions for teachers. In the first place, teachers' centers put control of professional growth directly in the hands of classroom teachers. Moreover, union-controlled teachers' centers could powerfully advocate released-time, credentialling and extra-service pay (Peterson, 1978; Leiter & Cooper, 1978; Selden & Darland, 1972). Roy Edelfelt, Director of the National Education Association (NEA) teachers' center project, has described
NEA's aim in an Instructor Special Report (1978). It is "to develop centers which are neutral places where teachers can get help with their own problems; where advisors help develop new strategies; where teachers can learn from each other amid new ideas and resources" (p. 1). While this point of view is closely related to that of the grassroots centers, the governance of such union alligned teachers' centers was to be set up, supported and controlled by organizations representing teachers in collective bargaining. This added a strong advocacy flavor well illustrated in the New York City settings reported on by Leiter & Cooper (1978).

As Geshwind (1970) noted, teacher militancy gave rise to a substantial thrust by the NEA to win federal legislation for teacher controlled teachers' centers. In fact, the legislative shape of the USOE Teachers' Centers Program of 1976 is more than partially the outcome of NEW lobbying. This program, which now funds ninety teachers' center projects across the country represents the strongest federal legislative support for teacher-controlled inservice education, ever\(^1\) (Watt, A., 1978).

The federal government and teachers' centers. A third group which found the British Teachers' Center movement relevant to American educational trends of the late 1960s

\(^1\)A majority of the Policy Board which governs the centers must be composed of full time classroom teachers.
and 1970s were federal education planners. The task force of the National Institute for Advanced Study in Training Disadvantaged Youth put out a study, *Teachers for the Real World* (Smith, B.O., 1969), which, along with the Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Training Complexes (Cohen & Lichtenberg, 1970), recommended that a network of training complexes be established to provide a regional delivery system for validated educational innovations.

Thus the federal government jumped on the teachers' center bandwagon. It hoped that some of the programs it had invested millions of dollars to develop could be delivered to teachers through the medium of the teachers' center training complexes (Dambruch, 1975).

Higher education and teachers' centers. A fourth powerful supporter of teachers' centers in the late 1960s and 1970s was the voice of higher education at the national level. Long criticized for providing heady, irrelevant pre- and inservice courses and programs within their campuses and thus distant from the real world of public school classrooms, some university educators saw the teachers' center as an antidote to the unpopularity of their programs. \(^1\) In 1974 an American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education task force published its final report, *Obligation for Reform*, in which it called for the creation of a network

\(^1\)There were some notable exceptions to this negative reasoning. One was the Integrated Day Program established as a pre- and inservice teacher center network in 1970 at the University of Massachusetts.
of "professional development centers" (Pomeroy, 1977). These centers would provide preservice and credentialled teachers with continuous preparation and retraining until retirement. They would offer 1) integration of practice and theory in teaching and learning, 2) development of measurable performance in instruction, and 3) application and continuous assessment of research findings as conditions of professional competence.

In such "teaching centers" a true collaboration between educational partners was envisaged. Governance would be equally shared by the six groups responsible for improving classroom instruction: the school, teacher organizations, college or university, local community, school board, and state (Pomeroy, ibid.). Schmeider and Yarger (1974) thought this model of teaching center offered answers to several of the big questions facing teacher educators:

1. the linkage of preservice and inservice educational personnel development
2. integration of curriculum and staff development
3. sharing of resources between uncommunicative and sometimes unfriendly educational constituencies, and
4. the continual renewal of educational personnel.

Here again the individual teacher's own intrinsic motivation for growth and idiosyncratic needs were but a single factor in a comprehensive design. One would have to
describe this concept of the teachers' center as another form of delivery system, from the top of the educational mountain down to the classrooms at the bottom.

**Summary.** The growth of teachers' centers in Great Britain triggered an enormous wave of interest in the United States during the 1970s. Four major groups of educators picked up the idea: 1) individual teachers with a bent towards active, individualized learning and local curriculum development; 2) the organized profession, with its commitment of improving the professional status of teachers; 3) the federal government, which saw teachers' centers as local facilities for mass dissemination of technology; and 4) higher education, which saw the need to coordinate pre-service and inservice programs in sites which were off-campus.

Although each of these four groups was influenced by the British experience with teachers' centers in the 1960s, they designed teachers' centers based on their own educational biases and the political realities of the time. Yet underneath this variety in structures and purposes for teachers' centers lies a much narrower range of assumptions about adult professional development. In fact, the following sections will develop the argument that there are just two

---

basic theoretical models for professional development. One approach is based on behavioral assumptions and has produced the "traditional," "deficit" or "top down" model of adult professional development (Pomeroy, 1977; Edelfelt, 1975; Dambruch, 1974). The other is based on humanistic and developmental assumptions and has given rise to the "growth" or "developmental" model of adult professional development (Rubin, 1971; Bunker, 1979; Combs, et al. 1971; Rogers, C., 1969; Maslow, 1968; Hruska, 1977; Watt, A., 1979). While teachers' centers respond to both models, only the latter shows promise for promoting lasting and meaningful adult development.

The Deficit Model of Professional Development

History and psychological foundations. The concept of a teacher as a technician, filled with a body of knowledge to be passed on to students, is anchored in the beginnings of American public education. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) identified twelve basic concepts which have shaped the continuing professional development of teachers. Among them are: learning is the receiving of information to be stored and used later; inservice education is training designed, planned and conducted for the teacher by persons in authority; the central purpose of inservice education is the remediation of teachers' deficiencies in subject content; leadership is direction-from-above and motivation
is direction-from-outside; intellectual leadership in goal-setting and planning for inservice education is expected to come from outside the school; and prescriptive legislation is an appropriate vehicle for improving the quality of teaching standards.

Although these notions were born in the 18th and 19th centuries when teachers were generally clergymen or women volunteers who could read and compute simple figures, they continued to be appropriate right up to the present technological delivery systems of the centralized American educational bureaucracy. This set of assumptions was especially relevant after Sputnik, during the curriculum reform movement of the late 1950s and 1960s, when "teacher proof" curriculum packages were developed for mass consumption (Nicholson, et al., 1976).

Underlying this traditional or deficit approach to learning, can be found a set of widely accepted assumptions about how learning takes place. Harking back to Locke, Thorndike and Skinner, the human infant is seen as a "tabula rasa," a blank slate on which all life's experiences would be imprinted (Belenky, et al., 1979). Behavior is externally motivated. External stimulus gives rise to internal response. Lawrence Kohlberg and Rochelle Mayer (1972) show how behaviorism leads to the "cultural transmission" ideology where "educating consists of transmitting knowledge, skills, and social and moral rules of the culture" (p. 5). Motiva-
tion, to the behaviorist, comes from the external stimuli of reward and punishment. The human organism is basically passive, or unmotivated, until an outside influence stirs it to action. That both behavior modification and educational technology are direct outgrowths of behavioral psychology indicates the enormous importance of this school of learning theory in education today.

In this view teachers are seen as clinicians whose weaknesses can be diagnosed and whose competence can be improved in terms of specific behaviors. Professional development involves training through presentation, simulation and feedback, which will modify some skills, and provide other new ones to update the teacher/clinician and prepare him/her to teach the changing requirements of the culture.

Current practice in relation to teachers' centers. The belief that people are extrinsically motivated has stimulated a number of systems for reward and punishment in order to attract teachers to participate in programs of teachers' centers. Some teachers' center programs have mandated participation, while others offer credit toward degrees or credentials, released time and sometimes even pay to teachers who will attend them. The organized profession strongly favors such a reward system (Leiter and Cooper, 1978).

Many teacher centers today incorporate some degree of top-down thrust to their programming in order to meet such
district, state and federal directives as mainstreaming of the handicapped, multi-cultural education, basic competencies, bi-lingual education. Some federally funded teachers' centers with teacher majority policy boards find it a political necessity to go along with certain mandated programs.¹

Feiman (1977) claims that the U.S. Office of Education was responsible for casting the teachers' center concept into a behavioral frame of reference in its National Teachers' Center Project of 1971. Teachers' centers in four states were supported. Major assumptions were 1) that teaching could be improved by changing the power relationships among educational institutions, and 2) that educational problems could be solved by technology. In the case of the Rhode Island Teachers' Center, validated products were chosen by administrators to be "installed" throughout the state. The list of inservice training programs was composed mainly of mini-courses and learning packages for Individually Prescribed Instruction in Math (ibid.). Here the educational process was to be improved by the infusion of validated products. Federal support of teachers' centers has definitely favored the deficit approach to professional development.

¹As a consultant to policy boards of several of these centers in Indiana, Massachusetts and New York, the author has found this to be evident. In fact, inclusion of federal directives in original proposals may have influenced the funding of some of the current Office of Education Teachers' Centers.
Another model for professional development of teachers involves interaction between the learner and what is to be learned. It implies a progression from a less professional to a more professional outlook through stages. Progression from one stage to the next is not primarily the result of external support but of internal motivation.

The Humanistic Developmental Model of Professional Development

History, psychological foundations and applications. The twentieth century antecedents of this second basic approach to professional growth can be traced first to the educational reforms of Parker and Dewey, and, later, to the humanistic psychology and open education movements.

It is unfortunate that Samuel Chester Parker's many brilliant contributions both to educational philosophy and to pedagogy during the first quarter of the twentieth century are so little known now. While professor of educational methods at the University of Chicago in the early decades of the twentieth century, Parker published at least four major textbooks (1912, 1915, 1919, 1923). Claiming to be strongly influenced by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Froebel and William James, he advocated the following "general aspects of learning": that each pupil learns through his own responses, influenced by his past experience and present frame of mind and that attention to school activities is best secured by utilizing the child's active interests (1923).
From close observation of experienced teachers at the University of Chicago Laboratory School, Parker saw that the first task of the successful teacher was to establish a positive physical and emotional climate for learning. This included stimulating native curiosity by focussing on the subject matter of the child's own life, family setting and community (ibid., 1923).

Rarely does Parker refer to his predecessor and much better known contemporary, John Dewey. Dewey is, of course, credited with being the father of progressive education in the twentieth century. This movement put the child and his/her own experience squarely at the center of the curriculum, rather than the subject matter to be learned. Yet Dewey's philosophy and the progressive movement have often been misinterpreted. In both *Democracy in Education* (1916) and *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902) Dewey elaborated on the simple theme of learning by doing. He proposed schools in which social responsibility could be learned by recreating microcosms of social issues and problems with which children could interact to reconstruct in a step-by-step sequence the real world in which they lived. The teacher's role as facilitator of the child's explorations and as extender of his understanding was crucial in making the connections leading to growth. Childrens' active involvement with their natural environment, the core curriculum concept, and emphasis on social problem-solving, characterized the modest
number of successful progressive schools in the 1920s to 1940s (Cremin, 1961).

The 1950s and '60s saw the culmination of new ideas about human learning and growth, in the "third force," "humanistic" or "perceptual" psychology movement. The theories of Arthur Combs, Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers have provided educators with a vision of human learning and growth as:

- primarily motivated from within (Rogers, 1969)
- based on positive feelings about the self (Rogers, 1969)
- based on the making of personal meaning (Combs et al., 1974)
- absolutely idiosyncratic (Combs et al., 1974)
- emanating from a basic drive to meet five levels of needs (Maslow, 1970)
- arising from interactions between the learner and the environment (Combs et al., 1974)

Educational writers and staff developers have applied these theories to inservice programs (Bunker, 1976, 1977; Hruska, 1977; Rubin, 1977a) and researchers have documented their usefulness in promoting professional growth (Lawrence, 1974; Bussis & Chittenden, 1976; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

The open education movement of the 1960s and '70s further contributed to this view that people learn through active involvement with the environment (Bunker, 1976;
The core idea that teaching is the facilitation of learning emerges directly from humanistic psychology. Teacher facilitators need skill in forming supportive interpersonal relationships to help learners move in the direction of maturity or self-actualization (Maslow, 1970).

Another major influence on the "growth" perspective is Piaget's work in the field of developmental psychology. In his thorough and fascinating studies of children, Piaget provided fundamental documentation that we learn through physical, cognitive and social interaction with our environment. Knowledge is not absorbed; it is invented. Moreover, growth is patterned in stages which are not necessarily age-related.

Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) call this the "cognitive developmental or interactionist theory of development" (p. 455). The present study argues that there is a confluence of developmental psychology with its interaction and stage theory and humanistic psychology with its individual self-actualization, in the grassroots teachers' center movement.²


²This would be equally true of the Open Education movement.
A number of major educational writers and staff-developers have applied these fundamental assumptions to educational settings. Rubin (1971, 1978) in particular has called for inservice programs based on the self-identified individual needs of teachers. He calls for a reversal in policy so that,

proﬁcial growth is regarded not as something the system does to the individual but rather as something the individual does to himself (1972, 273).

Of course, as Nicholson, et al (1976) point out, this view is incompatible with standardized specifications of competency for teachers, or with any kind of training program imposed on teachers from the top-down.

Another educator, Bunker (1977, 1978, 1979a), has bridged the gap between humanistic developmental theory and practice. With his associates Bunker has built a conceptual framework for professional development which has been directly translated into practice. Every training activity is based on one or more of the following "Beliefs Which Foster Human Growth" (Bunker 1979a):

1. Participants should be actively involved in solving real problems. People learn to do what they do. Learning takes place when people have an opportunity to interact with data.

2. Participants' needs must be met. In order to deal with higher order needs (cognitive, self-actualization) lower

order needs (psychological, security, belongingness) must be met.

3. Participants should be involved in decision-making about the design, implementation and evaluation of their own programs. **Shared decision-making** increases involvement.

4. **Skill acquisition** is valued. Skills are the tools for solving real problems.

5. Participants respond positively to the opportunity to work from their **strengths**. People are more effective when they feel good about themselves. Success is built upon success.

6. Participants seem better able to apply new learnings, refine their skills and continue growing as they get **feedback and support** from others. Human support systems encourage movement toward renewal.

7. **Growth takes time** and tends to occur in stages.

8. Participants will benefit from **self-initiated** and **self-directed** learning. People are their own instruments for growth. A major aim of staff development is to help others become more **self-directed** (p. 2).

These humanistic and developmental concepts of learning and growth form the theoretical framework for the second basic model of teachers' centers. This model has been variously labelled "bottom-up" (Watt, A., 1979; Devaney, ed., 1977; Mai, 1978; Scheinfeld et al., 1978); "developmental" (McLaughlin & Berman, 1977); "grassroots" (Martin,
The next section looks at research on professional growth programs which are humanistic and developmental. This will provide a strong rationale for the choice of the humanistic-development model of professional growth programs which are humanistic and developmental. This will provide a strong rationale for the choice of the humanistic-developmental teachers' center as the single most promising type of teachers' center for the purposes of this study.

Research findings supporting the humanistic developmental model of professional growth. Both Edelfelt (1977) and Nicholson et al., (1976) have attempted to take stock of the enormous literature on inservice education. They concur that the first reasonably good review of research was that conducted by Gordon Lawrence at al. in 1974 for the Florida State Department of Education. Lawrence analyzed ninety-seven programs for differences in materials, procedures, designs and settings. Those programs rated as most effective contained more of the following attributes:

1. They were school-based rather than college-based.
2. Teachers participated as planners and helpers in the programs. They took an active role.
3. Demonstration of materials was combined with supervised trial, followed by some form of feedback.
4. Teachers provided mutual assistance to each other rather than working on their own.
5. The programs were linked to a broader strategy of school-staff development, rather than one-shot events.
6. Teachers could choose goals and activities themselves rather than being told what to do.

7. Programs that were self-initiated and self-designed were rare but had a high rate of success.¹

A humanistic perspective is evident in this list, in that it directly suggests an approach to teacher professional growth beginning with self-identified need and offering peer support. A developmental thrust is also suggested in points 2, 3, and 5, where active learning over time is indicated.

Another noteworthy research study was conducted from 1973-1977 by the Rand Corporation. It examined 293 federally funded innovative programs supporting educational change (some of them in teachers' centers) in order to determine the most effective implementation strategies and the strategies which led to continuation beyond federal funding. The findings of this two phase study were reported in four volumes (1974, 1975, 1977, 1978). Its principal authors, Berman and McLaughlin, have discussed implications of the Rand findings at some length in the educational literature.²

¹This list is condensed from Edelfelt and Lawrence (1977) 18-19, and Nicholson (1976, 20-22).

The Rand study offered a number of findings significant to the present research. It suggested quite conclusively that, in both rural and urban "change agent" projects, the most effective programs provided concrete, teacher specific, on-going training and support in teachers' own classrooms offered by local consultants with local materials development.

The size and scope of federal funding had almost no relationship to successful project outcomes. Much more important were 1) whether a project had broad-based local administrative support right from the beginning, and 2) the extent to which mutual adaptation of both project goals and local setting took place in the implementation phase. Important methods for ensuring mutual adaptation were frequent meetings, classroom support by resource personnel and teacher participation in decision-making.

Also important was the project's leadership. As Zigarmi (1978) points out in her analysis of the Rand findings, "the change agent data show that the more effective the project director (in the view of teachers) the higher the percentage of project goals achieved" (81). On the other hand, the long term continuation of the innovative project was not found to be related to effective project leadership, but rather, to the attitude of building principals, and other institutional factors.

Research certainly favors a heuristic approach to professional growth. Both Lawrence (1974) and the Rand study
(Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) point to the need for programs that are developmental and humanistic. The Rand study concludes, however, that even the best staff development program will not succeed without certain political and institutional factors, namely, supportive administrators right from the start of the project, real mutual adaptation of goals and activities, and a "critical mass" of active participants.

Current practice: the grassroots teachers' center movement, the Teachers' Centers Exchange and the advisor concept. The findings of the Rand study came as no surprise to many grassroots teachers' centers across the country. Some of these grassroots centers had grown out of the open education movement. Others drew their philosophic sustenance from Dewey, Piaget, Combs, Rogers or Maslow. Most of them already modeled the small scale, local, individualized, adaptive, concrete, teacher-to-teacher style of operation characterizing the Rand study's successful projects (Devaney & Thorn, 1975). Despite striking differences in program, governance, financing and staffing, grassroots teachers' centers are bound together by their humanistic developmental assumptions about the way people grow. Active-learning, voluntary participation, non-judgmental on-going support and attention to individual needs are major themes in grassroots teachers' centers. In such centers teachers are viewed as competent
evolving professionals with valuable expertise to share.

Around these themes has developed a unique federal program: the Teachers' Centers Exchange, funded since 1975 by the National Institute of Education. The purpose of the Exchange is to develop and strengthen an informal network of teachers' centers "which advocate and provide for professional growth based on the personality of the teacher and the reality of the classroom" (Devaney, 1977, p. 3). Although the Exchange does not run an active center itself, it puts into practice the premises of teachers' centering on a national scale through phone calls, personal visits, publications and conferences of peers called workparties. In fact, Kathleen Devaney and her staff model precisely the humanistic developmental approach to teachers' centering that they advocate.

By 1979 the Teachers' Centers Exchange network had established some contact with over 500 centers which shared at least some of the following characteristics (Devaney, ed. 1977).

- They offer teachers fresh curriculum materials and/or lesson ideas, emphasizing active, exploratory, frequently individualized classroom work, not textbook and workbook study.

- These programs engage teachers in making their own curriculum materials, building classroom apparatus, or involve them in some entirely new learning pursuit of their own so as to reaquaint them with the experience of being active, exploratory learners themselves.

- Attendance at teachers' center activities tends to be voluntary or, if required, is at least based on their own previously expressed training needs.
- Teachers' center instructors are themselves mostly classroom teachers sharing their own expertise, engaging colleagues to make their own curriculum materials so that all become active exploratory learners. (pp. 150-151)

In grassroots teachers' centers, teachers are strongly encouraged to renew themselves as learners through informal "make-and-take" activities. But these hands-on activities are seen as only the first step in a developmental sequence leading to what Katz (1972) calls maturity, or a deepened "understanding of the total complex context in which he or she is trying to be effective" (26-27). Devaney (1977) describes teachers' center participants as careerists in search of a profession. Teachers' centers should promote what she calls "the depth of thought, the sureness of touch, the smooth mesh of theory with technique that are associated with professionalism" (17). O'Brien (1977) shapes a distinction between teachers' centers which promote teacher change (by helping a district implement a newly mandated reading series for example) and those which promote teacher development. Development is further elucidated by Lickona and Hasch (1976) as a "progression from 'make-and-take' kinds of concerns to involvement in personal learning, reflective discussion with staff, and construction of a point of view about teaching and learning" (451).

A unique feature of grassroots teachers' centers is
their staff members' "advisory stance." This involves a way of viewing and interacting with teachers' centers participants as capable professionals whether it is over the phone, in a meeting, during a workshop, in their classrooms. The staff member adopting the advisory stance is truly acting out the core of the humanistic developmental teachers' center philosophy. The advisory stance is a mode of relating to professional peers which involves starting with people's strengths and acting as friend, colleague, non-evaluative supporter and honest pusher in the direction of change and development (Thomas, 1979). The next sections will describe briefly 1) how advisors differ from consultants in other roles in American education; 2) what skills they need to have; 3) some of the problems of advisory work; and 4) research on advisories.

Advisors differ from other roles in American education. Katz (1974) describes four ways in which advisors are different from other closely related non-teaching roles (like supervisors, curriculum specialists, assistant superintendents in charge of instruction). Advisors provide help only when asked, only in terms of the teacher's own goals and needs, generally (but not always) within the classroom, and with the object of increasing a teacher's autonomy and independence.

1Kathleen Devaney distinguished work done with teachers in their own classrooms (advisor work) from similar work done with teachers whether in or out of their classrooms (the advisor stance) at the First Rural Workparty, July 5-8, 1978, at the Mountain Towns' Teachers' Center, Wilmington, Vermont.
Advisors tend to work with individual teachers more than with groups. They prefer extended involvement to "one-short" visits. Mai (1977), Manolakes (1975), Sproul (1977), Devaney (1977), Thomas (1979), and Apelman (1976, 1977, 1978) have observed and documented this heuristic approach to advisory work which is a mainstay of the humanistic developmental approach to the professional growth of teachers.

Armington (Devaney 1974) the first British advisor to work in the U.S., described his work with teachers in their classrooms. The advisor, he wrote,

> does not try to sell ready-made programs, 'packages' or methods. Instead his job is to respond to the demands of the situation. He does not tell people what they should do but tries to extend what they are capable of doing. He tries to sense what can be built upon. . . . The advisor's strategy is to work in places and with individuals who are ready for change. . . . Advisors go only where they are invited, and the relationship must always be one of mutual trust (75).

**Background and skills of advisors.** What skills and background should an advisor have? Although it should be clear from the foregoing that advisory work involves at least a blend of human supportiveness with professional knowledge and experience, there is some disagreement as to whether advisors need to be master teachers themselves. Apelman (1978), Devaney (1974), Weber (1974, 1978), Thomas (1979), and Hawkins (1974), make a strong case for the master teacher advisor. Katz (1974) and Mai (1978) find the following Rogerian qualities of the helping relationship more important: "an unobtrusive style of relating to other professionals. . .
a professional humility with a capacity to put other people at ease while at the same time challenging them to accept real responsibility for their own growth" (p. 10). Thomas (1979) points out that advisors "usually relate as generalists who are prepared to help teachers think through any area of their work. This is possible because the advisor's expertise lies not only in their extensive teaching experience but also in the process of helping adults examine their own and children's learning" (p. 4).

Newman, in a recent study (1980), identifies in the literature the following seven characteristics of advisors: they generally

1. have a positive self-concept
2. respect teachers' individuality
3. understand and draw upon the principles of developmental learning.
4. enjoy being involved in other people's growth
5. have leadership ability in working with adults
6. are skilled teachers with depth in at least one area of the curriculum
7. are actively involved in their own learning and growth.

San Jose sums up the challenge of advisory work in her description of this part of the teachers' center leader's job (Devaney ed., 1979):
It's fairly easy to walk in and tell someone what to do. It's not too difficult to listen to a problem and say what you would do. To listen to people and then help them think through what is the next best step for them, that is an extraordinarily demanding way to work! (p. 49)

The matter of what skills and abilities an advisor should have is an important issue for teachers' centers since it relates directly to staffing. Devaney et al., (1974, 1975, 1977, 1979) have written convincingly of the centrality of an advisory to successful grassroots teachers' center functioning. Yet in-classroom work still is not a very common feature of teachers' centers, especially with those which are not directly connected to the withering open education movement. Recognizing that teachers' centers talk more about advisories than they actually provide for them, this study views it important to find out what rural teachers think of the kinds of advisory work their teachers' center leaders do.

Problems of advisories. Although Devaney (1979) suggests that the teaching advisor is "fundamentally different from other supervisory jobs in the public education system and one which I believe may be essential in any serious effort to induce teachers to renew their learning. . ." (p. 7), there are some major difficulties inherent in the role.

The first is economic. Advisors who work on a one-to-one basis with teachers in their classrooms over extended periods of time are expensive. A number of teachers' centers
which started without advisories (particularly in rural areas) found that teachers had trouble getting to the distant center. When they tried taking the center to the schools the centers began to increase in impact.\(^1\) One issue addressed by this study is whether the in-classroom advisory service should be an aspect of leadership in small rural teachers' centers.

Manolakes (1975) and others have argued that the investment required for an in-classroom advisory service is cost effective, for growth that is slowly promoted tends to be real while change imposed quickly from the top down more often results in merely a cosmetic effect. Still, the sad demise of two of the best known and documented advisories for lack of funds belies this argument.\(^2\)

Katz (1974), Feiman and Peters (1976), and Thomas (1979), note a tension between ends and means in advisory work, which may lead more quickly to burn out than other jobs. In their experience, advisors must attempt to gain the trust of and work with all teachers, even those whose beliefs and teaching style differ fundamentally from their

\(^1\)This has been documented by Martin in Colchester, Connecticut and by Watt in Wilmington, Vermont, in proposals submitted to the Office of Education for Teachers' Center Program funding, March, 1978.

\(^2\)After ten years of advisory work, the economic crunch has forced both the Mountain View Center for Environmental Education in Boulder, Colorado and the Advisory to Open Corridors in New York City to fold up their in-classroom advisory services.
own. Basic differences in values may make non-judgmental support very difficult to give over extended periods of time.

Political subtleties can interfere with effective advising, too. Principals and other supervisors may be threatened by someone whose role is not aligned with the district hierarchy. Advisors do not evaluate so they quickly gain access to classrooms and the trust of teachers that others may envy. Katz (1974) and Thomas (1979) highlight the difficulty advisors sometimes have in answering a principal's questions about what goes on in classrooms, without undermining a teacher's trust.

Another dilemma for an advisor is the conflict between building an intense, productive working relationship with a teacher and at the same time bearing in mind the goal of facilitating teacher independence and autonomy. While Weber (1974) and Katz (1974) claim that fostering teacher autonomy is a primary goal of advisor work, the present author found that the linking work and the sheer companionship advisors provided for teachers in isolated rural classrooms seemed very difficult for both teachers and advisors to relinquish.¹

Moreover, advisors often find it difficult to judge their own effectiveness. Often they are looking for changes in teachers' behavior. They may not be aware that they have

helped forstall burn-out or have simply helped maintain "sanity."

Finally, Katz (1974) found that advisors felt drained from the need to be enthusiastic and "high" all the time. Contagion from their cheerful optimism was highly valued by teachers. The problem was, where could advisors, working essentially alone, get refuelled themselves?

Obviously the educational and personal challenges of advising are substantial. Several teachers' center researchers are currently exploring the notion that teachers probably go through stages in their professional growth which depend on many different factors and which probably require different kinds of advising at different times (Field, 1979; Watts, 1979; Martin, Watt and Thomas\(^1\)). Further research on stages of teacher development would substantially assist advisors in matching their services to teacher need.

Research on advisories.\(^2\) Undoubtedly the most comprehensive study to date of the role of the classroom advisor

\(^1\)These three have pursued this complex notion of a stage theory since the first Rural Workparty sponsored in 1978 by the Teachers' Centers Exchange. Martin is currently writing up their very tentative findings.

\(^2\)To the best of this author's knowledge, only one study of the impact of in-classroom advisory work preceded the one reported here. Patricia Ball observed and interviewed 15 teachers associated with Lilian Weber's Open Corridors Advisory. She found that teachers involved in both the teachers' center and the advisory "were more consistently 'open' than those only involved in the teachers' center (Lickona, T. and Hasch, P. "Research on Teachers' Centers." Educational Leadership 33, no. 6 (March 1976).
was conducted by Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976). They held in-depth interviews with sixty teachers who had received summer training in open classroom techniques and were involved in applying them during the school year with the support of advisors. Using "interactive and person-oriented viewpoints" (p. 1) they examined the internalized assumptions and constructs about teaching and learning of the teachers involved in this change process toward open education. Of the forty-four involved in the advisor program, thirty viewed the advisory support they received as the most significant of a number of influences in their growth as teachers (ibid., p. 138).

A coding scheme was developed to explore what kinds of advisor support they really valued. This scheme contained thirteen categories from "no perceived support" to "advisor perceived as leader and challenger." In general, the results showed that teachers perceived the same advisor activity in many different ways; that emotional support, respector of individuality, and providing new/alternative ideas were highly valued. In addition, those teachers most committed to the philosophy of open education were most receptive to the advisor support categories requiring the highest degree of mediation.¹

¹Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel use the term "mediation" to denote the degree to which teachers use the advisor's support to help them shape their own ideas. If the teacher simply "consumes" advisory service without internalizing or integrating it, mediation does not take place (Bussis, Anne; Chittenden, Edward; and Amarel, Marianne. Beyond Surface Curriculum: an Interview Study of Teachers' Understandings. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1976, pp. 157-158).
Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel's interview and coding scheme have been tested for congruence in several other settings (1976). But because of the length of time required for this in-depth validation process, the findings are based on very small samples. Moreover, the coding scheme represents the researchers' synthesis of a wide variety of teachers' responses. The categories provide a good tool for researchers to use in studying the advisory role but the coding scheme itself has not undergone the scrutiny of teachers. As part of the present study, teachers are asked to respond directly to the coding scheme. The findings, which are reported in Chapter IV, offer insights into the use of the coding scheme to describe the advisory stance, and lead to suggestions for changing the wording of some of the thirteen categories for further direct use with teachers.

One other study of the Advisor deserves note. Newman (1980) compared selected advisor's perceptions of their own roles with characteristics of the advisor role she identified in the literature. Newman found only 3 strategies that consistently bridged the gap between theory and practice: 1) concrete and material support, 2) emotional support, and 3) extending and investigating support. The advisors in this study rarely entered classrooms. Most of their work was


1Two categories have been added to the list of 13 by the present investigator, based on her experience and research on advisory work, 1976-1978.
done in the teachers' center and the school.

**Summary.** From the above discussion a picture emerges of a distinctive type of teachers' center, one which focuses on individual people as their own instruments for educational improvement rather than the delivery of new products or policies for instructional improvement. This type of teachers' center, variously called "growth-oriented," "developmental," "bottom-up," "grassroots," originated to support teachers who were changing from traditional to open methods of teaching. Grassroots centers have attracted to their staffs a new type of change agent called an advisor. Advisors take a heuristic and eclectic approach to adult professional growth. This approach is based on the developmental assumptions about learning associated with Parker, Dewey, and Piaget, and the humanistic assumptions of Rogers, Maslow and Combs. Both research and practice indicate that lasting professional growth is fostered more adequately by humanistic developmental assumptions and practices than by behavioral assumptions and systems-oriented training practices. Thus, further study of teachers' centers which firmly subscribe to the humanistic developmental assumptions about adult professional development is warranted.

To continue narrowing the focus for this study, Part II of this review will look at the rather sparse literature on rural inservice education. It will establish a rationale for further limiting the present research to a study of
rural teachers' centers.

**Rural Inservice Education: Problems and Possibilities**

Most grassroots teachers' centers are found in urban and suburban areas of the United States. Some statewide teachers' center programs (in Florida and North Dakota) have appeared in rural sites. Only a handful of teachers' centers have emerged in rural settings as the outgrowth of truly local, community-based efforts. Yet a forthcoming study of exemplary rural education programs by Dartmouth educator Faith Dunne (1978)\(^1\) claims that "the recent large-scale program with the greatest potential impact on rural school reform is probably the Teacher Center movement (which is) . . . more readily adaptable to rural needs than many earlier models" (pp. 26-27). Apart from two case studies of one rural teachers' center, (Dunne, 1980, and Watt, J., 1979) the present project is the first attempt to collect and analyze data to test the assertion that the rural teachers' center holds promise for rural school reform.

A look at the literature on rural educational reform reveals a number of problems confronting rural educators.

---

\(^1\)This case study for the NIE Schools Capacity for Problem Solving will be published by the Education Commission of the States in 1980 in a book edited by Paul Nachtegal, of the Rural Education Project, Wheatridge, Colorado.
These have had, and may continue to exercise, crippling restraints on efforts to provide opportunities for the professional development of rural teachers. The next three sections will 1) examine rural teaching conditions to establish the special needs of rural teachers for professional growth opportunities, 2) describe the conditions of rural life which inhibit rural school reform in general and rural teacher support in particular, and 3) review some of the more significant efforts to overcome these barriers and to provide professional growth programs to rural teachers.

Rural teaching conditions give rise to special inservice needs. Any rural study must first define rural.\(^1\) Here it is used to indicate people and land outside counties containing cities of 50,000 or more (Moe & Tamblyn, 1974). This definition of rural as "non-metropolitan" includes on the one hand people living on dispersed farmsteads,

\(^1\)Both Sher (1977) and Moe & Tamblyn (1974) explain that the term "rural" is more useful as a population-based census construct than as a descriptor of a geographic or cultural sector of this nation. Pluralism is a more accurate way to denote the range in rural situations from extreme poverty to great wealth; cultural and class homogeneity to vast heterogeneity; farm hamlets surrounded by miles of open countryside, to suburban farms. Of the six possible demographic definitions of rural, the one chosen above is the most common, and the source of most of the statistics used in this study (see Sher, 348, 377). (Moe, Edward O., and Tamblyn, Lewis R. Rural Schools as a Mechanism for Rural Development. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, ERIC/CRESS, 1974.)
hamlets or villages of less than 2,500. On the other hand, it includes those living in small, semi-industrial communities of 10-30,000 which lie outside the geographical orbit of cities of 50,000 or more (Sher, 1977). In this study, rural also involves locations at least thirty miles from the nearest institution of higher education or state-sponsored site offering graduate programs for teachers.

According to these criteria, a lot of our country is still rural. Fifty-four million or 26.5% of Americans live in rural areas, and fully one-third of the nation's school children attend rural schools with an average district enrollment of 1,323 or less (Sher, ibid.). There are 8,500 school superintendents in districts of under 2,000 pupils (American Association of School Administrators, 1979).

But what do all these statistics mean about the conditions of teaching in rural America? Burdin and Poliakoff (1973) speak to this issue compellingly in their ERIC/CRESS report on "In-Service Education for Rural School Personnel," summarizing all RIE and CJIE documents on rural inservice. They point out that rural schools still tend to be small.¹ Teachers must often teach several

¹It is not within the scope of this study to document one of the great issues of rural education during this century: consolidation. The theory that rural education would be improved by eliminating rural schools, (the number of one teacher schools dropped from 60,000 in 1950
grade levels in the same elementary class room or several subjects beyond their specialty area in high schools. This means many preparations every day. Since small schools tend to have less library books, less AV materials, and less teaching resources, teachers have to rely upon themselves more heavily as curriculum developers than do their large school counterparts. (Burdin and Poliakoff [ibid] even claim that the small school teacher is the curriculum!) Besides limited resources, rural teachers have limited specialized personnel to help them out. There are rarely central office staff in charge of curriculum and instruction and not many—if any—special education, modern language, reading, music and art teachers. In these circumstances rural classroom teachers must solve their own problems and create their own options for working with students who have special needs and abilities. Cross-age teaching and mainstreaming may be the latest fad in some quarters, but for rural teachers they have been everyday realities for years.

Clearly rural teachers need to be specially trained as generalists (Sher, 1976). They must be able to wear many hats and to respond to the requirements of students with the complete range of skills and abilities. Yet the

to 2,000 in 1970, according to Faith Dunne, 1978) has been hotly contested in recent studies by Sher, Rosenfeld, and Dunne (1977) among others.
rural school day rarely includes even a single free period for planning. The rural teacher, who teaches many academic subjects, supervises recess and lunch, drives the school bus on a field trip, and often coaches a sport after school, has no free time for planning. In some small schools a teaching principal or teacher has total responsibility for a group of students for three or four years in a row and no nearby colleague in the same situation with whom to talk.¹

Add to this the geographic isolation of many rural teachers from good sized public libraries, cultural centers, colleges and even from other schools with colleagues teaching the same things, and the rural teacher's job begins to look like a lonely mission indeed. Rural isolation is expressed in another way, too. New ideas, new educational technologies and techniques seem to arrive slowly in rural areas, if at all. One study has suggested that this may be partly due to lack of central office grant writers and partly to a deep strain of rural conservatism (Watt, J., 1979). The result is to put rural teachers in a backwash where stagnation threatens (ibid.).

¹Such a situation prevails in southern Vermont where within 150 square miles there are two men who teach grades 5-8 in two 3-teacher schools (Watt, A., 1978).
Not surprisingly, collective bargaining in rural areas is less developed than in urban areas. And where unions do exist, contracts contain little other than an afternoon or two of released time for mandated inservice activities and occasionally the provision for partial reimbursement for a graduate course. Other problems for the rural teacher, noted in the Recommendations of the National Seminar on Rural Education (1979) are lower salaries, the persistently high drop-out rate of students, and the apparent lack of incentives for the most talented rural teachers to stay in rural schools. Watt, J. (1979) suggests that the rural teachers' lack of professional status in their communities accrues partly from their identification by townspeople with other community functions like the road crew.

These then are some of the rural teaching conditions which are different from conditions teachers face in many metropolitan areas. Such conditions strikingly illuminate the particular needs rural teachers have for professional advancement opportunities. Why, then, are there so few examples of inservice programs for rural teachers? Why, among over six hundred ERIC abstracts of Rural Education entries in three Bibliographies of Rural Education, are there only two containing the word "Inservice" in their
Conditions of rural life hinder educational advancement despite some rural advantages. In 1967 the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty put out the landmark document, The People Left Behind. This study spelled out the socio-economic reasons for the unequal education available to rural youth. Rural sociologists Moe and Tamblyn (1974) tie rural education to issues of rural development, asserting that rural schools can only be improved by taking account of the total conditions and all of the institutions of rural society. They summarize the socio-economic situation succinctly: Basic deficiencies in rural education stem from rural poverty, a sparse population spread over wide areas, community isolation, limited public services, lack of local leadership and the concomitant of these problems--insufficient taxable resources to support educational services (ibid., 1974).

---


2 The complexity of the cycle of rural poverty and underdevelopment is graphically illustrated by Sher (1976, p. 298).
Equally important is a deep strain of conservatism in isolated areas. In the words of a rural school board member,

I learned the three R's in school; all these fancy, expensive new ideas are just distracting frills. As for 'professional development' of teachers--aren't they trained in their college certification courses to do the job? They already earn more than me. Why should our tax dollars pay for more education for them? Why I was taught by a fine teacher who never even went to college!¹

This rather logical pattern of thinking can often be found among rural parents and school committees. Resistance to outside "improvements" is a natural outcome.

Moe and Tamblyn also point out that because rural schools do attempt to comply with state and federal mandates to change, they are often distrusted by local citizens and are not viewed as a positive force. A school committee that pushes for change is likely to be distrusted and usually bows to the more conservative and powerful Board of Selectmen (Moe & Tamblyn, 1974). Thus population sparsity, lack of funds, and the conservative stance of the local community mitigate against school reform in rural, sparsely populated areas.

But the picture isn't all negative. Small communities and small classes, close personal relationships, the fact that the school is often the largest institution,

¹School Board member, to the author in rural Vermont, 1977.
major employer and central public facility in a small community, and that the life space of students, teachers and citizens has considerable overlap, are all factors which can work in favor of rural schools as the stage for rural reform. Sher (1977) summarizes both the positive and negative aspects of rural life as they relate to school reform in general and inservice education of teachers in particular. The major point of his well-documented anti-consolidation study is that while outside input is necessary to combat the effects of rural isolation,

the primacy of local circumstance must be respected . . . the linkages between school and community must be expanded. . . (and) reform efforts must capitalize upon the strengths as well as correct the deficiencies, of rural schools (pp. 274-276).

With few exceptions (Muse, 1977) there are no pre-service training programs specifically designed to prepare teachers for rural teaching conditions. In May, 1979, the government sponsored National Seminar on Rural Education recommended that the federal government should assist universities in the development of special pre-service training programs for rural teachers. This seems a sad need to reinvent the wheel, for An Office of Education Conference Bulletin in 1928, indicated the existence of a sizable number of programs for the preparation of rural teachers back in the 1920s.
In sum, then, it appears that rural teachers who have not been specially prepared for rural teaching, have a particularly compelling set of needs for professional support services. But the economic and cultural nature of rural life makes it difficult (perhaps impossible) for small communities to offer their teachers such support. And yet rural people dislike and distrust costly educational innovations dropped on them and financed from the outside. This poses a real dilemma. Lack of local funds, underdeveloped teacher bargaining power and a resistance to viewing teachers as professionals who deserve continuing support to perform a complex job—all these factors present problems for rural inservice planners. No wonder there are so few rural professional development projects described in the literature.

Yet there have been some creative attempts to remove these roadblocks to rural professional development. These efforts have been mounted, for the most part, through the collaborative efforts of universities, state departments, foundations, the federal government, and also, in a few documented cases, by locally sponsored grassroots efforts.

Recent models for rural inservice education. From the beginning of the rural school reform efforts of the mid 1800s, right up to the present day, the rural professional
development projects reported in the literature have been mostly top-down, with a sprinkling of grassroots efforts. There were those which attempted to upgrade rural teachers by imposing on them urban solutions, and those which paid more than lip service to the idea that rural settings breed rural needs and these are best met in locally designed programs.\(^1\) Though the balance between the top-down and the grassroots or bottom-up approaches is often difficult to discern in the literature, the more recent rural inservice models seem to have one thing in common: they claim to offer individualized approaches more often than group solutions. Wilson summarized this position in his *Review of Educational Innovations in Rural America* (1970). He found conclusive evidence that programs reflecting the top-down scientific management principles of the 50s and 60s, produced short-lived change at best and failed to make any significant impact on rural teachers and the nation's rural schools. Lasting change, he concluded, will only come if each individual teacher designs his/her own inservice program to meet his/her own needs.

**University sponsored rural inservice efforts.** Apart from the common and much criticized on-campus theoretically-oriented graduate course, and the Summer

\(^1\)The Rand study finding (1978) that program effectiveness was inversely related to cost, is particularly applicable to rural areas.
Institute, some rural colleges and universities have found ways to bring their expertise "out" to isolated teachers. The major thrust for this has been technological. Traveling vans offer courses packaged for individualized, computer-assisted instruction in rural Pennsylvania (Lehmann, 1971). Vans also carry special education courses around rural Nebraska (Dunne, 1979). An NIE/NASA-sponsored satellite beams teacher education films to remote areas of Alaska, and the Rocky Mountains (ibid). The Appalachian Education Satellite Project also projects graduate career education courses to teachers in remote mountainous areas (Marion, 1975).

In Vermont and elsewhere some courses are offered on closed circuit TV with occasional regional "class meetings" of participants. Rural teachers in Livonia, Michigan can design their own individual course to "Improve Your School Program and Earn Credit" (Burdin & Poliakoff, 1973). Nova University in Florida offers teachers independent study credit toward an advanced degree (ibid). Idaho State's "Teachers for the Rural World" program brings to rural teachers modularized units in science, library arts, and special education (ibid).

The field-based professor has been tried in several places (Bruce et al. 1976). But most university instructors travelling to isolated rural areas face the economic need
to find a minimum of ten to fifteen enrollees to make a course "go." Small teacher populations and great diversity in need and interest often prove insurmountable hurdles to getting such field-based courses off the ground (Burdin & Poliakoff, 1973).

One of the most interesting programs was sponsored by the New School at the University of North Dakota, with strong state department support. This was Vito Perrone's "Less-than-degree Program." Classroom teachers lacking a bachelor's degree received their regular salary to attend the university's strongly open-education biased teacher preparation program for a full year. In return, New School trained Masters Degree Interns took over the rural classrooms (Dunne, 1979). The Duo-Specialist Project of the University of Arizona is a similar year long exchange-for-training program where classroom teachers return to college to acquire special skills, needed in their own rural schools.

Burdin and Poliakoff (1973) analyzed the ERIC literature and came up with three rather interesting rural inservice education models they claim have great promise but which have yet to become reality. These all involve a "resource person" whose job is to help teachers diagnose, plan and evaluate their own inservice "contracts" for individual growth programs which would be provided by
computer printout from a federal "bank" of inservice materials. Tucker (1970) also describes the use of an instructional resource person teaching a course in a remote area of Nevada using an amplified telephone and conference bridge technique.

Other collaborative rural inservice efforts. Scanning the literature it is much easier to find reports describing expensive, comprehensive rural educational improvement programs, than examples of minimally funded, small scale local efforts. Often the organizers of such programs have neither time, money nor incentive to publicize their results. This is unfortunate since indigenous efforts may well be more promising. Still, it is worth noting several of the large scale national projects since they contained some inservice components, and made an attempt to attend to individual teacher needs and local community initiatives.

The Urban/Rural School Development Project, 1970-75, was a federally funded effort to develop community control of schools and teacher improvement in poor urban and rural areas, along the lines of an urban model that worked in New York City. The results are described in a doctoral dissertation (Manriquez, 1974) and in studies by Mesa (1975) and Joyce (1978). Unfortunately, political intrigue seems to have won the day over staff development efforts
in many of the sites.1

The Rural School Improvement Project, located at Berea College, offered Appalachian teachers some inservice opportunities. However, Wilson (1970) reported that five years after the federal funding ended no one could even remember what the program was called! Moe and Tamblyn (1974) describe the NIE funded Experimental Schools Program 1971-1976, (which funded twelve programs throughout the U.S.) as an attempt by the federal government to "explore the uniqueness of small school districts. . . find ways to build upon their strengths. . . and provide a comprehensive program of educational reform" (40). Local teachers and resources were very much involved in local curriculum development and were handsomely compensated for their participation while the funds lasted, according to Peterson (1975) who documented the New Hampshire site while it was federally funded.

Another approach to rural inservice has been the development of Regional Educational Laboratories. Although much of their work involves curriculum development, one of them, the Northwest Regional Laboratory, sponsored a rural leadership training program (Rural Futures Develop-

1Telephone conversation between the investigator and Paul Nachtegal of the Rural Education Project, Wheatridge, Colorado, February, 1980.
ment) where outside change agents helped community members develop the expertise to initiate their own school improvement and staff development programs (Moe & Tamblyn, 1974).

The concept of a regional education center, jointly funded by local districts, state departments, and federal grant is, perhaps, the most widespread "answer" to the need for rural teacher development (and school improvement) today. The state department in Texas funds nine training centers where teachers go to receive training to carry out state directives (Burdin & Poliakoff, 1973). The jointly sponsored Upper Red River VAley Educational Service Center in Grand Forks, North Dakota provides a vast array of materials, resources and training opportunities to schools in two states (Wilson, 1970). Other Regional Training Centers in Appalachia, Florida, Georgia and Tennessee, Montana and New Hampshire offer technologically advanced services which small rural school districts and teachers can take advantage of if they wish (ibid.).

Although regional centers make sense in terms of offering services and resources to moderately large rural sections of the country, they still do not address teachers' immediate day-to-day classroom instructional concerns or school/community development issues which involve each rural hamlet in its own special issues.
The Rural Teachers' Center. The idea of a rural teachers' center is not so different from the regional education center except that it is a smaller scale operation generally serving fewer teachers in a smaller geographical region. Rural teachers' centers tend to be less well funded, are more likely to be controlled by classroom teachers, and usually provide services directly to individuals (Watt, A., 1979). However, only a small proportion of the teachers' centers funded by the Office of Education in 1978 and 1979 are located in rural areas. These are of two major types: small single site projects and projects with multiple small sites spread over several counties. Some rural grassroots centers were started by local districts and Title IVc grants well before the federal program of 1978-1980.¹ A number of these rural centers formed a national rural teachers' center network in 1978 with the assistance of the Teachers' Centers Exchange. From this loosely affiliated network the five rural centers were chosen for this study, which have been in existence the longest time under one leader.

¹Because rural centers serve areas from a few square miles to whole states and sometimes provide services to large sparsely populated areas around small cities, it is impossible to give precise numbers to match this study's definition of rural.
Apart from Dunne's (1978) and J. Watt's (1979) case studies of one rural teachers' center in Vermont, there are no reports on the rural teachers' center as a vehicle for overcoming the considerable unresolved problems surrounding rural inservice education.

**Summary.** There is no doubt that rural teachers work under special conditions for which they are not specifically trained. Major writers on rural education, and rural policy groups like the National Seminar on Rural Education, agree that the professional development of teachers must be made a high priority in improving rural education. Yet certain realities of rural life continue to inhibit efforts to promote programs for teacher development. Conservatism bred from poverty, self-reliance and isolation still breeds hostility to "outside" money and ideas. There is sometimes ambivalence towards the school; though it may be the central institution of the community, it is often controlled from outside. Despite their often superior education, teachers are not always accorded respect by local townspeople. Moreover, teachers are often assumed to be fully trained when they are hired.

But rural teachers do have some advantages arising from small classes, informality, the less pressured environment and natural bonds to the community. Rural inservice planners have tried to capitalize on these needs and
advantages, and have produced a small but interesting number of inservice models during the past two decades. One that may hold promise is the rural teachers' center.

Planners and researchers of rural teachers' centers should bear in mind the lessons already learned about professional development of teachers in general and the special circumstances of teacher development in rural America.

To review, these are: 1) teachers must be in control of their own professional development programs (Rogers, Combs, Bunker), 2) programs arising from individual needs show more long-lasting change than do mandated programs designed by top level policy makers (Burdin & Poliaikoff, Watt, A.), 3) there should be a balance between outside and local control, and generally the less money spent, the better (Sher, Dunne, Rand study), 4) programs must forge real links between the school and the community (Sher, Dunne, Watt, J.), 5) services provided should be those really unavailable and truly asked for in response to actual classroom needs of teachers (Devaney, et al.), 6) strengths and unique qualities of each rural setting must be capitalized on (Sher), and 7) local, trusted leadership should be used wherever possible (Moe & Tamblyn).

Rural teachers' centers have small budgets and small staffs. Leaders must perform most of the roles and
functions necessary for the maintenance and development of the center. They must respond sensitively to local teacher and community needs as well as to outside sources of support. Can the rural teachers' center provide meaningful and much needed professional development for teachers, and other educational services to its community? The leaders' role may be an important factor in finding an answer to this question. The present approach is to ask teachers, administrators and community members in five of the "oldest" rural centers what they think are the teachers' center leader's most important roles, functions and activities. It is hoped that the findings will provide useful data for future research on the effectiveness of rural teachers' centers.

But why focus on leadership? To answer this question an overview of the literature on leadership in small groups and network theory are necessary.

**Leadership Theory**

Gibb has twice reviewed the research on leadership, once in 1954 and again in 1968. His findings are reported in the *Handbook of Social Psychology* (1954, 1968). He describes two major schools of leadership theory: trait theory and situational leadership. The study of leadership traits flourished during the expansion of the military-
industrial complex between the world wars. But no single set of leadership traits was found to be "best" for all leaders (Olmsted, 1959; Gibb, 1968; Stogdill, 1948). So, after 1945, research interest shifted to the study of leader behavior in specific situations. Hemphill's Ohio State studies led the way in this new focus on situational leadership (Lindzey, 1968).

The present study draws on both schools of leadership research, focusing on the following four aspects of leadership: 1) situational leadership, 2) small group leadership, 3) role theory, and 4) leadership traits.

Situational leadership. The contemporary approach to leadership in organizations is that there is no "best" style. An effective leader adopts his/her style to the needs of the particular followers and to the unique situation at hand. Hersey and Blanchard (1972) take a developmental view of the implications of this approach. Starting with Terry's (1960) definition of leadership as "the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives" (Hersey & Blanchard, ibid., p. 68), they describe leadership behavior on a continuum. At one pole is democratic relationship-oriented leadership. Different stages in the development of an organization call for more authoritarian or more democratic leadership behavior.
Underlying these poles are basic assumptions about human nature which McGregor (1960) calls Theory X and Theory Y.

Briefly, the Theory X authoritarian leader finds the source of power in the position, assumes that people are motivated extrinsically if at all and must be told what to do and when. Theory Y democratic leadership rests on the basic assumption that the leader's power is granted by the group and that human beings are self-motivated and self-directed. Thus democratic leader behavior involves shared-responsibility.

Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) situational leadership theory has interesting implications for teacher center leadership in centers more than two years old, especially when viewed in the light of the Rand Corporation findings (1978). Rand found that effective leadership in the institutionalization/continuation phase placed great emphasis on "mutual adaptation" of the project's goals to the local setting, and vice-versa. This would imply that the time for catalytic change agent behavior has passed. Perhaps by the third year of an innovative project, leadership behavior needs to shift from an initiating, risk-taking style (Miles, 1964; Havelock, 1973) to a more soothing, compromising style. In other words, leadership behavior may be required to change with the aging of an innovation.
But the size, structure and goals of a group also bear on the type of leadership behavior most suited to it. Hemphill (in Lindzey, ed., 1968) found more tolerance for autocratic leadership in large, formal, hierarchical groups like the military. And Gibb (1968) reported a study by Carter which found that the emergent leader (like the leader of a gang) could behave more autocratically than the leader appointed by a group, as in a social service organization. In the latter case the leader's role was seen more as a coordinator of activities, as an agent through which the group could accomplish its goals. Thus appointed leaders in service-oriented groups may have to adhere to McGregor's Theory Y Leadership Behavior.

Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (in Gibb, 1968) described Theory Y democratic leadership behavior in detail. This style of leader behavior seeks to evoke maximum involvement of group members in decision-making; to spread rather than consolidate responsibility; to reinforce interpersonal contacts; to introduce structure in order to strengthen group process. Such leadership avoids hierarchical relationships where special privilege and status differentials predominate. These authors claim that "the study of leadership is primarily one aspect of the wider study of differentiated functions within groups" (271).
There are two compelling reasons for grassroots teachers' center leadership to fall at this democratic end of the leadership continuum. First, the teachers' center is viewed as an innovation, an experiment, especially if it is funded with outside seed money. It must win local acceptance, must coax its way into the system. Second, and even more compelling, the grassroots teachers' center is deeply entrenched in the humanistic developmental view of adult growth. Theory X leadership, while appropriate for some "top-down" centers, would not match the humanistic developmental philosophy espoused by the grassroots centers.

The present research focuses on what Berman and McLaughlin of the Rand study (1978) call the institutionalization/continuation phase of the life of the innovation. At this point the organization is no longer new. No longer does the change-agent cycle operate as described by Havelock (1970) where the leader acts as catalyst to initiate change. During and after the third year leaders of such innovative projects must concentrate on diffusion: e.g., persuading and promoting the program so "late adopters" (Rogers, E., 1962) will pick it up. Neither the Rand study nor the Rogers work appears to differentiate between leadership roles and functions at the start and in the third or later years of an innovative project. The
question arises, what should the leader do in the institutionalization phase of a small, rural, grassroots teachers' center?

Small group leadership. Since this study focuses on rural teachers' centers where most leadership activities are invested in a single person, a brief look at small group leadership is relevant. The smaller the group, the more important and diffuse is the leader's impact on the group's development (Gibb, 1968; Kreitlow, 1965; Olmsted, 1959). But, Cartwright and Zander found that it was necessary to study a small group's functions in order to decode which ones belonged to the leader (in Olmsted, 1959). Olmsted makes a distinction between "fused" and "segregated" conceptions of small group leadership. In the former the leader performs many roles and functions while in the latter leadership roles are shared by several people.

One of the best examples of fused, small group leadership is that of the school principal. Rubin (1970) and Klopf (1974) have described the small school principal's role as an uneasy combination of leadership and managerial functions. If, as Lipham and Hemphill (in Rubin ed., 1970) note, leadership involves pushing the school toward change, while management involves maintaining existing structures, the principal, whose job includes both roles, will find that "a certain degree of tension is inevitable"
Teachers' center leadership also involves both the leadership and managerial roles, plus, presumably, the accompanying tensions. But there are major differences between the groups led by the principal of a small school and the leader of a small teachers' center. The principal is part of a larger formal organization: the school district. The role is clearly prescribed and imbued with both status and power "from above." Although Rubin, (ed., 1970) argues that principals are freer to lead than they think, they definitely get their authority from superintendents. In contrast, the grassroots teachers' center leader has to earn leadership power from the group of teachers and others who govern the project. Further, the principal is "on-line" in the educational hierarchy while the teachers' center leader is in a service-oriented non-hierarchical, loosely-structured organization. Although rural teachers' center leaders are often treated as if they were equal in status to principals, their leadership roles and functions cannot be compared too closely with those of the small school principal.

Role theory. Role is the dynamic aspect to status. Role theory is characterized in the Dictionary of Social Sciences (Gould & Kolb, 1964) as a combination of personal qualities and activities, "the set being normatively evaluated both
by those in the situation and by others" (p. 609). Nadel (in Gibb, 1968) suggests that investigating the "role demands" of group members and comparing them to "perceived roles" of leaders can help to determine "representative roles"—that is, behavior that typifies the standards and values of the group. This suggests that a comparison between participants' and leaders' perceptions of leadership roles should provide evidence to determine optimal leadership roles in teachers' centers.

Sarbin's studies (in Lindzey ed. 1968) of role expectations and role enactment also provide important guidelines for the present study. Role expectations specify conduct for role holders. In grassroots teachers' centers these expectations have only been vaguely formulated to date, leaving an enormous amount of discretionary choice to the role enactors (leaders). Sarbin suggests determining role expectations by means of self-report and survey questionnaire, pointing out that perspectives will differ according to vantage point but will generally fall into a meaningful cluster (ibid.).

Leaders of the five teachers' centers chosen for this study all expressed uncertainty about their role expectations, agreeing with Sarbin that such role confusion

---

1These formulations are sometimes job descriptions, used only for hiring purposes. See San José (1978) for a compendium of general role expectations. (San José, Christine. "Staffing a Teachers' Center." In Building a Teachers' Center. Edited by Kathleen Devaney. New York: Teachers' Centers Exchange, 1979.)
results in ambiguity, interferes with problem-solving, and may decrease member satisfaction (Sarbin, ibid., 1968). A study which clarifies role expectations would provide 1) a needs assessment for leadership in the institutional phase of the teachers' centers, 2) a job description for leaders based on activities considered priority items by all members of the group, and 3) a new level of awareness and communication among members of the group who participate in the teachers' center (the Hawthorne effect).

**Personality factors: leadership traits.** In his paradigm for organizational behavior, Getzels (1970) describes leadership as the interplay between the individual role and the individual personality. Having looked at role expectations (Sarbin, 1968; Gould, 1964) and situational leadership theory (Hemphill, 1968; Blanchard & Hersey, 1972; Gibb, 1968), it is now time to examine the more traditional side of leadership theory: those qualities, skills and traits a person brings to the leadership position.

Stogdill provides the classic review of 124 studies of the characteristics of leaders (1948), concluding that there is no consistent pattern of traits characterizing leaders in general. But it is certainly likely that a democratic leader of an innovative program will display different skills and traits than an autocratic leader of
a formal hierarchical organization. Miles (1964) suggests that innovative leaders need verbal ability, intelligence and enthusiasm but also a certain degree of rebelliousness, idealism and instability sometimes found in the "committed nut" (642).

In a study of *Leadership for Action in Rural Communities*, Kreitlow (1965) lists twenty-one qualifications for good leaders for action in rural communities. These run the gamut from ethical integrity to tact, versatility and perseverance. Kreitlow believes that all of these qualities can be developed in a person taking a leadership role for rural community action.

One fascinating aspect of teacher center leadership is that the position has attracted people with extremely diverse backgrounds. San José has suggested some general parameters for defining the roles of teachers' center staff in an article, "Staffing the Teachers' Center" (1978). She notes the importance of sensitivity to the needs of participants, an understanding of classrooms, professional management skills, a research orientation, and educational breadth and depth as qualities which should be possessed by teacher center staff. But can the repertoire of a single teachers' center leader in a small center contain all these skills? And if not, which ones are considered most important by participants: those
associated with teaching, management or educational leadership and research?

This study asks rural teacher center participants, for the first time, 1) what leadership roles, functions and activities are most important to them and 2) what leadership characteristics and skills they value most. All five centers in this study are over two years old. They are all concerned with the mutual adaptation process (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) necessary now that they face the issue of whether they will be accepted by their educational systems and continued as a part of the formal institutional structure or left to find their own means of survival.

However, there are other factors besides leadership which contribute to an understanding of teachers' centers as innovative programs. In his classic compilation of studies of *Innovation in Education*, Miles (1964) alludes to the complexity of the change process when he asserts that,

> educational innovations are almost never installed on their own merits. Characteristics of the local system, of the innovating person or group, and of other relevant groups far outweigh the impact of what the innovation is (p. 635).

Sociologists have addressed this issue of the relationship of an innovation to the social context of its host in studies of diffusion of innovations (Rogers, E., 1962) and,
more recently, in studies of networking. Because teachers' centers are frequently referred to as networks, the recent literature on educational network theory will be reviewed to provide background on rural teachers' centers as networks and on the networking functions of their leaders.¹

Networking for Change

Network theory is a relatively new tool to educators.² A number of the NIE network studies to be reviewed here call for documentation of ongoing teachers' center projects as educational networks (Miles, 1978; Parker, 1977; Kadushin, 1977; Peterson, 1977).³ The reasons

¹During the 1970s, the National Institute of Education's Schools Capacity for Problem-Solving has supported both the operation of several national networks (including the Teachers' Centers Exchange) and research on educational networking. The expectations were twofold: 1) that better understanding of educational networks would reveal reasons for the low percentage of successful innovations in the 1960s compared to the millions of federal dollars spent, and 2) that network theory might "provide a useful framework for developing a change strategy by which the federal government can induce educational reform" (Peterson, 1977, p. 1).

²Sarason (1977) points out that there is a vast array of literature on networking across more than a dozen fields, most of it generated since World War II. He believes that educators must improve their conceptualization of human resource networks in this era of limited and shrinking resources, and he decries the fact that no one has yet studied the networking of teachers' centers in their local settings.

³These studies all remain unpublished, to date, but may be obtained from NIE's Schools Capacity for Problem Solving, Washington, D.C.
should become obvious as the major themes from these studies are reviewed. This section provides a sociological rationale for the present study's application of network theory to the examination of leadership roles in rural teachers' centers.

**Characteristics of networks.** Social networks can be pictured as a series of nodes or points which represent people or groups, linked together at some places by lines (Peterson, 1977). Along the lines travel "flows of exchange" such as "objects, labor, affect, evaluation, knowledge, prescription and opinion, influence, and power" (Kadushin, 1977, 8). Many educational networks, like those for innovation and problem-solving contain both formal and informal aspects (Parker, 1977). If external funding is involved, they are likely to have a formal structure and basic plan for operation. At the same time such networks create and support many loose, informal linkages among people and groups. These informal linkages are fluid. They are formed and disappear with ease, often conducting very important information and affect between network participants, in what Miles and Lake (1975) refer to as pathways for low energy access to trusted competence. Despite the great importance of such informal and uncoded linkages, Schon (1977) warns of romanticizing informal networks which may be exclusive (like the "old boy network")
and impossible to monitor or replicate.

But Parker has come up with some important qualities of informal networks for innovation and problem-solving (1977). These traits closely approximate many characteristics of a grassroots teachers' center. The network, he says, must 1) convey a sense of being an alternative to established systems, 2) offer a feeling of shared purposes, 3) provide a mixture of information-sharing and psychological support, 4) have a central person who functions primarily as a facilitator\(^1\), 5) emphasize voluntary participation and equal treatment of all members (p. 7).

Grassroots teachers' centers have some characteristics of both formal and informal networks. Those that are funded with seed money have written proposals with specifically stated goals and objectives to be carried out in cooperation with teachers. Despite these formalities in structure, grassroots teachers' centers have more often been described as informal, emergent networks in which the interactions ebb and flow unpredictably among trusted equals (Devaney & Thorn, 1975). Such networks thrive on voluntary participation and low visibility. Sometimes their patterns of interaction are neither known nor understood as networking by those who are in them (Kadushin, 1977).

\(^1\)This crucial trait is further explicated on pages 103-105.
Rural teachers' centers may find networking more of a struggle than non-rural ones. Berry (1977) a human geographer, likens network activity to the flow of blood in the body. In discussing the difficulties of propagating an innovation in a sparsely populated area, he notes that "who knows whom and who talks to whom are powerful indicators of where and when an innovation is accepted, if it is accepted at all" (p. 1). Networking is more difficult in rural areas where networks are spread out and poorly connected by transporation and information fields. In such networks Berry finds that the change agent plays a key role in the diffusion of the innovation for the "personal information field is theirs, as is the perception of the market segment to be reached" (ibid., p. 27).

Like Berry, Peterson (1977) and Parker (1977) note that rural (and inner city) networks in poor areas are most needed and most difficult to sustain. Peterson (ibid) makes the interesting point that network intervention is most needed among those with least income, status and power--like teachers, who are both isolated and at the bottom of the educational hierarchy. When supporting such network formation he cautions that,

federal resources should be used sparingly, should be concentrated on lower-status segments of society, should take advantage of existing networks, should seek to build weak ties among those with common interests and should allow for maximum network autonomy (48).
All these points are relevant to rural teachers' centers networks.

A typology for innovative educational networks. Deliberately instituted networks for innovation and problem-solving like the teachers' centers in this study, must be viewed in relation to the social structure to which they are closest kin: the school system. Kadushin (1977) has developed a typology for viewing such a relationship, which includes three different continua. First is the degree to which the network for innovation or problem-solving is the direct expression of the formal school structure; that is, the degree to which it is instituted. Second is the degree to which the network connects otherwise separate elements of the formal structure; that is, the degree to which it is interstitial. Third is the degree to which the total network is known and understood by those who are members and nonmembers; that is, the degree to which it is visible.

Kadushin describes the school system as a formalized, utilitarian network with well-defined relationships among loosely-coupled\(^1\) isolated hierarchical units. It is concerned primarily with the "distributive aspects" of the

---

\(^1\)Lortie's term (1977). In his view networking will not provide avenues to educational reform until we have a much more valid picture of the operating reality of schools and school people than we now possess. (Lortie, Dan C. "Networks and Organizational Rationality in American Public Schools." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977 [Mimeographed].)
culture and tends towards maintenance of the status quo rather than support for change. Teachers' centers, he says, "operate in the interstices, as it were, of the larger and more pervasive bureaucracy" (ibid., p. 34). Especially during the first two years, they tend to lack a clear structure, to be informally responsive to lateral initiatives, to create links where none existed before. Kadushin explains that such "emergent" activities often run counter to norms of the school bureaucracy and would prove an irritant if they were more visible. He suggests that one of the most dramatic aspects of network analysis is the "unmasking of invisible structures."

A dialectic appears here, between the need for an informal, grassroots rural teachers' center to stay emergent, invisible and interstitial, and its need to become visible, formal and instituted in order to be recognized and accepted by the school system. The central issue is, how much can an informal, emergent, low-visibility network like a teachers' center be institutionalized without being coopted and losing its innovativeness? Kadushin does not offer answers to this question. He calls for more research on the local contexts of informal, innovative school-related networks.

Goodlad (1977) expresses this dialectic in a different way. While he appreciates the functions of a
"low energy" network where members hold common values and trust each other, he doesn't think such nets can really bring about sustained educational reform. Change in education, he contends, requires "continuing productive tension" which can only be achieved by networks containing "dissimilar organisms with differing self-interests" (p. 45). 1 This need for tension is reminiscent of a finding in the literature on organizational change (Rubin, 1970; Getzels, 1970) that the major impetus for organizational change is usually an outside force rather than an internal one.

**Cycle of change in a network.** In his study of many different kinds of networks for innovation and problem-solving, Parker (1977) developed a 6-step sequence for viewing the development of a network. This pattern of network development provides useful guidelines for the present study of rural teachers' centers. Parker warns, however, that movement through his six-step sequence is not inevitable; that costs and benefits are associated with each phase; and that later phases are not necessarily better than earlier ones.

---

1Watt, A. (1979) arrived at a similar conclusion using different terms: that "bottom-up" teacher development programs must be combined with "top-down" thrusts in order for significant improvement to occur.
Steps one and two involve isolated innovators working largely independently, and through such informal networks as "old boy" networks (like the superintendents' network described by Parker, 1977). Stage three involves the deliberate formation of an informal network like the North Dakota Study Group where someone facilitates regular interaction among "club" members. Stages four, five and six are of more interest to this study.

Step four--building a formal network--often grows out of earlier stages but has certain definite characteristics. These are: an agreed upon name, a formal statement of purpose, a directory of participants, designated facilitators or coordinators, an exchange or facilitating center (a "hub"), a newsletter or bulletin, regular meetings, curriculum materials, training workshops, and more. "Networks which enter this phase," adds Parker, "typically require a year or two of network building before they can turn their primary attention to information-sharing and psychological support" (p. 55).

In this fourth phase Parker observes a tendency for even low-budget networks to respond to pressures to develop more formal and "polished" mechanisms, with the inevitable need for a growing flow of funds and growing number of staff. At the same time he finds pressures for project funding to be replaced by local line-item budgeting or to
become incorporated by forming a tax-exempt agency. Such survival concerns often (but not always) lead to step five: institutionalization of the network.

At this point formal governance procedures and policies are often developed. Verbal agreements based on trust tend to be replaced by written documents and the size of the facilitating staff grows as prescribed activities increase the need for meetings, writing, evaluation, and planning. At this point the fear is that leadership will focus more on maintaining the system than on sharing of information and psychological support among network participants. Such a structure may call for a different kind of staff facilitator than the non-institutionalized network.

Parker's sixth and final step is the "dissipation of the network's spirit" (59). When maintenance or expansion become the central concerns, the altruistic spirit of the original network usually diminishes. The network for innovation and problem-solving becomes an established bureaucratic agency no longer offering its participants the kind of information sharing and psychological support that was its original function. Parker finds that this leads to one of two consequences: either the emergence of an established, formal system (like Kadushin's coopted network) or the death of the network, as the participants
stop supporting the staff in their survival or expansion efforts.

**Network frames.** A different perspective on network functions and development is taken by Matthew Miles (1978). He suggests that the functioning of a "deliberate" network for educational change depends not just on the stated objectives of the network, but, more importantly, on the underlying philosophy or "frames" guiding its goals.

The frame serves, in effect, as a kind of grand strategic backdrop; it dictates the implicit functions of a network, the types of flow it will end up carrying, and thus the incentives for participants. . . (9).

He describes the following six frames, five of which seem particularly relevant to grassroots teachers' centers goals. The first frame for educational change is the one most commonly associated with "top down" educational reform (Watt, A., 1979). It is not associated with grassroots teachers' centers. This is the belief that practitioners are backward/obsolete, and must be modernized by being infused with new technology. The next four frames bear directly on rural grassroots teachers' centers.

Frame two is that of inequity. Here the problem is that educational goods are unfairly distributed, especially in rural and poor areas. The network functions to redress this balance. Frame three is stagnation. Here
the "know-how" is not lacking so much as the will and energy to share it. The network functions to combat burn-out by revitalizing its participants through a flow of affect.¹ Frame four is that of isolation and resource poverty. Networks mindful of this view attempt to import and distribute more resources primarily through barter and exchange.² Miles specifically notes that some strategies for improving rural education involving teachers' centers hold this view. Frame five is anomie. This is the point of view, so convincingly described by Lortie (1975) that practitioners are lonely, fragmented and isolated from each other. In this case the network builds a sense of community, an extended social system of shared values and support. The sixth and final frame is that of unshared craft. A blend of the isolation and anomie frames, this one starts from the premise that practitioners are talented craftspeople who use a network as the means for sharing and deepening the knowledge that they already possess.

It is interesting to note the parallels between Miles' second through sixth philosophical frames for net-

¹Parker (1977, 13-16) describes the importance of telephoning and face-to-face interaction to promote "good vibes," and claims that in a network for innovation and problem solving such good feelings promote the high trust and altruism that are the cornerstone to healthy network functioning.

²Sarason's (1977) complex study of the Essex network is perhaps, the prime example of this view. (Sarason, Seymour B. Human Services and Resource Networks. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.)
working, and the basic assumptions girding members of the Teachers Centers Exchange together (Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Devaney, ed., 1977; Devaney, ed., 1979), which have been described in the first section of this review. Miles (1978) concludes the section on network frames with a note of caution. He warns against prescribing or evaluating network functions even when the frames are understood. He feels that there is not yet enough documentation of ongoing network functioning to evaluate networks, particularly those based on any of frames two through six.

**Leadership in networks for educational improvement.** Both Parker and Goodlad discuss leadership in relation to network development. Parker found that "a person functioning as an effective facilitator" (1977, p. 7) was one of the five most important traits in all the networks for innovation and problem-solving that he has studied. This was particularly true of new and small networks. He found that the person(s) occupying this role tended to maintain low profiles, calling themselves coordinators or facilitators in preference to directors. Moreover these people had generally non-abrasive personalities, a great sensitivity to the needs of other people, an unusual commitment and dedication to the goals of the projects, and the ability to inspire trust and altruism among participants (ibid., pp. 2-22). Whether a network grew
spontaneously or deliberately (through external funding) was not nearly as important as the extent to which the network had the five key traits,

especially an effective facilitator who champions the network's continuation. These champions are usually impressive, even charismatic individuals. ... in most cases administrators or experienced community organizers with a secure institutional base. ... a few, however, are operating almost totally with personal resources (39).

Goodlad (1977) studied leadership at the "hub" of his League of Cooperating Schools (LCS), a formal, intentional network created to promote educational improvement through principals of eighteen schools in the Los Angeles area. The "hub" was the network office. Originally the hub staff's job was to "massage" the network so that the hub (leadership) would gradually work its way out of business. Leadership functions for "self-renewal" would be 'learned' and taken over by school principals at the "nodes" of the network. But in practice this did not work. Goodlad found the continued presence of the network hub essential to maintain the "productive tension" needed for school improvement.

Staffing the hub, moreover, required "persons oriented more to the development of people than specific elements of school programs" (Goodlad, ibid. p. 49). He suggested that such persons should be trained as curriculum generalists or in counseling and behavioral aspects of
administration. These leaders must maintain the "productive tension" between the bureaucratic system and the change process.

Goodlad draws attention to the difficulty of finding continued funding for such network "hubs" and suggests intermediate service centers (in Texas), County Departments of Education (in California) or Field Service Division of Colleges of Teacher Education, as possibilities. The role of the hub leadership, he concludes, "is one of the most important and least studied aspects of networks" (33).

Summary and Research Questions. Miles (1978) summarizes all these studies of networking with several caveats. First he cautions against evaluative prescriptions of network functioning, because network study is "so dense and complex... so beset with the incalculable that such prescriptions are not now possible and may never be" (8-9). Second, he says that the essential paradox of a network for educational reform remains unsolved. That is: can a network for educational change be accepted and instituted by the host education system and still remain innovative? Miles concludes that "we badly need ongoing documentation of networking efforts and their consequences" (49). Research, he says, must examine what networks actually do in order to develop a coherent theoretical understanding of what sorts of efforts lead to what outcomes.
The present study views the rural grassroots teachers' center as a small network for educational innovation and problem solving (Parker, 1977), whose leader operates the "hub" of the network (Goodlad, 1977). It recognizes both the need for rural networks and the geographical challenges of networking in rural areas (Berry, 1977; Parker, 1977). It recognizes further, that the grassroots teachers' centers in this study:

1. contain both informal and formal elements (Parker, 1977);

2. may show a pattern of change over time from Parker's position four ("building a formal network") to his position six (dissipation of the network's spirit);

3. depend for their existence and survival not just on leadership efforts but also on the formal educational institutions and setting around which they are "draped" (Kadushin, 1977, 13);

4. have reached the stage where institutionalization continuation issues require them to be concerned with becoming more visible, instituted and interstitial (Kadushin, 1977);

5. function within the largely unstudied philosophical "frames" of inequity, stagnation, resource poverty, isolation, anomie and unshared craft (Miles, 1978).

The aim of this study of leadership at the hubs of five experienced rural grassroots teachers' centers is to clarify what these leadership roles, functions and activities really are in experienced (2-9 year old) centers in order to provide direction for what they should be. It will also collect data from participants on what skills such
leaders need to network as educational innovators and problem solvers in experienced teachers' centers. The purpose is not to evaluate either the centers or the leaders. Rather, it is to specify leadership role priorities and leadership characteristics and skills as they are viewed by informed participants and to explore teachers' perceptions of leaders as advisors. The study also expects that the raw material gathered by questionnaire and interview will assist in determining what networking strategies are most appropriate to these rural teachers' centers at the "experienced" stage.

Thus, from one perspective the study can be seen as a network analysis. It offers for the first time documentation of many aspects of leadership at the hubs of on-going small, rural teachers' center networks. To collect this information a leadership opinion survey was developed and administered. It provided data to answer the following specific research questions:

1. Which roles and functions of a rural teachers' center leader are considered most important by participants?
2. What are the most important leadership activities and how do participant perceptions compare between centers and between participant groups?
3. What leadership characteristics and skills do rural teachers' center participants and leaders consider
most important in experienced teachers' centers?

4. How important is the leaders' role as an advisor to teachers in rural teachers' centers?

The next chapter describes the experienced rural teachers' centers selected for the study and the methodology used to gather the data.
CHAPTER III
SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter is composed of two sections. The first describes each of the five rural teachers' centers in the study. Included (but not necessarily in this order) is the following information:

- geographic location and size of area served;
- numbers of schools, teachers and students served;
- relationship to universities and to metropolitan areas;
- other professional development programs in service area;
- sources of funding and budget pattern;
- staffing;
- major types of programs;
- origins;
- relationship to school districts;
- leader's background and perceptions of his/her leadership roles.

Information for this section came from taped interviews of each leader by the investigator, and from interviews with a colleague, secretary or other staff member, during each on-site visit. In the following descriptions, the intent of the writer is to convey the uniqueness of each
rural site, despite their common bonds of location outside metropolitan areas, service to primarily rural teachers, and almost single-handed leadership of one person.

The second half of this chapter describes the processes used to develop, administer and analyze the results of the questionnaire used as the primary instrument for data collection.

Descriptions of the Five Rural Teachers' Centers

Teacher-Community SEED Center. Western Massachusetts is dotted with once-bustling mill towns along the banks of northern New England's rivers. Shelburne Falls (population under 3500) with its single Main Street and red brick storefronts, no longer supports its mill, or any other major industry in this heavily wooded, partially farmed section of the state.

Still, Shelburne Falls is the largest town in its nine town rural school district spread out over four hundred square miles. It has its own modern elementary (K-8) school as well as a turn-of-the century red brick school building that now houses the district's administrative offices and the teachers' center.

This district, the largest in Massachusetts in square miles, includes just five elementary schools, one regional high school and one private school. The total student population is 1929, with 147 teachers. Shelburne Falls is in
approximately the center of this rural area. It is twenty-five miles from the nearest state college offering graduate education courses and about sixty miles from a metropolitan area, Springfield, Massachusetts.¹

In the summer of 1976 a Title IVc grant of $11,600 was awarded to this rural district to open a teacher-community center. The original proposal attempts to resurrect the tradition of people depending on one another for social, emotional and intellectual support. Its major goal was to foster the sharing of new ideas in education "and the world as a whole" between teachers, schools and the community.²

It was appropriately named the Teacher-Community SEED Center with SEED an acronym for Sharing, Exploring, Educating, Developing.

Located next to the Superintendent's office (where it was given free utilities, duplicating, mailing, phone) in a cozy small classroom, it has ample resources. There are a professional library with learning kits, games, posters, a recycle center, curriculum guides and a comfortable meeting area with a sofa and overstuffed chairs.

Both the idea and the proposal were conceived by administrators. Key concepts, from their perspective, were combatting isolation and increasing communications between [read more]

¹The U.S. Census defines any city of over 50,000 as metropolitan.

²Proposal to Title IVc of the Massachusetts State Department of Education, April 1976.
teachers and community. A media services coordinator wrote the proposal with a committee of principals and the superintendent, who hired the first director.

Gwen van Dorp came to the SEED center from a small town of 9,000 in Michigan. She came by way of Amherst, Massachusetts, where she was auditing doctoral courses in education. She had four years of English teaching experience in traditional and alternative middle school settings. Recalling earlier years, she describes herself as "flexible" and as a "generalist." She was involved in "everything" from elementary school on up. In a small town she held many leadership responsibilities and experienced "lots of early success." With a major in advertising and an M.A. in communications and humanistic education, traditional classroom teaching held less appeal than finding something out of the ordinary, where new ideas and problem-solving would provide challenges, and where she could "see how public schools functioned from outside the classroom." The vague teacher-center job description provided by the district superintedent intrigued her. Commenting later on her work history, she reflected that she was never daunted either by responsibility, or by her own lack of training, but would jump right in and learn-by-doing, whatever the job was.¹

At the time of this study the SEED center was 2-1/2 years old, coming to the end of its Title IVc funding. The

¹From taped interview with Gwen van Dorp, June 11, 1979.
budget was up to $20,000 with $5,000 in local support. In accord with Title IVc regulations, a validation report had been prepared and SEED was expecting to be chosen as a site for the diffusion of the teachers' center concept in Massachusetts. This would mean a partial continuation of State Dept. funding for next year--its fourth.

The staff for the SEED center in 1979 consisted of van Dorp as director, a competent artist hired with CETA funds, and two part-time student neighborhood youth workers. The superintendent's staff provided some extra office assistance.

The in-center programs occupied so much of van Dorp's time that she rarely visited schools, which she "constantly regretted." Besides workshops and graduate courses primarily for teachers and mini-courses and a preschool story hour primarily for community people, a major portion of the leader's time was involved with an administrator-initiated staff development program to help promote middle school cooperation during the transition from elementary to high school. School and community meetings were held in the center and a newsletter was published once a month.

In this rural area teacher reimbursement for a graduate course and an occasional released time day were the only professional development activities before the SEED center came. In two years SEED had organized a Teacher Advisory Board and Staff Development Teams with teacher representatives
from all schools. These teams had the major voice in determining courses, workshops and programs for released time days. But the SEED director was always responsible first and foremost to the superintendent, particularly in terms of the middle school program.

This close tie made the teacher center leader uneasy. She felt she was viewed as an arm of the administration partly because of the location of the center next to the superintendent's office and partly because it seemed difficult to involve teachers significantly in a project in which they had no initial investment.

She also wondered whether teachers would feel comfortable, if she could find the time to visit them in classrooms. She felt that her ability to function in an advisory role in classrooms was limited, even though many meaningful one-to-one contacts were made at the teachers' center and on the phone.

Just after this study was agreed to, a new director, Steve Germain, came aboard. He saw the study as an opportunity to review what the center had been doing its first two years which would help him set his own priorities for the new job. His cooperation in distributing and collecting the questionnaire was crucial to the data gathering process. Forty-eight questionnaires were given, through the school mail service, to 25 teachers, 11 administrators, 5 parents,
5 school committee members, and 2 staff members. These people were chosen by the first teacher center leader as having had most contact with the center and with her leadership. Thirty-five complete questionnaires were returned, or 73% of those distributed.

Postscript. In the year that has passed since this study was conducted, a new director and CETA funded assistant have come to SEED; the middle school project has blossomed into a Title IVc grant on its own; the SEED center has received $19,000 in Title IVc validation funds from the State Department to help other Massachusetts communities start teachers' centers; and a new superintendent has come. The local program struggles to maintain its impact, with more than one half the director's time involved elsewhere helping to start teachers' centers. Local funding for 1980-81 is not anticipated and if neither of two proposals for state support are funded, the prognosis for SEED's survival is very dim.

The Teacher Place. Burlington, Wisconsin, a town of 7,000, is set gracefully in the midst of lush farm and dairy and lake country near the "sauerkraut center of the world." Only thirty miles from the metropolitan areas of Racine Milwaukee and Kenosha, the town is nonetheless surrounded by a primarily agricultural economy as far as the eye can

---

1The sampling process is described later in this chapter.
see over the flatish rolling countryside. Yet highways criss-cross the landscape, offering easy access to Teacher Place inside a thirty mile radius around Burlington.

Within its 250 square mile orbit, Teacher Place programs and services are primarily used by 1200 teachers in 89 public and private schools in 45 public school districts. Parents, day care providers and teachers from the large urban areas also find their way to Teacher Place. "We Welcome Everyone" is the motto, well attested to by thousands of pins locating visitors' hometowns on a map of Wisconsin by the entrance to the center. Thirty miles away is the University of Wisconsin, Whitewater which maintains close contact with Teacher Place through courses and other activities.

An independent teachers' center not affiliated with any school district, Teacher Place was the creation, in 1976, of its director Judith Schulz. Her goal was to provide material and emotional support for anyone who teaches or works with children which, she maintains, is nearly everyone at some stage in their lives. Operating on a shoestring budget of scrounged materials, fundraisers and huge amounts of volunteer time (the director was at first a volunteer herself), Teacher Place has always relied on the creative fundraising efforts of its director.

The three room, second story, central Burlington setting is a visual feast to enter. From floor to ceiling
a colorful array of handmade samples of curriculum materials are artfully displayed to catch the eye. An interdisciplinary approach to thinking is emphasized. There is a large recycle area; there are work tables, comfortable chairs, laminating machine, xerox, and a kitchen area. There is so much to see that 30-minute "learning tours" of the center are provided by the director who stresses that make-and-take is only the starting point here. Hands-on experience can lead to the larger questions about how people learn. The teacher center brings people together to share real learning experiences which have immediate applicability.

Teacher Place offers many hands-on workshops (How to Make a Tablet, Recycle into Learning, No-Camera Slides with Nature as the Subject, A Bardboard Oven. . . for example) and courses stressing interdisciplinary approaches. Although individuals are encouraged to drop in and use the center's enticing facilities, groups of teachers from a school or district are also beginning to come to Teacher Place for contracted inservice days. An artful newsletter goes out to thousands of teachers and others every month.

Fundraising is a part of most activities. Everything is sold, from 1/4 cent wooden spools, to memberships, to the services of the director. Each year a public learning fair has attracted hundreds of adults and children to support Teacher Place while making and learning themselves. A number of small businesses also support Teacher Place as well as,
recently, the Johnson Wax Foundation. The budget at the time of this study was well under $15,000 annually. A number of CETA contracts brought in help from senior citizens and high school students, mostly on a part-time yearly basis. While the hours of business varied during the afternoons and evenings, the director reserved "closed" morning time for her own writing, phoning, planning and continual scrounging for more materials and resources.

Two groups provide assistance with decision-making and the budget. They are a teacher/citizen Board of Directors and an advisory board of influential supporters. The former group has recently been strengthened in an effort to build more meaningful ties with whole schools.

Teacher Place is a visual reflection of the interests and skills of its director. Judith Schulz describes herself as an organizer, with an interest in sales and business, since the age of ten. She grew up near Burlington and was the first in her family to attend college. There she began training as a kindergarten teacher but switched to art, realizing her creative abilities and that she really wanted to be able to help people learn, first with their hands and through hands, with their heads. One reason she has donated so much of her own time and energy to Teacher Place is that "it is everything I love to do."

The director's original interest in this study arose from a fascination with the idea of comparing her work to
that of other center directors and from an interest in how her leadership is perceived locally. In exchange for a workshop and policy board training session given by this investigator, she and her advisory board chose the sample of forty-nine people to receive the questionnaire. They included 32 teachers, 5 administrators, 2 school board members, 9 parents and community people, and 1 staff person. Forty were returned complete: a total of 82%.

Postscript. Teacher Place in 1980 is in full swing. With $10,000 from the Johnson Wax Fund and an ability to generate over $30,000 from its own programs, Schulz says, "the fourth year is like an avalanche." But with only a CETA funded secretary and two part-time students, she still wishes for another professional staff member. Teacher Place is open twenty-two hours a week, mostly after school and on Saturdays; it has expanded its Board; published a book; and, after three and a half years, feels more confident of its future than ever before.

Project RISE. About 15 miles beyond the suburban limits of metropolitan Hartford, Project RISE is located in east-central Connecticut. RISE (Regional In-Service Education) began in 1976 with a planning grant of about $18,000 in Title IVc funding. It now serves nine rural towns, 585 K-12 teachers in seventeen public and private schools spread over a geographic area of about 200 rolling square miles of woodlands and farms. The teachers' center occupies a large
classroom plus a small office room in a modern elementary school in Colchester, by far the largest of the nine towns, whose population is 8500.

The idea for this teachers' center was initiated by a principal. It grew out of contacts made during three years of advising in Colchester done by the director, Peter Martin, while he was a doctoral student at the Center for Open Education at the University of Connecticut. In his article, "A TEachers' Center for Nine Rural Towns," Martin (1977) describes the carefully orchestrated growth of the teachers' center from "seeds planted on top" in a conservative rural area where many people still wondered, "why should a town waste its resources on 'teaching teachers who already know how to teach?'' (ibid., p. 1).

The major features of RISE are its advisory program of in-school consultants, its comprehensive workshops and its on-going needs-assessment process with administrators as well as teachers.

Funded by the Noyes Foundation for one year at a time, the (one full-time and two part-time) advisors spend a majority of their time in schools and classrooms "helping the teacher bridge the gap between the inservice workshop setting and the real world of the classroom" (Lance, ed. 1977, 31). The advisors meet with school staff development teams and principals to help plan school-based workshops as well as those that will be offered at the center.
Advisors are usually classroom teachers on leave of absence or part-time graduate students who are trained by Martin as advisors. Martin finds it frustrating that just as they are gaining confidence and skills, the year ends. Because the funding is never secure, his whole advisory staff is new each fall.

RISE has strong links with administrators, especially superintendents, in all the districts. These were carefully nurtured by Martin during the planning year. Not only is final budgetary control in the hands of RISE's Superintendent's Board but Martin also sits in on interdistrict superintendents' meetings and serves on some superintendent's committees.

In contrast, RISE's links with higher education are not so strong. In Connecticut graduate credit cannot be given for courses organized off campus. RISE's original strong links with the Center for Open Education did not result in a University of Connecticut affiliation since the center was itself an externally funded program. Thus RISE does not offer courses but has concentrated on developing workshops in a wide variety of formats to meet many needs. There are mandated inservice half-day workshops, all-day workshops with substitute teachers paid for by RISE, and voluntary evening, after-school and Saturday workshops. Some take place in schools, others in the center.

Part of the success of the Workshop Program (ninety-three were conducted in 1977-78) may be credited to the
thorough needs-assessment process. The entire planning year of the project was devoted to forming a structure and process for assessing and reassessing the needs of teachers, principals, and superintendents. The formal instruments are used annually. Informally the advisors' job is to find out daily what individual teachers need, while Martin keeps lines of communication and decision-making open with administrators. Three different policy boards help tie this process up structurally: a Superintendent's Board, a Teacher Advisory Council, and an Interdisciplinary Committee. The director answers to all three. Parents and community people are not very actively involved in the center's governance or programs at this time.

Before RISE, professional development programs for teachers were almost non-existent unless funded from the outside. During its first three years, RISE attempted to provide all things for all people. At the time of this study about one-quarter of its $70,000 budget was provided locally by the nine districts—a figure Martin considered quite high for these small towns. Because Title IVc was soon to end, he applied for federal funds under the Teacher Centers Program, but was turned down in 1978.\(^1\)

Reflecting on his leadership, Martin emphasized his qualities of patience and stick-to-itiveness as important to

\(^1\)Reapplication in 1979 resulted in an award under the Federal Teacher Center Program.
the rural scene, where "change tends to be viewed so negatively that I don't think a quick, flash in-the-pan type of person could make it."¹ This low key perseverance plus a keen ability to listen, synthesize ideas nonjudgmentally and smooth over heavy issues with humor, make Martin a person who, after three years, has gained the trust of superintendents, teachers and his staff.

Martin, whose roots are in Maine, definitely prefers rural life to the urban scene. The son of two teachers, at first he eschewed the field of education but found himself drawn to working with handicapped youngsters. While teaching Special Education in Hartford, he gravitated into the masters and then doctoral program with Vincent Rogers at the University of Connecticut, because the open approach to education "just felt right to me." At this stage he is glad to have left the classroom and advising, preferring to administrate. He describes himself as functioning more often on the level of superintendent. Yet he is in close contact with his advisors and works with individual teachers in the center and in workshops he leads on classroom space arrangement and construction.

Martin and his advisors (now nine months into their role) selected 45 teachers, 10 administrators, and 6 school committee members who had "most contact with the center" to receive the questionnaire, along with the part-time and full-

¹Interview with Peter Martin, May 2, 1979.
time staff of five. Sixty-eight percent (45/66) of the questionnaires were returned; 30 from teachers, 7 administrators, 4 from school committee members and 4 from staff.

Some confusion was expressed among respondents as to whether they were to respond only to Martin's leadership roles and functions or to those of the advisors as well. For although RISE had only one permanent professional staff member, who shaped the project from the start, the foundation supported advisors played an indispensable role making it work. Of the five centers in this study, RISE's professional staff was the largest, despite its annual turnover.

Postscript. In 1979 RISE was awarded a federal grant under the Teacher Center Program which has allowed Martin to expand staff and services within the framework of the original project. With this year's annual budget of $130,000 he has hired 2 full-time and 3 part-time advisors (most of them previously trained at RISE) to run the teachers' center site and programs and increase in-school services, while he has overall responsibility for the project and for increasing its impact beyond the nine original towns. Despite four sources of funding, he still feels he is constantly hustling for the next year. Title IVc will end in 1980 unless a one year validation grant is forthcoming. The Noyes Foundation does not ordinarily carry a project for over three years. Unless matched by outside funds, the $16,000 of local support will not be renewed. However, in the spring of 1980 RISE is
providing both programs and coordination of all inservice efforts in its service area, and enjoying its mandate thoroughly.

Advisory Center for Teachers. Thirty miles southwest of Dallas, in a basin surrounded by rolling ranchland, lies the town of Waxahachie, Texas. A small school district by Texas standards, Waxahachie supports two large public elementary schools, a sixth grade middle school, a junior high, and a high school. Although the town population is 13,600, busing of rural students from the surrounding one hundred or so square miles brings the school population to 3,850.

The history of the Waxahachie Advisory Center for Teachers (ACT henceforth) begins with the history of the superintendent. Having sponsored an EDC\(^1\) model Follow Through project and visited the EDC in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Billy Bates sold the idea of in-classroom advisory support for teachers coping with change, to his district school committee as well as his 150 K-6th grade teachers. In 1971 he started the Advisory Center for Teachers. He provided a space "separate from the administration, rich in materials and ideas where teachers could come for support--but only on a voluntary basis."\(^2\) Bates also selected a

\(^1\)Educational Development Corporation, Cambridge, Mass.

\(^2\)Interview with Superintendent Billy Bates, April 19, 1979.
classroom teacher to staff the center, whose teaching style reflected the flexibility and creativity that he had seen in East Coast Follow-Through Centers.

This teacher, Frankilou Jett, a 15 year veteran teacher of grades 3 through 8, claims she learned much of what she knows about being an advisor from her superintendent and mentor, Bates, and from her seven years of learning-by-doing at ACT. Bates describes her as a "self-styled expert," while her staff use the terms "dedicated" "cheerful" "supportive" and "likes a challenge." Jett describes herself as "a learner, not just a teacher." Looking back over her four careers, first as an accountant, second as a rancher, and third as a teacher before heading ACT, she states:

I love to learn. When you've never lived on a ranch until you're twenty-one and then go out and live and learn everything about it, that's the way I do everything. I like to learn. I can fix a fence. I can do anything to a cow that needs to be done.¹

In 1973 ACT joined with the district Media Center and took over six large rooms on the second floor of one of the elementary schools. Space and color are two of ACT's initial attractions. Curriculum ideas, displays and resources are organized around subject areas. An impressive greenhouse occupies one full wall. Meeting and eating areas take up part of each room, and in another area there are the customary laminating and duplicating machines, and recycle

¹Interview with the investigator, April 20, 1979.
materials. A popular cardboard carpentry shop is next door in the Media Center.

Jett describes her part-time secretary as the administrative assistant without whom she would not be able to manage the center. For, typically, her mornings are spent in K-6 classrooms and in meetings with district administrators, while afternoons are in the center planning programs and occasionally running one of the workshops. Additional staff assistance is provided several afternoons a week from 1:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. by pairs of teachers, partially on released time, partly supported by a stipend from the district. These 8-10 teacher staff members, selected by the director, form her advisory board for program planning and budget management. They submit an annual budget request of about $8,000 to the superintendent. Jett's salary is paid out of state funds for a "supervisor."

ACT is not the only professional development program in this small district. Title IVc funds support a computer-based, prescriptive individualized training program called Project Point. Despite profound differences between the two approaches, both ACT and Point work closely together. ACT plans many of the workshops identified as "needed" by Point. The key is that teachers are never required to attend them.

University affiliation is strong at ACT, despite the sixty miles that separate it from Texas Woman's University. A complete series of courses leading to the Masters Degree
in reading and elementary education have been offered at the center, over the years.

Parents and community members who see ACT's monthly calendar and attend or drop in, often end up being hired as teacher aides. Otherwise the center does not reach actively into the community. Not only is ACT entirely funded by the school system but there is also a very active community education program sponsored through the local technical college.

A visitor to ACT cannot escape the impression of close-knit personal ties, and district-wide cooperation between administrators and the teachers' center. Nearly a decade of stability in key personnel coupled with the superintendent's initial and continuing full support for the center provides a sense of continuity unique among the centers in this study.

In this context the remarkable return of 100% of questionnaires is a little less surprising. Forty-three were distributed and completed by 22 teachers, 8 administrators, 11 parents/community members/paraprofessionals, and 2 staff members.

Mountain Towns' Teacher Center. Narrow roads winding through heavily forested mountainous terrain characterize sparsely populated south central Vermont. This teachers' center is the most rural of those in the present study. It was funded with Title IVc funds in April 1974, to promote
child-centered education. The Mountain Towns' Teachers' Center (Hereafter MTTC) serves a student population of 1,279 and a professional staff of 120 in ten elementary schools, two high schools, two nursery/day care units and one private school. These schools are dotted over ten towns, three supervisory unions and three hundred fifty square miles. Almost one-half this area is national forest land.

MTTC is located in a sunny classroom of the modern elementary school in the largest town, Wilmington (pop. 2,200). It contains the usual professional books, idea files, resources and materials to assist teachers with curriculum development. Besides a xerox machine, comfortable meeting area and large avocado trees enlivening the room, there is an office space with two telephone lines.

In its program thrust equal emphasis is given by staff to regular bi-monthly visits to every member school and courses, workshops and meetings in the center itself. The school visits grew into an Advisory Program in which the professional staff of two worked with individual teachers, students, teaching-principals, and sometimes whole school staffs in their own tiny (2-6 room) schools. Another major program was the "college consortium," where the director developed and administered locally taught graduate courses with a credit option from five different institutions of higher education in three states. These "nearby" colleges are 32-145 miles from the MTTC. The nearest metropolitan
area is Springfield, Massachusetts, about 80 miles away.

A third major thrust was toward the community. MTTC worked with youth groups, church groups, community classroom volunteers, and the health center to build a communications and service network for the schools. A full adult education program operated out of the teachers' center.

MTTC was created by a group of teachers in an "Open Education" course who wrote the Title IVc grant for a teachers' center to support teachers as they changed to more child-centered instructional approaches. Although the proposal received the required administrative support, it was not the idea of any of the three superintendents and was initially viewed as somewhat of a frill.

Initially staffed by one full time and one half-time professional with a budget of $24,000, both the center and district administrations underwent key personnel changes during the first five years. New superintendents in the two major districts arrived at about the same time as a new director for MTTC, in 1976. Title IVc funds were extended to a fourth year. These were supplemented by several CETA grants, up to $3,400 in local contributions, and about $3,000 raised from the center's programs and fundraising.

Tenuous relations with two district superintendents and several principals and two years of expanded program development characterized the leadership period of MTTC's second director, Anne Watt. A recent immigrant to Wilmington
with long standing family roots in the area, Watt was a doctoral student at the University of Massachusetts. She had taught pre-school through college and felt convinced that adults and children learn best when given appropriate support for taking personally identified "next steps." Watt had been associated with the center from its opening, as the first teacher of graduate courses. Although she was an outsider, many teachers and the Governing Board members knew and trusted her when they hired her to be the second director of the MTTC, between 1976-1978.

Although principals and one superintendent became nominal members of the MTTC Governing Board, it was always a teacher controlled organization, definitely set apart from the line organization of any district. When Watt resigned in late 1978 due to the failure of MTTC to find major local funding or to win a federal grant from the Teacher Center Program, the Governing Board found and hired MTTC's third director, Heidi Watts, with CETA funds. Both staff and budget were substantially cut back at the time of this study but the energetic, resourceful Watts has developed some new programs and a good relationship with one superintendent.

Before MTTC came, these mountain towns teachers had no other professional growth opportunities besides partial reimbursement for a graduate course taken on a distant college campus. Even during the six years of the center's funded life it has been difficult to sell the terms "in-
service" and "staff development" to rural school boards who claim they hire "already trained" teachers. They complemented the MTTC for providing "good" and "interesting" programs but remained unconvinced that professional development might be a necessity for educational personnel.

Because of the present investigator's relation to MTTC, excellent cooperation was provided both in piloting and conducting the survey. After the pilot, fifty-one final questionnaires were distributed. Forty-six or 90% were completed. This included 23 from teachers, 11 from administrators, 2 from school board members, 6 from parents and community members, and 4 from staff.

**Postscript.** In March 1980, MTTC arrived at the very end of its financial resources. A last ditch attempt to obtain local revenue sharing funds at Town Meetings resulted in a small grant from one of the ten towns, Whitingham. CETA funds for Watts and her secretary were exhausted. However, spring programs were in progress, including a graduate course. The Governing Board, now consisting solely of teachers and community people, met regularly and appeared to control the fate of the many resources in the center. Watts herself planned to spend two days a week at the center through May 1980--as a volunteer--to wrap up her affairs and attempt to find volunteers to keep it open. It seemed likely that the MTTC would move to Whitingham in the fall of 1980.
The superintendent of the center's major district, though verbally very supportive of the center, never actively sought local funds for MTTC. He did travel to the state capital twice to appeal personally to the Commissioner who was unable to help.

Table 1 on the following page summarizes the available data describing the five teachers' centers in the study.

Methodology

Development and validation of instrument. As previously mentioned, the Teachers Centers Exchange helped to identify the five small rural teachers' centers which: 1) were at least two years old at the time of the study; 2) had no more than two full time professional staff; 3) had been led by the same person for at least two years; and 4) had made some contact with the Teachers' Centers Exchange network. Only five centers met these criteria.

Initial contacts with leaders of the five centers in October 1978 revealed leader interest in the project for several reasons. All five leaders wanted to find out how their own constituents viewed their leadership roles and functions; how their leadership roles compared with those of the other rural leaders; and how to organize and prioritize their own work in more appropriate and meaningful ways for

---

1 Although both rural and regional (and some statewide) teachers' centers networks have been started since this study, no other centers which would have met this study's requirements in 1978 had surfaced by March 1980.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of operation</td>
<td>2-1/2</td>
<td>2-1/2</td>
<td>2-1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. mi. served</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># school districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number teachers served</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1200+</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' years of service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-1/2</td>
<td>2-1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of full time professional staff at time of study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from nearest affiliated IHE</td>
<td>25 mi.</td>
<td>30 mi.</td>
<td>30 mi.</td>
<td>60 mi.</td>
<td>32 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional devel. programs in service area</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major funding sources</td>
<td>Title IVc L.E.A. CETA</td>
<td>Fees, CETA own fundraising, Johnson Wax Fund</td>
<td>Title IVc Noyes Foundation L.E.A.'s</td>
<td>L.E.A.</td>
<td>Local CETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Range</td>
<td>$11-25,000</td>
<td>$15-42,000</td>
<td>$18-130,000</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
<td>$20-42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*plus 2 part-time advisors
the next year. While they were amenable to the idea of being interviewed, the consensus was that a questionnaire seeking the opinions of appropriate constituents would be most useful. It would provide them with others' insights into their leadership which might help them adjust their goals and energies for the coming year. In addition, three of the leaders felt financial pressure because of the need to replace federal grants with other funds. The leader of the independent center always had funding pressures. Only the leader of the Texas center was not motivated by financial pressure to look closely at her leadership.

**Questionnaire construction.** The questionnaire development occurred in several stages. In the first, the investigator drew up a **Check List** of possible leadership roles and functions. The Check List was based on records of the investigator's two years of personal experience as a rural leader, her readings in leadership, and the first of the research questions. All the rural leaders completed, edited, and added to the Check List.

Agreement was reached between the investigator and the other four leaders that their roles logically fell within the three part framework of administrator, developer, teacher/advisor. Moreover, after editing the Check Lists, each leader agreed that all their major functions were listed. Thus the edited Check List became the first half of the pilot questionnaire. It represents the five leaders'
composite answers to the question: "What are the roles and functions of a rural teachers' center leader?" Data collected from the first half (Part I) of the questionnaire would provide answers to the first two research questions:

1. Which roles and functions of a rural teachers' center leader are considered most important by participants?
2. Which are the most important leadership activities and how do participant perceptions compare between centers and between participant groups?

Data from the second half of the questionnaire would provide answers to the third and fourth questions:

3. What leadership characteristics and skills do rural teachers' center participants and leaders consider most important in experienced teachers' centers?
4. How important is the leader's role as an advisor to teachers in rural teachers' centers?

The next stage involved piloting an eleven page "draft questionnaire" and cover letter\(^1\) with ten participants of the teachers' centers in Vermont and Massachusetts. The sample was composed of volunteers from each of the final categories of respondents, six of them teachers. None of these people was selected for the final sample.

The pilot results were tabulated by hand. The questionnaire was too long and some distinctions were re-

---

\(^1\)Appendix A.
quested that even the best informed observers felt unable to make. After substantial revisions, the two-part final questionnaire was eight legal pages, and took one-half hour to complete.

**Sampling Process.** The five teachers' center leaders discussed the sampling process at length. Because of the fairly small rural populations served, the community thrusts of three programs, and sponsorship of four centers by Local Education Authorities, the sample was chosen from the following groups: 1) teachers, 2) administrators, 3) school board members, 4) parent/community members, and 5) teachers' center staff. Each leader selected the sample for his/her own center. These five categories of participants represented both the political and the educational scope of the rural teachers' centers. It was anticipated that the Hawthorne effect would influence the study by raising many respondents' consciousness of the teachers' center, particularly administrators and school directors whose influence on the center's ultimate fate might outrun their present experience with the work of its leader.

Once the scope of the sample was agreed on, a sampling method was discussed among the leaders. They felt that

---

1 A distinction between "importance to you" and "importance for continuation of the center" was made in the pilot. Respondents found the distinction unimportant and the format cumbersome so the likert scales were replaced by a frequency scale, thus simplifying the format considerably.

2 Final Questionnaire, Appendix A.
informed opinion would yield far more reliable data on their leadership roles and functions than opinion derived from a random sample of users of the center. A weighted stratified sample of people who used the centers regularly, sometimes, and once or twice would satisfy this condition.

The next decision was to determine how large a sample would satisfy at least some of the requirements for validity. Teachers were obviously the major group of participants in teachers' centers programs. Among the four rural centers funded through Local Education Authorities, 10-15% of teachers in the districts served were chosen by each leader for the study. Teacher Place, the independent center, had a far larger general population to draw upon with no direct mandate to serve teachers in any particular district. For this center 10-15% of the teachers who had used the center more than once were selected by the leader for the study.

In all but the independent center, all administrators and teachers' center staff in the area served were identified by each leader to receive questionnaires.

The other two groups, parents/community members and school board members, presented more of a problem. Few of these people had extensive contact with the centers. Yet the literature indicated the increasing political and social importance of these two groups as rural centers grew older. A compromise was made, asking each leader to select "about five" members who "knew the center best" from each of these
groups. Numerical results would not indicate much validity or reliability for these categories, but preliminary trends could be observed among their opinions.

Since this study was exploratory and not evaluative, statistical procedures were not used in data analysis. Rather, trends were to be observed from simple frequencies and cross-tabulations. In adhering to non-statistical procedures, it follows Guba's (1978) and Stake's (1975) extended view of evaluation in which collaboration between researcher and subjects is as important as quantitative results. Because this study's goals were to provide clarification of leadership roles and functions and direction for future planning rather than an evaluation of current leadership or program, the questionnaire results were to be considered more for qualitative than quantitative significance.

**Distribution and collection of the instrument.** To help overcome the possibility that the five leaders might feel "used" by the researcher in furthering her own professional ends, visits to each site were arranged. While there, the investigator conducted interviews with each leader based on the questionnaire which they had received a week earlier. In return, the investigator offered to conduct a workshop or meeting for teachers and to assist the leader in both the actual selection of the people who were to receive the questionnaire and the distribution of the instrument. The investigator made face-to-face contact with a number of
potential respondents, both in the workshops and the informal distribution process.

The questionnaires were returned within two weeks to the teachers' center by mail, by hand, and through interschool mail systems. This might have affected the honesty of response had the questions been evaluative. As it was, board members, school representatives and teachers' center staff all helped collect the questionnaires, which were mailed from the teachers' centers to the investigator within a month of their distribution. Of a total of two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires distributed, two hundred nine, or 81.3% were completed and returned. Table 2 shows the numbers of questionnaires distributed and collected at each center.

Analysis of the data. Quantitative results were coded and tabulated by computer to reveal frequencies, means, and cross-tabulations of center by center data, and group by group across-center data. The open-ended questions were analyzed by content. No statistical procedures except means were used since the samples were small and the design would not permit reliability judgments. The step by step discussion of the results in the next chapter relies on both the questionnaire results and on the taped interviews of leaders which provided the investigator with many insights about each center beyond what could be discovered by the questionnaire alone.
TABLE 2

QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RETURNED FROM THE FIVE TEACHERS' CENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF
LEADERSHIP SURVEY RESULTS

The following sections answer each of the four research questions. Questionnaire results are presented in seventeen non-statistical tables and descriptively analyzed. Center-by-center and position-by-position comparisons and discrepancies are noted and explained. Data from interviews with each leader and from open-ended survey questions are introduced to support some findings. Tables comparing findings by center (location) and by participant group (position) are located in Appendix B.

Research Question #1: Which Roles and Functions of Rural Teachers' Center Leadership are Considered Most Important by Participants?

Question F divides leadership into three major roles, asking respondents what percentage of the leader's time should be ascribed to each. Question E identifies seven functions within the three major roles. It asks respondents to prioritize the seven functions in order of importance for the coming year.

Frequencies and cross-tabulations of the data from Questions E and F\(^1\) provide summary results which are presented

\(^1\)See Questionnaire, Appendix A.
by location (Texas, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Wisconsin and Vermont) and by position (teachers, administrators, school board members, parents/community, and teachers' center staff.

Results for Question F indicate how participants feel the leader should divide his/her time between the three major leadership roles. Overall, participants answer as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Advisor</td>
<td>32.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>30.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, all three roles are viewed as nearly equal in importance for rural teachers' center leaders. Evidently most time should be spent on development, with teaching/advising second in terms of time and administering the center, third. However, these preferences vary from center to center. Table 3 compares the amounts of time rural leaders should spend on these three roles, by location.

At the Advisory Center for Teachers in Waxahachie, Texas, the teacher/advisor role is perceived as significantly more important (43.2%) than the administrative role (21.1%). A content analysis of answers to the question, "Why did you choose these percentages?" reveals great respect for the leader's work as an advisor in classrooms and as a developer.

These percentages exceed 100% because of inaccuracies in a few individual responses.
of new ideas. In contrast, the administrative role is frequently described as "paper work"; a "necessary evil."

SEED center participants in Shelburne Falls, Massachusetts rate the developer role significantly higher (45.25%) than the teacher/advisor role (25.29%). This accurately reflects the director's major effort to initiate new programs and her regret that she was able to teach and advise much less than she wished.

At Project Rise, in Colchester, Connecticut, the developer role is perceived as somewhat more important (37.66%) than the teacher/advisor role (28.84%). Here the leader also spends considerably more time (40%) as a developer than as a teacher (20%) but the teaching/advising role is highly valued and is enriched by several part-time staff advisors.
At Teacher Place in Burlington, Wisconsin, and at the Mountain Towns' Teacher Center in Wilmington, Vermont, administration and teaching/advising are seen as almost equal in importance in terms of the leader's time. Of note is the fact that the Vermont leader spends more time advising in schools than in the center, while the Wisconsin leader spends very little time in schools but does a great deal of teaching/advising in the center.

When viewed by position in Table 4 below, these same data reveal some slight differences in perceptions of the importance of the three major roles.

Here we find that all categories but the parents/community group place the developer role somewhat ahead of the others. School board members and teachers' center staff (including clerical) give the developer role significant importance (over 40%). However, parents/community view the teacher/advisor role as by far the most important (41.9%). It is somewhat surprising that administrators rate the administrative role as less important than the other two. Either they don't value their own administrative work very highly or they think administering a teachers' center is not very important.

Most of the leaders themselves seem to have mixed feelings about this division of time, except in Texas where the leader spends 47% of her time as teacher/advisor and
TABLE 4
PERCENT OF TIME ON THREE MAJOR LEADERSHIP ROLES BY POSITION. COMPARISON BY MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Teacher/Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>31.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>32.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>41.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Center Staff</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>41.91</td>
<td>28.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

substantially less on the other two.\(^1\) All the other leaders spend less time teaching/advising. They express frustration, almost apologizing that this is so but feel that the reality of running a teachers' center precludes more teaching.

Overall, perhaps they are justified, for participants clearly identify the developer role as most important, with the exception of parents/community and the Texas center where the teaching/advising role is most favored.

\(^1\)The researcher conducted interviews with the five leaders during April-May, 1979.
We can conclude that rural teachers' centers' participants want their leaders to spend about one-third of their time in each of three major roles: developer, teacher/advisor, and administrator, although actual percentages vary somewhat between locations and groups of participants.

Question E divides these three major roles into seven kinds of functions asking respondents to prioritize them in order of importance from 1-7 where 1 equals the most important function. When frequencies were tallied and means compared, the lowest mean score indicated the function accorded highest priority. Table 5 divides the three leadership roles into seven functions, giving the mean score for each.

A comparison of these mean scores for the whole population shows a range of only 2.81 percentage points between the most and least important functions. This confirms that all seven are definitely considered important aspects of a rural teachers' center leader's job.

The 209 rural participants prioritized the seven functions as follows:

1. manage and run the center
2. initiate and plan programs
3. communicate regularly with all constituent groups
4. teach/advise in the center
5. raise funds to continue programs
6. teach/advise in the schools served by the center
7. inform the public of all center programs.

TABLE 5

THE SEVEN FUNCTIONS COMPRISING THREE MAJOR LEADERSHIP ROLES. PRIORITIZED BY MEANS WITH THE LOWEST MEAN INDICATING THE HIGHEST PRIORITY FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Communicate regularly with all constituent groups ( (\bar{x} = 3.58) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and run the center ( (\bar{x} = 2.45) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Initiate and plan programs ( (\bar{x} = 2.45) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform the public of all center programs ( (\bar{x} = 5.26) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raise funds to continue programs ( (\bar{x} = 4.5) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Advisor</td>
<td>Teacher/advise in the teachers' center ( (\bar{x} = 4.44) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach/advise in the schools served by the center ( (\bar{x} = 5.19) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ranking is interesting from several perspectives, despite the overall closeness in importance of all seven mean scores. Although a good number of respondents say that
many specific management tasks are too mundane for the leader to perform, here we see a firm recognition of the overall importance of management for leaders of rural centers.\footnote{Interviews of leaders as well as open-ended participant responses indicate that both leaders and participants were reluctant to emphasize management, implying that it is one of the least appetizing aspects of teachers' center leadership.} That the most creative function, initiating new programs, is ranked a close second, is no surprise. To find teaching/advising fourth and sixth overall inevitably confronts leaders with the puzzling question of why do participants think leaders should spend about one-third of their time teaching/advising, yet they give this function a low priority? An ambivalence is suggested here which shows up again in the findings on advisor activities (p. 159) and is discussed in Chapter V.

Ranked seventh and last is the "inform the public" the dissemination function of the leader. Perhaps participants consider these as rather formal networking activities (tasks which generally include writing, mailings, and public speaking) aimed at the public and thus less important to them than the informal person-to-person networking which is mixed in with most of the other functions.

Such informal "pathways to trusted competence" (Miles and Lake, 1975) are a characteristic of networks like teachers' centers and are clearly more important to this
study's participants than formal dissemination activities.

When the ranking of leadership functions is cross-tabulated to compare priorities center by center, we see some variety. Table 6 below compares the rank order for the seven functions by location, and Table 18, Appendix B,\(^1\) compares rank orders for each location by position.

The results for Texas follow the overall rank order exactly, except that fund-raising is missing from the list. Because this center is locally supported through the district budget, there has been no need for the leader to be concerned with fund-raising. However, there is a discrepancy between Texans' answers to questions E and F. They say that most time should be spent in the teaching/advising role (43.2%), yet teaching/advising should only come fourth and fifth in priority out of the seven functions. To explain this, a close look at the means reveals that in Texas, communicating, initiating, teaching/advising in both the center and the schools are within just 5/10 of a percentage point of being equally ranked. Thus, teaching/advising is nearly tied for second priority, after managing the center.

\(^{1}\)Findings in Tables 18-26, Appendix B, are based on very small numbers of respondents in some categories and were therefore not considered appropriate to report in the text. On the other hand, these tables provide leaders of the five centers with the opportunity 1) to compare findings for their center with the others, 2) to compare their own answers with those of their participants, and 3) to compare their responses with the other leaders'.
Table 6

Rank Order of Seven Leadership Functions by Location\(^1\)
where 1 = most important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
<th>Overall Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate regularly with all groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage and run the center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and plan programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the public of all center programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise funds to continue programs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advise in the teachers' center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advise in the schools served by the center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The means and absolute frequencies for the first three priorities turned out to be exactly the same. Thereafter bias affected the absolute frequencies. Thus this rank order is based on a comparison of means.

* no fund-raising done by Texas leader at all.
In addition, many of the Texas respondents appear to make no connection among the three roles and the seven functions. Those that perceive the administrator role as least important also prioritize the functions of management and communication as most important. Evidently the words "manage" and "communicate" are not perceived as a description of the administrative role in Texas even though each is highly valued on its own. This discrepancy did not arise in any other center.

In Massachusetts, initiate, manage and communicate top the other functions by a clear margin with fund-raising and teaching in the teachers' center close behind in fourth and fifth places respectively. Next comes informing the public, and last, teach/advise in the schools served by the center.

Teachers in Massachusetts differ with administrators on one point (Table 18, Appendix B). They report the leader's management function as top priority while administrators report the initiator function to be the most important. In slight contrast to both, the leader reports initiating and communicating to be most important, with management, informing the public and teaching in the center tied for third place. School board members and parents/community in Massachusetts support the leader's opinions by placing both teaching/advising functions in third and fourth places, ahead of fund-raising and informing the public. This view is not shared by teachers or administrators who form
the majority of responses. The overall interest of members of the public in the teaching/advising role of the leader may reflect their sense that a major goal of teachers' centers is to improve teaching and that teaching/advising is the most direct route to the goal.

Table 6 (p.151) shows that Connecticut follows the overall pattern for ranking the seven leadership functions with only one minor exception. The initiator function is ranked number one, one-tenth of one percent above the management function.

When viewed by position within Connecticut, there is one distinct variation in this ranking pattern (Table 18, Appendix B). The four teachers' center staff rank fund-raising as the leader's top priority, with manage and communicate tied for second, and initiate in third place. This may be explained by the fact that much of the leader's initiative had been involved in proposal writing just before the study was conducted. Other staff advisors are involved in more of the teaching/advising functions of the center. Evidently no other participants are as clear about this division of labor as the staff. Furthermore, some teacher respondents report confusion over whether they were to answer the survey in terms of their on-site advisor as leader or the director of the center as leader. Despite this difficulty, the Connecticut results match the overall results almost exactly.
In Wisconsin, Teacher Place respondents depart from the overall rank order in all but the top two priorities: managing and initiating. Third in importance is rated fundraising, with informing the public fourth. Communicate (3rd place overall) is rated fifth in importance at Teacher Place, with teaching/advising in the center and in the schools, sixth and seventh (Table 6, p. 151). Predictably, all Wisconsin respondents rate teaching/advising in the schools as a low priority. This center has access to hundreds of schools within a thirty mile radius. A one member staff could not hope to get around to them all.

Three factors may contribute to the differences between Teacher Place rankings and others. First, this center is independent. It has no funding other than what it raises itself. The leader is an ardent and able fundraiser. Second, the leader has a knack for publicity. Much of her communication is done (in her own words) "just naturally" and through the monthly flyer. Third, because Teacher Place is not dependent on any school district for funding or continuation, there is no need for the leader to spend much time maintaining close contact with school districts, state departments, school boards, etc. Hence the low ranking of the communication function.

When broken down by position within the center, some additional variation appears (Table 18, Appendix B). Everyone but the leader rates managing the center as most impor-
tant. Initiate and plan programs is an unanimous second choice. The most striking difference is between the leader's rating of teaching/advising in the center as her top priority¹ and everyone else's rating of this as sixth. One explanation for this may be that the leader's talent as a manager of resources is immediately evident to all who visit Teacher Place. Yet her more subtle ways of facilitating growth through the provision of materials and incisive verbal encouragement to each individual are not perceived as "teaching/advising" by participants, the way they are by her.² As to her teaching of courses and workshops, the leader maintains that, "If I can't have that, I don't want any of it."

She also points out in the interview that she enjoys all seven functions and feels they are all vitally important to her leadership role. She probably gives them almost equal percentages of her time and energy. "That's what makes the job interesting."

In Vermont the rank ordering of leadership functions

¹An interview with this researcher clarified that this is a strong preference rather than the reality which involves a lot more management than teaching/advising.

²Observation and interview data provided this insight. For example, each new visitor is given a 30-minute tour of the center which the leader describes as an educational act of itself.
matches that of Connecticut and is nearly the same as the overall rank order shown on Table 6 (p.151). Teachers and administrators perceive initiating new programs and managing the center as top priority in Vermont, with fund-raising generally third. The six parents give teaching/advising in the schools second priority, the highest of any group for any center (Table 18, Appendix B). The four staff (two of them clerical) also rank some of the seven functions differently. They were the only ones in the entire population to rate "communicate" as top priority. This is followed by initiate, raise funds, teach/advise in both center and schools. Managing the center and informing the public are at the bottom. Perhaps management and publicity rank low because at the time of the study this center had a highly competent administrative secretary who performed many management functions and a part-time staffer for publicity. The leader concentrated on communicating, both informally and formally, with constituent groups. School board members characteristically recognize the priority of fund-raising, along with the leader, now that all federal grants have ended.

Results of prioritizing the seven functions can also be tabulated by position as in Table 7 below.

Generally there is a close match between the ratings of all groups of respondents with the overall rank order and the ratings by location. Of special note is the fact that
Table 7

Rank Order of Seven Leadership Functions by Position
where 1 = most important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>P/C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Overall Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate regularly with all groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage and run the center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and plan programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the public of all center programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise funds to continue programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advise in the teachers' center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advise in the schools served by the center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T = Teachers
A = Administrators
SB = School Board members
P/C = Parents/Community members
S = Staff
teachers (who form the largest group of respondents) rate teaching/advising in the schools as the least important of all leadership functions in a rural teachers' center. Possibly teachers feel that there is just too much work to do in the center for it to be practical for the leader to work in schools. Or perhaps it is too threatening for "experts" like teachers' center leaders to be working with teachers in their home territory. This surprisingly low priority accorded teaching/advising in member schools is addressed elsewhere in this chapter (pp. 199-204). Its implications are discussed in Chapter V.

Teachers' centers staff consider management functions less important than initiating, communicating and fund-raising. This is probably because the small clerical staff in several centers perform some management duties for the leader.

**Summary.** In general, what emerges is a picture of the rural teachers' center leaders as a people with a wide variety of functions. The most important of these involves work associated with initiating and planning new programs, managing and running the center, and raising money. In addition, rural leaders must communicate regularly with all constituent groups. In terms of role, the leader should spend nearly one-third of the time teaching/advising. But when it comes to prioritizing seven leadership functions, teaching/advising in the center and teaching/advising out in
member schools are viewed as less of a priority than the administrative aspects of the work. Least important is the publicity public relations function for rural leaders.

**Research Question #2:** What are the Most Important Leadership Activities and How Do Participant Perceptions Compare between Centers and between Participant Groups?

The three main leadership roles, administrator, developer, and teacher/advisor are subdivided into seven functions as described in the previous section. The questionnaire further divides the seven functions into eight lists of activities, each list describing a function in greater detail. Respondents were asked to check the three most important activities from each list of 7-12 items. The frequencies have been tabulated by location and position and are presented and compared in Tables 8-15. Cross-tabulations by position for each location are noted in Tables 19 through 26. They are included in Appendix B.

In general, we find a remarkably close correspondence between the views of each of the five centers and the perceptions of each group of respondents: teachers, administrators, school board members, parents/community, and teachers' center staff. Some of the differences are equally interesting and are examined in the following text. These comparisons and contrasts are highlighted by cross-hatching in Tables 8 through 15.
A Role 1: Communicating regularly with various groups. Among the communication activities, Connecticut and Vermont think that the three most important groups to communicate with are 1) the governing/policy board and committees of the board, 2) superintendents and principals, and 3) teachers' center staff and volunteers. Texas agrees with 2) and 3) above but chooses district inservice committees over the policy board. This is not surprising since the Texas center's advisory board makes less substantive decisions than the district administration, which has always provided its major support. The Massachusetts center, also started by administrators, places less emphasis on the importance of its advisory board. Instead, Massachusetts rates communication with whole school faculties at regular meetings as one of the top three. This choice is not shared by the Massachusetts leader, who reported that she had difficulty with whole school faculty communication. It is, however, shared by teachers in Texas.

Wisconsin, a center independent of school districts, rates communication with superintendents and principals much less important than all the other centers. Instead, like Texas, it places district inservice committees among the three most important groups.

These findings appear in Table 8 where a numerical percentage of the total responses is given for each activity and the three most important activities in each category are
TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION A ROLE 1, SHOWING THE
THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHADED AREAS

"Our Leader Should Communicate Regularly With..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tx Ma Ct Wi Vt Totals</strong></td>
<td>Governing/Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 41 51 46 39 46</td>
<td>&amp; Committee of Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 47 51 26 59 52</td>
<td>Superintendents &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 29 18 26 17 20</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 29 18 26 17 20</td>
<td>School Boards &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 29 18 26 17 20</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 29 40 41 6 30</td>
<td>District Inservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 29 40 41 6 30</td>
<td>Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12 9 21 9 11</td>
<td>College Educ. Depts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12 9 21 9 11</td>
<td>Who Control Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12 9 21 9 11</td>
<td>Credit &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 56 73 82 63 70</td>
<td>Teacher Center Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 56 73 82 63 70</td>
<td>&amp; Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 27 22 39 39 29</td>
<td>State Depts. &amp; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 27 22 39 39 29</td>
<td>Agencies Outside Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 27 22 39 39 29</td>
<td>Service Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 53 31 10 13 27</td>
<td>Whole School Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 53 31 10 13 27</td>
<td>at Regular Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 3 0 7 9 8</td>
<td>Meeting the Many Unantc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 3 0 7 9 8</td>
<td>ticipated Visitors Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 3 0 7 9 8</td>
<td>Phone &amp; Drop In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 3 2 0 4 4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 35 45 39 46 209 Number of Respondents 209 125 41 12 20 11

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators; SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
shaded. The breakdown is by location and position for comparative purposes.

The right side of Table 8 shows that teachers, administrators, school board members and staff agree with the teachers' centers' overall choices of policy board, administrators and teachers' center staff and volunteers (left side of Table 8) exactly. The parents/community group differs in one area, saying, predictably, that school boards and community members are more important than the policy board. This may reflect their own wishes for more contact with teachers' centers leaders. Of note is the fact that communicating with community organizations and school boards is not perceived as very important by most of these rural teachers' centers participants. This contrasts with the rural education literature which emphasizes the need for school community interaction.

An examination of the fairly large number of "other" responses reveals the wish to add "individual teachers" to the groups of people with whom the leader should communicate regularly. Further use of the questionnaire would require adding this activity.

Of note is the fact that leaders in Texas, Massachusetts and Wisconsin say that "meeting of the many unanticipated visitors" is one of their three most important communication activities. (Table 19, Appendix B) None of their participants rate this activity so highly. As noted
in the literature review, the importance of this kind of informal, interstitial, networking is often unrecognized by those who engage in it. This would hold true for participants in contrast to leaders. Also of note are the strength of affirmation of the importance of communicating with volunteers in Texas and Wisconsin centers, and with the governing board in the Vermont center. Everyone voted for these activities.

B Role 1: Managing the teachers' center. Activities in this category include both clerical and leadership work. In larger teachers' centers many of them would probably not be considered as part of a leader's job. In this category all five centers and all five groups of participants agree on one area as a leadership priority: scheduling all teachers' center activities. Beyond this, total frequencies indicate that ordering and organizing resources come second in overall importance. Paper work for credit options is rated a distant third, closely followed by record keeping and documentation, writing letters/responding to inquiries, and budget/bookkeeping work.

In contrast, most teachers' centers staff view record keeping and documentation as much more important than ordering and organizing resources. School board members agree with them. But leaders in Texas and Wisconsin take the reverse view. Table 9 summarizes data showing the most important management functions by both location and position.
### TABLE 9
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION B ROLE 1, SHOWING THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHADED AREAS

"Our Leader Should Concentrate on the Following Management Functions..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
Nine percent of the total responses fall into the "other" category. Several people use this space for such comments as, "most of these should be done by an aid at $3.00 per hour." Two people in Massachusetts mention the idea of coordinating materials and events for different schools and teachers as a management task. Apart from these comments, people suggest activities which are identified later in the questionnaire under different headings.

Results also show that teachers in Massachusetts and Vermont value the leader's paper work for college credit options, while all five groups in Vermont feel that "writing letters and responding to inquiries" (formal networking) is important (Table 20, Appendix B). Administrators, especially in Massachusetts, value the printing and mailing work—formal networking again. In Texas both teachers and administrators agree on the importance of "making displays for the center and schools," although the leader does not see this as one of her most important activities. In Connecticut almost everyone values the leader's budget/bookkeeping work, as in Wisconsin.

In short, the only management activity regarded as crucial by all constituents is scheduling.

A Role 2: Initiating new programs. In this category are listed the most creative functions of the developer role, which has already proven to be the most important of the three roles. Almost all respondents view "creating and
organizing courses, mini-courses and workshops" and "developing new options for professional growth" as the two most important creative-initiatory activities of rural leaders. The only exception is in Wisconsin, where teachers rate both "planning community programs" and "attending professional growth activities to become a better teachers' center leader" slightly higher than developing new options. Table 10 presents frequencies by location and position for the question of how the leader should function as an initiator.

"Assessing needs periodically" is considered very important by all participant groups but teachers, except in Connecticut and Vermont (Table 21, Appendix B) where teachers do rate needs assessment highly.

In Massachusetts and Wisconsin, "planning community programs" is rated among the top three initiator activities. It would be odd if this were not so, as the Massachusetts Teacher/Community SEED Center was specifically funded to build bridges between rural teachers and rural communities. The independent Wisconsin Center is a community rather than a school supported venture. This community focus is definitely lacking in Connecticut, Vermont and Texas which are equally rural but did not include a strong community thrust in their initial goals. In Texas this was deliberate because the same town already sponsors a separate community education program.

But in Vermont and Connecticut, despite the leaders'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 67 91 83 71 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating &amp; organizing courses, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>78 78 76 82 80 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 33 52 40 42 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding &amp; hiring people to run courses, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>42 46 44 36 35 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 58 16 48 33 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning community programs</td>
<td>31 31 29 36 25 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 42 59 38 60 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing needs periodically</td>
<td>48 45 61 55 40 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 12 0 5 16 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping abreast with the field (reading, etc.)</td>
<td>10 9 7 18 25 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 67 64 40 67 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new options for professional growth</td>
<td>62 58 71 73 45 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 21 16 43 11 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional growth activities to become a better teachers' center leader</td>
<td>26 30 12 0 40 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents: 205 122 41 11 20 11

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
stated desire for increasing community outreach, few participants support that view. Yet research in rural educational reform warns that programs funded by the state or federal government which don't involve the community are less likely to survive than those that bind the two together (Moe and Tamblyn, 1974).

Many respondents link "finding people to run courses" with "creating and organizing courses." In every center but Massachusetts, it is fourth in overall importance, and for teachers in general, it ranks third.

"Keeping abreast with new ideas in the field" ranks overall as the least important leadership activity in this group. Only parents/community members seem to value it a little in contrast to teachers' center staff who unanimously agree that keeping abreast with new ideas is not one of their three most important initiator activities. This finding contrasts with San José's (1978) hope that core staff members of small teachers' centers will engage in research as an ongoing aspect of their job. Perhaps the rural participants in this study value the leader's expertise highly enough as it is. Leaders themselves express sadness that they have so little time for reading and reflection.

Two groups favor another professional development activity for leaders. Wisconsin participants and parents/community feel that it is important for leaders to attend professional growth activities to become a better leader.
Leaders in Texas and Wisconsin agree with this.

B Role 2: Informing the public. When asked to choose the three most important dissemination (publicity-public relations) activities, all participants rate "writing a monthly newsletter or calendar" as the single most important leader job in this category. Writing news releases is also highly valued except in Texas and among parents/community members. Interestingly, all groups but staff, in all centers but Texas, rate "speaking at community functions" as the third most important activity. This view probably reflects a sense that the teachers' centers are too insular and need to be understood better in their local communities. In Texas, the oldest of the rural centers, it is more important for the leader to attend and present at conferences and attend meetings outside the district than to do publicity work locally. This could be attributed to the internal stability of the Texas center within its district.

Teachers' center staff also rate "attending meetings outside the district" (with State Department, union, in-service planning, potential funding agencies) higher than "speaking at local community functions." Possibly these staff members feel that future support for the center from outside the district is more likely than from the local community. On the other hand, everyone else's emphasis on "speaking at community functions" and "writing news releases"
belies a sense that more needs to be made public locally about the programs of the teachers' center. Table 11 illustrates these tabulated results by location and position.

A further breakdown of these data (Table 22, Appendix B shows some differences between how leaders and participants view some activities in this part of the developer role. In Massachusetts and Connecticut, leaders rate "writing brochures and evaluation reports" highly. These are two centers with hope of continued federal funding. Participants in these two centers are probably well aware of the time-consuming importance and unfortunate necessity of these documentary activities. Generally, these results show that teachers' center leaders need to concentrate on writing a newsletter and news releases and speaking in public in order to spread the word and inform the public of the center's activities.

C Role 2: Fund-raising activities. The array of responses to this question is pictured in Table 12. Since the Texas center is funded annually through the superintendent's budget, fund-raising is not a leadership activity in this center. Of the other leaders' fund-raising activities, "learning to write and writing grant proposals" is quite well supported, receiving one-half of the total responses across the four centers and among all participants. Only school board members in Connecticut disagree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 43 | 34 | 44 | 40 | 45 | 206 | Number of Respondents | 206 | 123 | 41 | 11 | 20 | 11 |

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
TABLE 12
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION C ROLE 2, SHOWING THE
THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHADOWED AREAS

"Our Leader Should Attempt to Raise Funds to Keep the Center Going by..."

% of Responses by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Developing ideas for contacting local funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Developing ideas for contacting state funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Developing ideas for contacting federal funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Organizing fundraising events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Developing contacts with private foundations for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Learning to write and writing grant proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Exploring ways to make center self-supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Responses by Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>P/C</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 34 41 40 45 160 Number of Respondents 160 95 33 9 13 10

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
Most valued by most groups is "exploring ways to make the center self-supporting." Parents/community members give this a resounding 92% of their votes. But both Connecticut and administrators in general do not support this method of fund-raising. Could it be that these two groups have enough experience to feel fairly certain that a self-supporting teachers' center might be difficult to pull off in their rural areas? Moreover, the actual meaning of self-supporting in terms of leadership activity is not clear, except in the Wisconsin center where goods and services are sold to support the center. Do teachers and others in Vermont and Massachusetts envision turning their centers in this direction? Further research is needed to understand exactly what "self-supporting" means to rural respondents.

Opinions about the leader's role in relation to local, state and federal funding sources, reveal some interesting trends. Surprisingly, administrators seem to prefer that the leader try for federal funds. Of the three sources, they see local (the ones they would probably have to exert their influence to raise) as least important. In sharp contrast, school board members and teachers' center staff rate local funding as far more important than state or federal, reflecting the more general opinion that an educational innovation can only become institutionalized if it becomes locally funded. Since Connecticut and Massachusetts are currently federally funded, it is understandable, though
possibly short-sighted that they rate state and federal funding as more important than local.

Interestingly, school board members and parents/community members in all five centers generally rate "seeking state and federal funding" as a very low priority for the teachers' center leaders (Table 23, Appendix B). This finding deserves discussion in the broader context of rural values. The literature has revealed that rural isolation, self-reliance and poverty breed conservatism and hostility to "outside" money and ideas. Because state and federal dollars bring a degree of outside control of school programs, there is a feeling that the locus of control shifts from the local community to distant agencies. Against this background it is quite logical for community and school board members to have reservations about seeking state and federal funding even for centers like Vermont and Massachusetts which may otherwise not survive.

Another reason for rural conservatism toward state and federal monies is the general track record of even the most successful rural school improvement projects which created exciting jobs and programs while they were funded (3-5 years) and left little behind except disappointment once the money dried up. In fact, the literature shows very few examples of successful local continuation of federal projects after the three year start-up phase.

Responses by position are more varied than the
responses by location on the issue of fund-raising. Each group selected a different category as first choice. All groups agree that "organizing fund-raising events" is the least important type of fund-raising for the leader to pursue. These results also show that leaders in experienced rural teachers' centers should write grant proposals, find ways to make centers self-supporting, and focus on local funding sources. The next question to be answered is just what are the real options for local funding of experienced rural teachers' centers which arrived on the local scene providing free services?

The next three categories of response focus on the leader's role as a teacher/advisor in three different settings: within the teachers' center itself; in the schools served by the center; and in teachers' classrooms. The purpose is to explore perceptions about the most important teaching/advising activities in each location.

A Role 3: Teaching/advising in the teachers' center. The results reported in Table 13 below show a very clear mandate for the kind of teaching and advising leaders of experienced rural centers should engage in within the teachers' center. All five centers and all participants rank the informal networking activities of "connecting people with information, resources and other people" and "helping a teacher develop extend or adapt their own idea" as by far the most important two leadership teaching/advising activities. Third, among all
### TABLE 13
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION A ROLE 3, SHOWING THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHADED AREAS

"Our Leader Should Provide the following Services in the Center..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tx</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 43 | 34 | 44 | 40 | 46 | 207 | Number of Respondents | 207 | 123 | 41 | 12 | 20 | 11 |

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
groups save Massachusetts, comes "teaching a course, workshop or seminar on a curriculum or instructional topic."

In Massachusetts, where the leader facilitates meetings rather than teaches workshops or courses for teachers, a slightly higher percentage of responses went to "unscheduled useful discussions with visitors who drop in."

When these results are tabulated by position within each location (Table 24, Appendix B), one observes that school board members, parents/community members, and leaders in Massachusetts and Wisconsin place high value on another informal networking activity: "unscheduled useful discussions." Also in these two centers the idea of the leader "teaching a workshop on a topic of interest to the general public" is valued over teaching students or listening to non-teaching problems. Reasons for the community focus in these two centers have already been noted. Only in Texas does the leader report that being a listener to non-teaching problems is more important than being a connector of people to information and resources. Yet in interviews with the investigator, all of the leaders readily assert that a great deal of their time is devoted to dealing with non-teaching problems. Evidently participants do not share this view.

The findings reported in Table 13 clearly highlight the value of networking in rural teachers' centers. Also of note is the importance assigned to the leader as teacher, despite the overall feeling that the leader should spend
least time on the teaching/advising role.

B Role 3: Teaching/advising in member schools. Results show that the three most highly valued activities the leader conducts in rural schools are 1) "arranging a future workshop based on expressed teacher needs," 2) "making informal staff-room contacts leading to a future project with a teacher," and 3) "discussing/planning with the principal."

This finding underscores the importance of the principal's role in rural teachers' centers or in any program that seeks to improve classroom instruction. Even teachers are convinced of this priority.

Closely following these three categories, in Massachusetts, Connecticut and Vermont is another networking function: "linking a teacher with another teacher, resource or curriculum idea." Table 14 illustrates these results by location and position.

Perhaps the most unexpected finding in this category is that overall, "conducting a staff-development activity with the whole staff" receives the lowest ranking. When examined by position within location (Table 25, Appendix B), it is evident that teachers are the ones who do not favor this approach, except in Massachusetts. In Texas and Wisconsin, administrators also avoid checking this activity, along with the leaders of the Texas, Massachusetts and Connecticut centers. Probably this negative reaction to
TABLE 14
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION B ROLE 3, SHOWING THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHAD ED AREAS

"Our Leader Should Regularly Visit Member Schools..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 43 | 32 | 44 | 40 | 45 | 204 | Number of Respondents | 204 | 121 | 41 | 12 | 20 | 10 |

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
whole staff activities has to do with the traditionally non-voluntary nature of such training sessions.

Among the leaders of the five centers, there is wide disparity of opinion regarding the leader's in-school activities. This may indicate a variety in personal style. Also, it is surprising that in Vermont, administrators do not rate discussing and planning with the principal as one of the most important leader activities in the schools. Yet the Vermont leader values these contacts and Vermont administrators express a clear preference for communicating with administrators in an earlier question (Table 19, Appendix B). This discrepancy remains unexplained.

C Role 3: Visiting teachers in their classrooms. Results for this question reveal several interesting perceptions. Most important to all groups is "discussing and developing a new curriculum idea" (78%). Discussing problems related to students or instruction is seen as much less important (43%), except in Connecticut and Texas. Overall, the second and third choices are "bringing books and curriculum materials" and "arranging space, displays or learning centers." One can reflect that all three of these activities involve the outsider least in the classroom instructional process since they do not usually involve participation in teaching time. Table 15 shows the findings for this question by location and position.
TABLE 15  
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION C ROLE 3, SHOWING THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN SHARED AREAS  

"Our Leader Should Visit Teachers at Their Request in Their Own Classrooms..."  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Bringing books &amp; curriculum materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Offering recognition by noticing a strength; giving a boost to morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Discussing student or instructional problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Discussing &amp; developing a new curriculum idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Directly teaching a lesson to whole class or portion of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Organizing space, displays or learning centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 32 44 38 45 201  Number of Respondents  201 120 40 12 19 10  

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff
In Vermont, all groups strongly favor "offering recognition for a strength, boosting morale" over "arranging space." The same choice is strongly supported by all five leaders, by teachers' centers staff as a whole, and by school board members (Table 26, Appendix B). Unexpectedly, this kind of support is not so important to teachers, except in Vermont and Wisconsin. Clearly least important overall is the notion of the leader directly teaching a lesson to some or all of the class. Whether this is because classroom teaching is not seen as an appropriate leadership function or because teachers do not favor the idea of an outsider taking over, is not clear.

Three of the leaders have "other" suggestions for in-classroom activities. Two explain that they would do "any of the above at the teacher's request" and one says she would "assist with a lesson." Several parents and teachers in the Vermont center suggest "gleaning ideas from teachers to share with others," "addressing specific needs, tailoring service," and "assisting teacher with a major project." These all seem appropriate and may reflect the type of assistance already received by these people.

Summary. Almost all of the leadership activities identified in the questionnaire are considered among the three most important to the job of rural teachers' center leader, by some participants. It is a job requiring administration, development, and teaching/advising. The developer role is
slightly more important than the other two, particularly the initiatory activities of creating courses and workshops and developing other new options for professional growth.

Next in overall importance are the management activities of scheduling all center programs and the communications work of meeting regularly with governing/policy boards, superintendents and principals, and teachers' centers staff and volunteers. Fund-raising comes next with emphasis on writing grant proposals and finding ways to make the center self-supporting. In the teaching/advising role, leaders should spend most of their in-center time connecting people with information, resources and other people, and helping a teacher extend or adapt his/her own idea. Teaching a course or workshop is next in importance.

When leaders visit schools, they should focus on arranging future workshops, making informal staffroom contacts, and planning with principals. In classrooms, the most important activity is to discuss and develop new curriculum ideas. Bringing resources from the center and helping with space arrangements are also valued. Finally, in the publicity and public relations function, the leader should focus on putting out a monthly newsletter or calendar.

When these activities are compared center by center and group by group, the findings vary. This variation is predictable for the centers are different in age, size, funding patterns, and organization. Moreover, leaders of the
five centers bring a variety of backgrounds and experience to their work. Given these differences it is surprising to find so much agreement between centers and participants and leaders on the most important leadership roles, functions and activities for leaders of experienced, small rural teachers' centers.

Research Question #3: What Leadership Characteristics and Skills do Rural Teachers' Centers' Participants and Leaders Consider Most Important in Experienced Teachers' Centers?

After identifying the most important activities, functions and roles of the five rural teachers' centers' leaders, participants were asked to give a hypothetical "hiring committee" some advice on the most important characteristics and skills to look for in choosing a leader for such a center. In phrasing the question this way the hope was to encourage respondents not to describe their leader but to draw out of their experience a generalized profile of leadership characteristics and skills.

This question was answered in two ways. First, by respondents checking the four most important from a list of nine characteristics and skills. Second, they answered the open-ended request to "describe the characteristics of a good leader for a small rural teachers' center in your own words." This section reports and compares the frequencies from the list. Then it develops a general leadership profile based on a content analysis of written responses from all five
teachers' centers.

Survey results. Respondents checked the four most important of nine characteristics and skills of a rural teachers' center leader. The findings are presented by location and position in Table 16.

Overall, results show that the three most important skills and characteristics of a rural leader (all receiving over 65% of responses) are definitely:

1. creativity and follow-through on new ideas (70%)
2. skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults (67%)
3. public relations and human relations skills (66%)

Next in importance is:

4. administrative and management skills (57%)

Following, with substantially less checks are:

5. knowledge of the field of education: a philosophic breadth of scope that commands respect (37%)
6. credibility as a teacher of students (33%)

Categories receiving least checks are:

7. expertise in curriculum (23%)
8. financial expertise, development and writing skills (20%)
9. skill in teaching adults (9%)

Several respondents indicated that they felt this question could be included in "skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults: advisor skills." This could be one reason for the very low percentage of responses.
### Table 16

**Characteristics/Skills of an Effective Leader in a Rural Teachers' Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Four Choices Shaded</th>
<th>% of Responses by Position*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Responses by Location</th>
<th>Creativity &amp; follow through on new ideas</th>
<th>Credibility as a teacher of students</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; management skills</th>
<th>Public relations &amp; human relations skills</th>
<th>Expertise in curriculum</th>
<th>Knowledge of the field of education, a philosophic breadth of scope that commands respect</th>
<th>Skill in teaching adults</th>
<th>Skill as a motivator &amp; facilitator of growth in adults: advisor skills</th>
<th>Financial expertise, development &amp; writing skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tx</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>Wi</td>
<td>Vt</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board, P/C = Parents/Community, S = Staff

---

Number of Respondents: 118, 41, 12, 19, 10
When viewed center by center, there are two noticeable departures from these overall findings. In Texas, credibility as a teacher of students is much more important than administrative and management skills. This is not surprising. The leader considers herself more of a teacher than an administrator. She spends at least one-half her time in the schools. Moreover, Texas participants rate the administrator role as significantly less important (21%) than the teacher/advisor role (43%). Administration is seen as "paper work" by some Texas participants.

The other major variation is in Vermont where the leader's knowledge of the field of education and philosophic breadth of scope are seen as more important (64%) than creativity and follow through on new ideas (55%). Teachers, interestingly, are the only group in Vermont who did not take this perspective. Possibly Vermont respondents tend to prefer that leadership act in response to general issues and specific needs as they arise, rather than come up with new and creative ideas. In fact, this five year old center was often characterized as a "responsive" teachers' center.

The three categories with least overall responses are expertise in curriculum; financial, development and writing expertise; and skill in teaching adults. In their comments, participants made it clear that they want their leaders to be skilled in all curriculum areas generally, rather than have expertise in few specific areas. That only 20% rated
the financial and development skills as "most important" is interesting since four-fifths of the centers had severe financial pressures at the time of the study.

Viewing the responses by position in Table 16 shows conformity to the overall findings except in two respects. The school board members in all five centers claim knowledge of the field of education. . . (83%) to be vastly more important in a rural leader than public and human relations skills (25%). The 19 parents and community respondents also perceive educational knowledge and a philosophic breadth of scope (63%) as distinctly more important than administrative and management skills (47%). Thus people in the community want teachers' center leaders to be educators rather than managers or human relations specialists.

These findings indicate a very high level of respect for the teachers' center leaders as educators in the eyes of people who tend to have the least frequent contact with them. It must be remembered, however, that all respondents were chosen to answer the survey because of their participation in the teachers' centers. Their opinions do not necessarily reflect the opinions of others less well informed and/or supportive of the teachers' centers. In fact, it would be interesting to see how those who have least contact with the rural centers view leadership skills. One suspects that the findings would be entirely different.

When the leaders' own responses to the question of
characteristics and skills are compared, several patterns emerge (Table 27, Appendix B). All five leaders agree on the importance of creativity and follow-through on new ideas. Leaders in Texas, Connecticut and Wisconsin say that credibility as a teacher of students is very important (although in Connecticut and Wisconsin no one else agrees with them). Administrative and management skills are reluctantly\(^1\) rated as highly important by the Massachusetts, Connecticut, Wisconsin and Vermont leaders. Public and human relations skills are among the top four in every center but Vermont. Only the Vermont leader values knowledge of the field of education as one of the four most important leadership skills. And only in Connecticut does the leader not rank skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults as one of the top four skills.

Leaders, therefore, generally agree with each other, or with the majority of participants in their centers, on the four most important leadership characteristics and skills. There are two exceptions. In Wisconsin the leader alone rates credibility as a teacher of students above administrative, management skills, in contrast to all other Wisconsin participants. And in Connecticut the leader rates credibility as a teacher of students over skill motivating and facilitating growth in adults, in contrast to all other

\(^1\)This almost apologetic reluctance appeared in each interview with the researcher.
Connecticut participants.

Evidently in these two centers as well as in Vermont and Massachusetts, participants feel that credibility as a teacher of students does not carry as much importance for leadership as the leaders seem to think.

Leadership profile. One hundred and fifty-four out of two hundred and nine people elaborated on their choices of the four most important leadership characteristics and skills. These responses were charted. A content analysis was performed for each center's responses. Finally, a composite description was drawn up, combining the most frequent responses under two separate headings: 1) personal characteristics, and 2) skills. This composite description elaborates on the results just presented. It represents additions to and amplifications of the objective responses and is entirely composed of quotations. The description below uses only respondents' words and phrases. Although it describes one human being, it is a profile of five.

Personal characteristics in a rural leader are even more important than professional skills. The wide range of qualities mentioned might be classed as those involving relationships with other people and personal attributes.

In dealing with people and helping teachers to improve their teaching, the rural leader should be open, friendly, warm, understanding, tolerant, and a good listener. In
addition, she/he must be cheerful, helpful, sensitive, supportive, encouraging, non-judgmental and trusted by all groups of participants.

This leader should have very special personal attributes. She/he should be highly creative, an excellent improvisor and full of ingenious ideas. She/he should also be versatile and flexible: a jack-of-all-trades who is resourceful, persistent, open-minded, able to take criticism as well as survive under pressure, yet maintain the courage of his/her convictions. This leader should be self-motivated and confident, in fact, a superman. At the same time she/he must be low key, down to earth but not too earthy, and not personally ambitious. She/he should be aggressive but not pushy; assertive but not dominant [qualities one respondent finds, in most cases, in a female].

Thirdly, the leader of a small rural teachers' center should be very hard-working. She/he must have boundless energy and enthusiasm. She/he must inspire and motivate others; be dynamic and optimistic; take risks. At the same time, this paragon should be patient, easy-going, tactful, humorous, and not easily discouraged.

The rural leader's skills should excel in five areas. In order of importance these are: communications, knowledge of education, administrative and management skills, public relations skills, and knowledge of rural needs.
Most important, the leader must be adroit at communicating with teachers as a peer, yet get along equally well with administrators and community people. She/he should know how to "read" the needs of people, discern individual teacher's problems and needs, work well on the grassroots level.

With a thorough knowledge of education, child development, and especially curriculum, this person must be deeply committed to the professional development of teachers as well as to all other goals of the teachers' center. At the same time this person should possess an eclectic approach to professional development which enables him/her to work well with all types of teachers.¹

The rural leader's administrative and management skills should be highly developed. This person must organize well, delegating some jobs yet taking responsibility and keeping an eye on the whole picture of the center's development.

Public relations skill in a leader was fourth most frequently mentioned, although it placed low in priority overall among the seven leadership functions. Respondents stressed the importance of being able to "sell" the center, and of "political astuteness" as being especially critical in a rural center.

¹There is no mention of open-education or of any other specific point of view by any respondent, including leaders.
Finally, the leader should understand rural attitudes, characteristics and needs. He/she must be sensitive to the differences between the small rural schools served, aware of local community needs, and should be responsive to the special ambience of each rural community. A teacher sums up the skills and characteristics of a leader this way:

A leader needs ideas, therefore he should be creative or adept at seeking ideas from other sources. He needs to be a good organizer and to be a capable manager of the center since, in a small rural area he is likely to have few assistants! Most important he should be able to handle people and know curriculum thoroughly since he will most likely have to handle all subjects and grade levels.

Clearly, the rural teachers' center leader is expected to be a warm, outgoing person and a distinguished educator. However, no leader in this study embodies all of these characteristics and skills. Thus, while the composite picture presented above may present useful guidelines for those charged with hiring a rural teachers' center leader for an experienced center, it should not be inferred that such a person necessarily exists.

Research Question #4: How Important is the Leader's Role as an Advisor to Teachers in Rural Teachers' Centers?

One survey question attempted to separate the leader's work as an advisor\(^1\) with individual teachers, from all other aspects of the leader's work. It attempted to discern what

\(^1\)See definition of advisor, Chapter I, page 16.
specific types of one-to-one advisory activities are perceived as most important to rural teachers. The Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976) coding scheme for teachers' perceptions of advisor support provides the most comprehensive categorical description of the advisor role to date. This coding scheme was used to divide advisor activities into twelve parts (items 1-12 below).\(^2\) Items thirteen and fourteen were added by this researcher based on her own work as an advisor. The fourteen advisor activities appear as follows:

1. a service and administrative agent: arranges visits and workshops; gets resources to teachers

2. an extension of the teacher: helps in classrooms, providing an extra pair of hands

3. an emotional stabilizer and stimulator: provides a sympathetic ear, a boost for morale and inspiration to keep trying

4. a respecter of individuality: understands teacher's perspective and accepts and works from teacher's goals and methods

5. a stage director and demonstrator: shows ways of setting up room, using materials, ways of teaching. Gives specific ideas

6. a diagnostician and problem-solver: helps identify and pinpoint problems so solutions are jointly perceived

7. a provider of alternatives: suggests new ideas

\(^1\)Of interest also was the opportunity to test this operational description of teacher perceptions of advisor support with a larger and more diverse population of teachers (128) than hitherto; a population not associated with open education.
8. an explainer and theorist: provides theoretical rationale for methods, explains educational principles

9. a modeling agent: advisor demonstrates an instructional principle by working with students while teacher observes

10. an appreciative critic and discussant: provides non-judgmental but careful observation and analysis of classroom issues

11. a provocative and reflective agent: helps stimulate and brainstorm new ideas leading to clarification of teacher's "next steps"

12. a leader and challenger: helps teachers see themselves capable of daring to risk new ways or challenge arbitrary decisions

13. a "linker": provides a bridge between teachers and relevant resources or programs. Puts teachers and classrooms with common interests in touch with each other

14. an organizer: assists teachers with preparation and follow through for field trips.

Respondents were asked to check all activities they believed to be important to an advisor's work. Table 17 below lists the types of advisor support spelled out above, numbered from 1-14. This table compares totals of the teachers' responses with the frequencies from each teachers' center and with the views of each leader.

Since many people checked a majority of the fourteen items, the most notable results are those which have either a very high (80-100%) frequency of approval or those which have a distinctly low (under 40%) percentage of checks.

Overall, we see that categories 1, 7 and 13 receive a much higher percentage of checks than all the rest. Teachers
TABLE 17
IMPORTANCE OF ADVISOR ACTIVITIES TO TEACHERS AND LEADERS
IN THE FIVE RURAL TEACHERS' CENTERS

- O = notably high (80-100%)
- □ = notably low (under 40%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of perceived advisor support</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Leader Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Teachers by Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses: 137  26  20  34  29  28
place most value on the advisor's work as:

a. a service and administrative agent who arranges visits and workshops and gets resources to teachers
b. a provider of alternatives who suggests new ideas
c. a "linker" who builds a bridge between teachers and relevant resources and programs and who puts teachers and classrooms with common interests in touch with each other.

Two important observations are that all three of these support activities imply networking, and that none of them requires the advisor's actual presence in a teacher's classroom.

None of the six activities receiving the next most favorable response (numbers, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 12) after the ones already mentioned (numbers 1, 7, 13) require the advisor's presence in the classroom while the teacher is teaching. Categories 3 and 4 fall into the domain of emotional support. Items 5 and 10 (stage director and appreciative critic) involve discussion between the teacher and advisor in non-teaching time. Items 11 and 12 (provocative and reflective agent, leader and challenger) can happen on the phone or in the teachers' center, as well as in the classroom.

Turning to the least popular advisor activities, items 2 and 9, which require direct intervention of the advisor in the teaching act, receive the lowest percentage of all checks. Using an advisor as a "helping hand" in the classroom or as
a "model" who demonstrates an instructional principle are clearly the least desirable advisor activities for the majority of teachers in this study. Reasons for this finding are unclear but it supports those writers on advisories who maintain that the disadvantages of having an "expert" demonstrate in the classroom outweigh the advantages.¹

The other least important advisor support activities overall are numbers 8 and 14. The results for category 8 show that only in Texas is the advisor's theoretical and interpretive activity moderately highly valued. Apparently explanations of educational principles are not viewed by many teachers as an important aspect of the advisory service even though they do value the leader's background knowledge of the educational field and of curriculum in general. This seeming incongruity is clarified in the humanistic developmental literature. Adults generally do not appreciate gratuitous explanations from experts who know more than they do. Yet they do value support for self-chosen next steps, from those they respect.

Item 14, assisting with organization and follow-up on field trips does not attract much importance, except in Massachusetts.

¹Alberty & Dropkin (1975) stress that modeling a way of interacting with a small group of children is acceptable, but not taking over the whole class to demonstrate a teaching technique, which might foster teacher dependence instead of teacher autonomy.
All these findings suggest a wariness on the part of teachers toward having advisors observe or participate directly in their teaching process. One might infer that the image of the advisor as an expert teacher is somewhat threatening to this group of rural teachers. Moreover, in view of the previously ascertained unimportance of the leader's "credibility as a teacher of students," it can be concluded that in this study the "master teacher" image of an advisor is not as crucial as the literature has indicated.

Table 17 (page 196) also shows that teachers from the Texas center find almost all of the advisor support activities highly significant, except for "extension of teacher," "modeling agent," and "helping with field trips." The leader's perceptions concur with teachers' very closely except in one respect. In Texas, teachers view the leader's provision of theoretical rationale and educational principles as more important than the leader does herself!  

Connecticut teachers are also strong supporters of most aspects of the advisory service. Table 17 shows that over 64% of responses favored all categories but 2, 8, 9 and

---

\[1\] It is interesting to note that the "Advisory Center for Teachers" in Waxahachie grew out of many years of contact with EDC Follow Through, one of the organizations involved in the Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel study. This center's participants clearly place the leader's advising work as a top priority, along with the superintendent. These results should confirm to this center that it has closely followed its mentor in developing its advisory program over seven years.
14. At Project Rise, which has three advisors on the staff (no other center has advisors other than the leader), the only unpopular activities are, "extension of the teacher," "explainer and theorist," "modeling agent," and "organizer of field trips." The major contrast between the Connecticut teachers and their leader is that 65% of teachers value the notion that the leader challenges them, helping them to see themselves capable of risking new ways and challenging arbitrary decisions. The leader did not check this item.

In Massachusetts, in-classroom assistance (2 and 9) and the two emotional support categories (3 and 4) fared least well with teachers. In fact, fewer Massachusetts teachers (only 35%) checked the "emotional stabilizer and provider of a sympathetic ear," than in any other center. The reason for this may be that the leader was rarely able to visit schools. But it is surprising to see that organizing and helping with field trips (14) and acting as a stage director/demonstrator (5) both received 60% of responses, and the provision of new ideas (7) received 95% of responses. The leader checked none of these three items.

The fact that the leader in Massachusetts checked fewer categories than participants and than other leaders, and reflected frustration at being able to spend so little time in schools, was revealed in the interview. Her administrative duties were clearly spelled out but she had to forge her own advisory role. Hers was the smallest
grant and smallest staff. She felt the need to "get out to schools" but was unable to find the time. Possibly she was unaware of the extent of her advisory potential in the center itself, as a provider of new ideas, an organizer of field trips, or a demonstrator of materials. After all, only three of the fourteen types of advisory activities could only be done in classrooms. All the others involve kinds of support which could be offered in the center or even over the phone.

Wisconsin is another center where the leader has almost no opportunity for one-to-one in-classroom work with teachers. It is not surprising, therefore, that this center has the lowest percentages of perceptions of advisor support overall. It is more remarkable that a center that does not think of itself as even having an advisory, actually values most of these activities so highly. Sixty-nine percent of teachers think the leader's work as a service and administrative agent arranging visits and workshops is important, though she herself did not check this. Overall, however, the teachers' and leader's perceptions of advisor support in Wisconsin are very consistent.

This is not so true in Vermont. Like Wisconsin and Massachusetts teachers, those in Vermont attach the greatest importance to linking activities, providing new ideas and to the service and administrative functions. Much less important are all the other advisor support activities,
except the following three: "respector of individuality and understanding of the teacher's perspective," "appreciative critic" and "provocative reflective" roles. In these respects Vermont closely matches Texas.

The leader in Vermont was the only person who checked all categories of support. This implies both the leader's greater awareness of the scope of the work she did and also the disappointing fact that too little time was spent in an advisory relationship with most teachers.

Least important to Vermont teachers are helping in the classroom, demonstrating instructional principles, and providing a theoretical rationale for methods. Probably these are seen as potentially evaluative thus more threatening than supportive to teachers in Vermont as well as in the other rural settings.

The above results raise several interesting questions, which cannot be fully answered by this study. First, to what extent do these responses indicate what teachers wish they had more or less of and how much do they reflect what teachers believe that they already have? This study's focus on "what is most important to me" probably leads to an expression of preference, but this can only be inferred.

The other question is, do these results support or undercut the idea that rural advisors should leave the teachers' center and travel, often great distances, to visit teachers in their schools and classrooms? All five rural
leaders express the opinion that bringing the teachers' center to the schools and classrooms is crucial to the success of their work. Yet these results show:

1. much highly valued advisory activity does not need to take place in rural schools
2. rural teachers are least likely to value advisors participating in the teaching process itself.

Finally, a question arises about the coding scheme itself. The categories were labelled by the EDC researchers as conceptual "tags" for groups of individual statements. Some of these labels would be very unlikely to come up in actual advisor interactions, either because of their psychiatric overtones or because they do not seem quite appropriate to classrooms. Examples are "emotional stabilizer and stimulator," "extension of teacher," "stage director." "modeling agent." Possibly conceptual labels like these seemed inappropriate to teachers, in describing advisor activities. And other categories using labels like "explainer, theorist, diagnostician, critic," may have evoked fear of unsolicited evaluation in some teachers.

If this is so, it might explain one discrepancy between these findings and those of Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976). They found that the "emotional stabilizer" category received the greatest percentage of perception of support responses, while teachers in this study were considerably less enthusiastic about this category. Yet the
five leaders in this study emphasized in interviews the enormous amount of time they felt that they spend in sympathetic listening. Leaders, therefore, perceived the "emotional stabilizer" to be one of their most important and pervasive advisory support activities.

Both studies found "provider of alternatives: suggests new ideas" to be one of the most important activities. This finding confirms the importance of being a curriculum generalist and of having creativity and follow through on new ideas, which emerged as key skills and characteristics of the rural leader, in the leadership profile.

In sum, three networking types of advisor activities are most important to teachers in this study: 1) the linking idea where the leader helps teachers with common interests or resources to make contact with each other; 2) the provision of alternatives, new ideas; and 3) the service and administrative agent arranging visits and workshops, getting resources to teachers. The two least important advisor activities are those which involve the leader's direct participation in the teaching process. Apparently many advisory support activities are valued which do not require on-site school and classroom visits. The implications of these and preceding findings are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS
OF MAJOR FINDINGS

This final chapter summarizes the results of this study of roles, functions and activities of rural teachers' center leaders in the light of the problem statement and literature review. It proceeds to offer a job description for the rural teachers' center leader, new insights into the rural leader's advisor stance, and documentation on how rural teachers' centers function as educational networks. The conclusions contribute as much to small teachers' center leadership in general as to rural leadership. Finally, the methodology is discussed and directions for further research are suggested.

Leadership Roles, Functions and Activities

The review of small group leadership theory has shown that a leader's role is defined by the interplay between what she/he does (activities) and who she/he is (characteristics) as defined by those affected. This study asked five groups of participants to identify the leadership roles, functions, activities, characteristics and skills of five experienced rural teachers' center leaders. Results have been compared overall by both location and position and by
position within each location. The following summary of the findings provides what Nadel (1957) terms a full prescription for the representative role of a rural teachers' center leader.

Despite major differences between centers in staff size, age, sources of support, and budget, there are undeniable patterns of correspondence between participants' and leaders' perceptions of leadership activities and traits among the five teachers' centers. The two charts on the following pages provide an overall summary of both the role expectations for rural leaders and the personal characteristics and skills required for the work of rural teachers' center leadership.

Chart 1 defines the rural leader's three major roles in terms of the functions and activities considered most important by both their participants and themselves. All three major roles are almost equal in importance. The seven functions are prioritized, 1-7, and the three most important activities within each function are listed in order of overall importance to all participants.

This chart accurately pictures a basic tension between leadership and management remarkably similar to the leader/manager tension in a principal's role described by Lipham and Hemphill (Rubin, ed., 1970). Teachers' center participants prefer the leader in general to spend more time developing and teaching/advising than administrating the
**Chart 1. The Most Important Roles, Functions and Activities of an Experienced Rural Teachers' Center Leader**

**Communicate with All Groups**
- a. teacher center staff and volunteers
- b. superintendents and principals
- c. governing/policy board and committees

**Manage the Center**
- 1. schedule all activities
- 2. order and organize resources
- 3. do paperwork for credit options

**Initiate and Plan Programs**
- 4. create and organize courses, workshops
- 5. develop new options for professional growth
- 6. assess needs periodically

**Teach/Advise in the Center**
- 7. connect people with information, resources and other people
- 8. help a teacher extend or develop own idea
- 9. teach a course, workshop or seminar

**Teach/Advise in Member Schools**
- 10. arrange a future workshop based on expressed needs
- 11. make informal staffroom contacts leading to a future project
- 12. discuss, plan with principal

**Administer**
- 13. raise funds to keep center going
- 14. explore ways to make center self-supporting
- 15. write grant proposals
- 16. develop ideas for federal funding

**Inform the Public**
- 17. write monthly newsletter
- 18. write news releases
- 19. speak at community functions

**Explanation:**

3 Major Roles: showing % of time spent on each

7 Functions: prioritized

21 Activities: showing 3 most important in each category
teachers' center. But when functions are specified in greater
detail, the administrative work takes on a higher priority
than being a developer and teacher/advisor in the view of all
groups of participants. This ambivalence between the
requirements of management and the urge to operate creatively
as an educator is built into the role of the rural teachers' center leader, except when teachers' center management is provided by district administration, as it is in the Texas center studied here.

Leadership Characteristics and Skills

Chart 2 below presents a summary profile of the characteristics and skills of an effective leader in a rural teachers' center showing percent of responses for each category. The summary was drawn from responses to two questions: 1) "If you were asked to advise a hiring committee on what characteristics and skills to look for in choosing a leader, which of the following would you suggest as the four most important?", and 2) "Please describe the characteristics of a good leader for a small rural teachers' center in your own words."

In terms of MacGregor's democratic leadership theory, the leader of an experienced rural teachers' center earns his/her leadership status and authority by combining the characteristics/skills listed in Chart 2 with performance of the role demands of participants described in Chart 1. The
Chart 2. Effective Leadership Characteristics and Skills Prioritized by Rural Teachers' Center Participants

1. CREATIVITY AND FOLLOW THROUGH ON NEW IDEAS
   - courage of convictions
   - highly creative, dynamic
   - versatile, improvisor
   - flexible, ingenious
   - resourceful, confident
   - boundless energy
   - self-motivated
   - enthusiastic
   - persistent
   - energetic

2. SKILL AS A MOTIVATOR AND FACILITATOR OF GROWTH IN ADULTS
   - communicates as peer with teachers
   - patient, open-minded
   - humorous
   - trusted by teachers and administrators
   - good listener
   - non-judgmental
   - supportive

3. PUBLIC AND HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS
   - understanding
   - tolerant
   - warm, open
   - sensitive
   - outgoing
   - helpful
   - down-to-earth
   - friendly
   - diplomatic

4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS
   - aggressive but not pushy
   - good organizer and delegator
   - hard working
   - not bureaucratic
   - takes criticism well
   - long-range planner
   - survives well under pressure
   - low-key, tactful
   - politically astute

5. KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIELD OF EDUCATION: PHILOSOPHIC BREATH OF SCOPE THAT COMMANDS RESPECT
   - a curriculum generalist can help with any classroom problem
   - knows child development, adult development and learning theory
   - knows rural community and local school needs
   - complete commitment to philosophy of helping teachers help themselves

6. CREDIBILITY AS TEACHER OF STUDENTS
   - a good teacher
   - treats all students alike
   - excellent teacher

7. EXPERTISE IN CURRICULUM
   - knows curriculum thoroughly
   - keeps up with new ideas
   - offers constructive criticism

8. FINANCIAL EXPERTISE DEVELOPMENT AND WRITING SKILLS
   - fundraiser
   - clear goals
   - master of many trades
   - effective speaker can "sell" the center proposal writer
   - a "go-getter"

9. SKILL IN TEACHING ADULTS
   - knows each teacher's needs
   - accessible
   - commitment to professional growth
   - motivator of people
interplay between the leader's personal qualities and the leaders' activities previously summarized, brings this study to a three part formulation of the rural leader's job description.

**Job Description for Experienced Rural Teachers' Center Leader**

A. Philosophical stance. Applicants for the job of rural teachers' center leader must subscribe to the belief that teachers and administrators are individually their own best judges of what they need for improving classroom instruction and that the teachers' center leader's major duty is to sensitively discern and promptly respond to individual needs, whatever they are and whenever they arise.

B. General requirements: experience and skills. Must have background in adult development, human relations and/or counseling; must be familiar with public school teaching requirements and pressures; must be creative, enthusiastic, provide follow-through on new ideas and be able to demonstrate organizational and management ability; should be able to take initiative within a framework of democratic decision-making; should be sensitive to political realities of the local district(s) served and be able to achieve the respect of all levels in the school district hierarchy. This person should understand child development and be possessed with an eclectic educational philosophy. She/he should be ardently
committed to the center's goals to improve the teaching-learning process.

A general expertise in curriculum is required in order to field any problem with useful alternative solutions. Knowledge of the local community, schools and resources is also useful in order to be effective as the hub of the informal network formed by a rural teachers' center.

In general, skill in providing support for the efforts of others to professionalize themselves is most important: more important than management or organizational skills, teaching or creativity.

C. Specific duties: (in order of importance)

1. To provide ongoing advisory services for teachers on an individual basis. To help extend or develop an idea, obtain materials, link people and resources with each other. To help others see themselves as growing professionals.

2. To create, organize, coordinate and schedule courses, workshops and new options for professional growth. To develop and manage credit options.

3. To communicate regularly with staff, volunteers, school administrators, policy boards and committees involved in teachers' center activities.

4. To explore funding alternatives (write grants, make political contacts both in and outside districts served).

5. To conduct continuous informal needs assessments among all participants, responding quickly to requests for service.

6. To order and organize all teachers' center resources.
7. To teach courses and workshops on curriculum and instructional topics.

8. To keep the public informed of the center's activities through a newsletter, news releases and speaking at local community functions.

9. To be familiar with local resources and work well with local community people and schools.

Although this is a most challenging job description, it does not require formal public school teaching credentials, classroom teaching experience, nor expertise in directly helping teachers to teach. This is a direct contrast to job descriptions for the hiring of most directors for teachers' center projects funded by the current Office of Education Teacher Centers Program. These job descriptions for federal projects require valid teaching credentials, three to five years of teaching experience, and some "demonstration" experience. In many cases candidates must be presently employed as a classroom teacher when applying to direct a teachers' center.

If, as this study has shown, skill in supporting adult development is crucially important, it seems almost a contradiction to require current expertise in teaching children as the prime qualification for the leadership role.

Rural Leaders as Advisors

The fourth research question sought teacher opinion on the leader's role as advisor. Results showed that the

---
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most valued advisor activities involved networking between people and resources and the provision of new ideas, while the least valued activities involved direct participation in the teaching process.

Thus, perhaps the most surprising conclusion of this study is that although rural teachers do value the leaders' work as advisors in many different ways (Table 17, p. 196) they prefer that the advisor not participate as a helper or model during teaching time (which is all day in the rural school).

Two questions that emerge from these findings are: 1) do teachers want advisors inside the sanctity of their classrooms at all? and 2) exactly why are teachers reluctant to have direct advisory participation in the teaching process? These are important issues for further study because the current literature on professional development places so much emphasis on in-classroom assistance as the locus for professional growth (Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Devaney, ed., 1977, 1979; Rand Study, 1978; Rubin, 1977).

This finding does not mean that rural leaders should immediately cease taking their advisory service to the schools. Yet they must now weigh carefully the pros and cons of visiting member schools in view of the time and cost of travel and the lack of teacher support for in-classroom demonstration teaching. At the same time, teachers' strong support of many non-classroom advisory activities as an
integral part of the leadership role brings this study to the conclusion that the advisory stance is a central feature of rural teachers' center leadership whether or not traditional advisor work is done in schools and classrooms.

A second conclusion is that rural teachers do not require their leaders to be master teachers who "have already had years of experience working successfully with children" (Thomas, 1979, 2). Nor do rural teachers in this study require their leaders to be experts in a particular curriculum area. Rather, the rural leader must be a facilitator of adult development who provides ideas, resources and general support. As summarized by Thomas (1979), an advisor is:

Someone who practices the art of drawing out the best in a teacher and in a school. Not master teachers who 'have the answers' but colleagues committed to working and learning alongside teachers (2).

**Network Theory**

The findings of this study provide new documentation on the functions of rural teachers' centers as educational networks. The five most salient points are:

1. Even in highly experienced rural teachers' centers, informal, one-to-one "information-sharing and psychological support" (Parker, 1977) permeated all three of the leaders' major roles as administrator ("communicate regularly with individual teachers and unanticipated visitors who drop in
or phone"), **developer** ("assess needs informally"), and as **teacher/advisor** ("connect people with information; help a teacher extend own ideas," "make informal staffroom contacts," "provide alternatives," "link teachers, resources and other teachers"). Thus, informal networking was understood and highly valued in rural teachers' center leadership.

2. This informal, interstitial networking was buttressed by regular, formal networking with staff and volunteers, superintendents and principals, and policy boards and community members. Thus both formal and informal networking are processes crucial to the functioning of experienced rural teachers' centers.

3. Despite their age and well-established patterns of formal and informal networking, the three rural teachers' centers financed primarily by federal grants remained much more precarious than the one locally instituted from the start, and the independent center. Unfortunately, these results support Berry and Peterson's (1977) finding that rural networks are very difficult to sustain over time even with active leadership at the hub and small budgets. A year after the completion of this study, two of the five rural centers had all but lost their funding.

4. The teachers' center leadership profile from this study very closely matches Parker's (1977) configuration of leadership traits in networks for innovation and problem-solving. Parker found the five most important leadership
traits and skills to be:

- effective facilitator
- low profile, non-abrasive personality
- great sensitivity to others' needs
- dedication to project goals
- able to inspire trust in participants.

This study also supports Goodlad's (1977) finding that effective staffing of the "hub" of an educational network requires "persons oriented more to the development of people than specific elements of school programs." (36)

5. Finally, this study does not support Kadushin's theory that an interstitial network can become instituted, through making its invisible "flows of exchange" visible. In the case of rural teachers' centers, the institutional location of the original sources of support, found to be crucial in the Rand Studies (1974, 1977, 1978) seems to be more important to the longevity of these rural teachers' centers, than network development.

**Rural Education**

This study has demonstrated that the job of the rural teachers' center leader is to provide much of what is called for in the literature on rural professional development in general: e.g., small scale, individualized, responsive community sensitive programs providing a high degree of informal networking between the leader and all participants.
Two findings specific to rural education stand out: 1) Educational programs for the community turned out to be less important overall than anticipated, even though maintaining informal contacts with community organizations was valued as a leadership activity. 2) Mistrust among community members in this study toward state and federal funding for the teachers' centers confirmed Moe and Tamblyn's (1974) warnings of the continuing pervasiveness of rural conservatism toward outside sources of money. So, even though rural community members supported their teachers' centers as appropriate vehicles for professional development, they favored local over state or federal funding even when local funds were not available.

Thus, while rural teachers' centers' networks do show promise for meeting the professional needs of widely dispersed and isolated rural teachers and communities, we do not have enough evidence to agree with Dunne (1978) that rural teachers' centers have the "greatest potential impact on rural school reform. . ." and are "more readily adaptable to rural needs than many earlier models" (26-27).

In fact, the findings of this rural study seem to be applicable to centers with small staffs as well as centers that are geographically rural.
Discussion of the Methodology

The collaborative development and piloting of a questionnaire among the five rural teachers' center leaders helped to validate the instrument as representing most, if not all, aspects of leadership work in this population. It solicited the opinions of two hundred nine participants by asking them to select the most important from each class of items "for the coming year."

One problem was that it was difficult to tell whether the responses indicated 1) ideal preference, 2) the most practical alternative under the circumstances, or 3) what respondents perceived to be their current reality. For example, it could be inferred that, while parents/community members preferred the teachers' center leader to spend 41 percent of the time teaching/advising, the same group felt that teaching/advising in schools was only practical as a much lower priority (4th out of 7). Some clarifications emerged from the interviews of leaders, which greatly assisted in the interpretation of questionnaire results.

The instrument was quite long (eight legal pages). A great deal of data were collected, not all of which could be reported in this study. Yet both leaders and participants were sufficiently invested in the process and results that 81 percent of all the questionnaires were returned. The first half of the questionnaire could be used again to replicate this study or the second half can be revised to
explore programs and incentives in rural teachers' centers.

Methodologically, the choice of a weighted stratified sample of the teachers' centers' most active supporters reduced the generalizability of the results for the rural school-related population as a whole. But a random selection of teachers in districts where small teachers' centers are located would be likely to provide so wide a range of informed and uninformed opinion that that approach is not recommended. In short, the instrument and sampling method developed for this study were sound, both theoretically and technically. Three suggestions for further use of the instrument are offered. 1) The study could be replicated with minor adjustments to describe the leadership role in other experienced teachers' centers with small staffs either in rural or non-rural settings. The questionnaire could also be used 2) to explore leadership preferences in small teachers' centers that are just beginning. Finally, 3) the questionnaire can be used with policy boards as an awareness raising and training instrument, since it develops in great detail the leadership role.1

Further Research

This study has thoroughly described the roles and functions of five rural teachers' center leaders. Two

1It has already been used as such on two occasions, with leaders of new and experienced rural and urban centers.
interesting issues arose in relation to the advisor role. These deserve further investigation because they have broader implications for the professional development of educational personnel.

First, the lack of enthusiasm among even supportive rural teachers for in-classroom advisor work indicates a need for further research to determine to what extent the classroom itself is really the starting point for teacher development with advisory support, as has been widely claimed in the literature. The major question to be answered is: Should in-classroom advisor service be a part of any teachers' center programs, or does the risk of threatening a teacher by having an "expert" enter the sanctity of the classroom negate the growth potential of the relationship? One would need to explore teachers' views of 1) the specific times and settings they prefer for growth activities, 2) the experience and qualities of helper/trainers they prefer to work with, and 3) their feelings about the specific types of expertise they would welcome/not welcome within their classrooms.

The second issue for further investigation is the comparative importance of two different areas of expertise in advisors: teaching and counseling. Should staff developers/advisors be teachers who are masters of their craft or
should they be counselors adroit in human relations? Is knowledge of child development or adult development more important for those educational leaders whose work is devoted to strengthening and deepening teachers' sense of themselves as life-long explorers of the process of education?

Finally, the results of this preevaluative exploratory study provide the foundation for research on both leadership and program effectiveness in small teachers' centers. These findings also provide guidelines to assist in developing programs for the preparation and training of leaders for small teachers' centers. Now that the leadership role in rural teachers' centers has been described fully and the job defined, these data can be incorporated into an effectiveness study which would have to take into account many institutional and political factors besides leadership. The findings would help to answer the question of central concern to all those involved in teachers' centering: how effective is the teachers' center as a location and system for promoting the professional development of educational personnel in rural and non-rural areas?
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Dear

As part of my doctoral research I am conducting a survey on rural teachers' centers. Yours is one of just five rural centers in the country that has been going more than two years. All five, in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Texas, Vermont and Wisconsin, have agreed to take part in this study.

This questionnaire has been drawn up with the help of your Director (leader) and is being distributed with the consent of your Board. Its purposes are (1) to help your teacher center leader decide on the best use of his/her time. (2) to seek your views on inservice education and (3) to help me with my research.

Your opinions on this survey will be a great help in determining future directions for your center. They will also help to provide guidelines for the leaders of newer rural teachers' centers, who may be able to profit from your experience.

This survey is being distributed to teachers, administrators, parents, school board members, community people and teacher center staff. You have been selected to receive it because you have had some contact with your teachers' center. We are asking for your perceptions and opinions about how your teacher center leader can best serve you. Will you help?

Please don't worry about the accuracy of your opinions. Your thoughtful impressions will be very helpful in determining next year's leadership priorities. Your answers to these questions are confidential. After they have been computer tabulated, the results will be available to your center. This will happen during the summer of 1979.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in taking time out of your already full schedule to help with this research. Will you kindly seal your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to your teacher's center within one week?

Yours very truly,

Anne Watt

NOTE: Please tear off and throw away this page to preserve your anonymity.
You will need about one half hour to complete these questions.
INQUIRY ON TEACHER CENTER LEADERSHIP

PART I

Introduction.

In Part I three major teacher center leadership roles have been identified. They are ADMINISTRATOR, DEVELOPER and TEACHER/ADVISOR. Each of these roles includes a number of specific functions. In small teachers' centers leaders sometimes find their jobs overwhelmingly extensive. Often it is hard to decide what to do when time is so limited. This part of the questionnaire seeks your help to determine what leadership functions are most important in running your teachers' center.

Each of the three major roles mentioned above is described and then followed by lists of specific functions, all of which have been identified as duties performed by leaders in small rural teachers' centers such as yours. Now that your center has been established for several years, it will be very helpful to have your opinions on which of these leadership functions you think are most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ROLE</th>
<th>This major leadership role includes communications and decision-making necessary for keeping the center and its programs going. It involves meetings, writing letters and making phone calls. It also involves coordination between the teachers' center and other organizations, and management of the center itself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Instructions: The Administrator Role has been divided into two parts, A. and B. A involves communicating with many groups in order to gather data for decision-making regarding the programs of the center. B involves management of the center to facilitate its programs. In each list below please decide which three (3) items are most important and check them.

A. Our leader should communicate regularly with: (check only 3 from this list of 11)

1. Governing/Policy Board and committees of Board
2. Superintendents and Principals
3. School Boards and Community Organizations
4. District Inservice Committees
5. College Ed. Depts. who control graduate credit and programs
6. Teacher center staff & volunteers
7. State Depts. and other agencies outside direct service area (including funding sources and other teachers' centers)
8. Whole school faculties at regular meetings
9. Teacher center staff and volunteers
10. Meeting the many unanticipated visitors who phone and drop in
11. Other (please specify):

B. Our leader should concentrate on the following three management functions: (check only 3 from this list of 10)

1. Ordering, organizing books, resources and recycle materials
2. Taking care of the budget, book-keeping
3. Documenting activities, keeping records, files
4. Making displays for the center and schools
5. Scheduling center, school and community activities
6. Writing letters, responding to inquiries
7. Printing and mailing program information
8. Doing paper work connected with credit for courses, workshops and independent projects
9. Keeping the center attractive, conducting social events
10. Other (please specify):

OVER PLEASE
LEADERSHIP ROLE # 2 DEVELOPER

This major role of the teacher center leader is divided into three parts. They are (1) the creating, planning, and initiating of new programs, (2) informing schools and the public about all the center’s activities through publicity and public relations and (3) seeking funds to keep the teachers’ center going.

Instructions: The Developer role has been divided into three parts, A, B, and C, with accompanying lists of functions. Please decide which are the three most important functions for your leader under each category below.

A. Our leader should function as an initiator by: (check only 3 from this list of 8)

1. Creating and organizing courses, mini-courses and workshops
2. Finding and hiring local teachers or outside consultants to run workshops and programs
3. Planning community programs (adult education, parent-child activities)
4. Periodically assessing needs of individuals and groups, informally and formally
5. Reading educational books, journals etc. and sharing new ideas with teachers and administrators
6. Developing new options and programs for professional growth
7. Attending professional growth activities to become a better teacher center leader
8. Other (please specify):

B. Our leader should inform the public about the center’s programs by: (check only 3 from this list of 9)

1. Writing a monthly newsletter or calendar
2. Writing news releases
3. Making posters and flyers
4. Developing media displays (photos, slide shows, movies, etc.)
5. Speaking at community functions (PTOs, Lions Club, local industry, etc.)
6. Writing brochure, evaluations, and annual reports, by-laws, etc.
7. Attending, presenting at in-service conferences
8. Attending meetings outside district (State Dept., Union, Inservice Planning, potential funding agencies, etc.)
9. Other (please specify):

C. Our leader should attempt to raise funds to keep the teachers’ center going by: (check only 3 from this list of 6)

1. Developing ideas for contacting potential local funding sources
2. Developing ideas for contacting potential state funding sources
3. Developing ideas for contacting potential federal funding sources
4. Organizing fundraising events
5. Developing contacts with private foundations for funding
6. Learning to write and writing grant proposals
7. Exploring ways to make the center self-supporting
8. Other (please specify):
LEADERSHIP SURVEY

The third major role of the teacher center leader can involve direct teaching of courses and workshops, but it goes far beyond the traditional teaching function. The role involves being available as a sounding board to anyone who brings an educational or personal issue to discuss. When the teacher center leaders act as a non-evaluative, supportive listener, problem-solver, or idea generator, they are called Advisors. Being an Advisor is a very important aspect of the leader's educational role. It takes place both in the center and in schools served by the center.

Instructions: The next three sections ask for your opinions on the importance of your leader's work as Teacher/Advisor in the teachers' center itself, in the schools served by the center, and in teachers' classrooms. Please decide which are the three most important functions in each of the three sections which follow.

A. Our leader should provide the following services in the teachers' center itself: (check only 3 from this list of 8)

1. Teaching a course, workshop or seminar on a curriculum or instructional topic
2. Teaching a workshop or mini-course on a topic of interest to the general public
3. Teaching several students (with or without their teacher)
4. Connecting people with information, resources and other people
5. Helping a teacher develop, extend or adapt their own idea
6. Listening to non-teaching problems
7. Unscheduled useful discussions with visitors who drop in
8. Other (please specify):

B. Our leader should regularly visit member schools: (check only 3 from this list of 6)

1. Making informal staffroom contacts leading to a future project with a teacher (assessing needs)
2. Arranging a future workshop based on expressed teacher needs
3. Conducting a staff development activity with whole staff
4. Linking a teacher with another teacher, resource or curriculum idea
5. Other (please specify):

C. Our leader should visit teachers at their request in their own classrooms: (check only 3 from this list of 7)

1. Bringing books and curriculum materials
2. Offering recognition by noticing a strength, giving a boost to morale
3. Discussing student or instructional problem
4. Discussing and developing a new curriculum idea
5. Directly teaching a lesson to the whole class or a portion of the class
6. Organizing space, displays, or learning centers
7. Other (please specify):

OVER PLEASE
D. Which is more important to you, personally: the leader's work as a teacher/advisor in the teachers' center or in the schools? (Please check only 1)

1___leaders' teaching/advising in the center

2___leader's teaching/advising in the schools

3___both are of equal importance to me

E. Now suppose you were asked to help your teacher center leader determine priorities from among the roles on the previous pages, for next year. Will you please number in order of importance the following seven roles?

Number 1 = most important, in my opinion
Number 7 = least important, in my opinion

Our leader should:

a___Communicate regularly with all constituent groups (p. 1)

b___Manage and run the center (p. 1)

c___Initiate and plan programs (p. 2)

d___Inform the public of all center programs (p. 2)

e___Raise funds to continue programs (p. 2)

f___Teach/advice in the teachers' center (p. 3)

g___Teach/advice in the schools served by the center (p. 3)

F. In your own view, how should the leader's time be divided between the three major leadership roles described on the previous pages? Can you suggest what percentage of time should be devoted to each of them next year? Our leader should spend:

_____% of time as ADMINISTRATOR

_____% of time as DEVELOPER

_____% of time as TEACHER/ADVISOR

TOTAL 100 %

G. Why did you choose these percentages?
## PART II

### Introduction

This section of the survey seeks your opinions on
(1) how inservice education can be approached in your district,
(2) how a teacher center leader can best serve you and
(3) what skills you value in a teacher center leader.

Inservice education is defined here as the whole range of activities by which educational personnel can extend their personal and professional competence. Teachers' centers cannot hope to provide programs to meet all inservice needs. Can you help determine which ones to focus on?

### A. Which of the following seventeen inservice approaches should your teacher center leader be involved in facilitating, and which ones should not be connected with the teachers' center? Please put a TC beside those activities it is helpful to have your leader involved in and a NO beside those which he/she should not be involved in. Mark each item below with a TC or a NO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC = teacher center leader involvement</th>
<th>NO = no teacher center involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. one-to-one sharing with a non-evaluative experienced teacher/advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. inservice courses and seminars locally requested and offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. activities organized with input from me, just for the staff in my school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. required workshops/presentations for all district personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. voluntary workshops taught by teachers and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. help setting up school visits to observe other teachers and programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. in-classroom non-judgmental assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. developing curriculum on my own with professional recognition; (publicity, helping to publish, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. link with university through supervision of student teachers or taking a grad. course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. participating on an inservice planning team or committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. providing technical assistance for teacher-initiated projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. an informal exchange of teaching ideas with someone respected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. access to graduate degree program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. provision of an &quot;expert&quot; to speak on a topic new to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a place to go for resources and new ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. support from a trusted supervisor or principal, for trying a new approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. other (please add meaningful inservice activities not included above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVER PLEASE
NOTE: If you are not a teacher or a teacher center leader, please skip the next question. Question B. is for teachers, teaching principals, and teacher center leaders only.

b. The teacher center leader as an Advisor. Sometimes the teacher center leader acts as a non-evaluative support person or 'master teacher'. This role can involve visiting teachers in their classrooms at their request. It also involves providing personal and professional assistance to school personnel at the teachers' center and over the phone. A list of advisory functions is given below. Please check all those that you would find important for supporting your own personal and professional growth. Check all that are important to you.

An Advisor acts as:

1. a service and administrative agent: arranges visits and workshops; gets resources to teachers.
2. an extension of the teacher: helps in classrooms, providing an extra pair of hands.
3. an emotional stabilizer and stimulator: provides a sympathetic ear, a boost for morale and inspiration to keep trying.
4. a respecter of individuality: understands teacher's perspective and accepts and works from teacher's goals and methods.
5. a stage director and demonstrator: shows ways of setting up room, using materials, ways of teaching. Gives specific ideas.
6. a diagnostician and problem-solver: helps identify and pinpoint problems so solutions are jointly perceived.
7. a provider of alternatives: suggests new ideas.
8. an explainer and theorist: provides theoretical rationale for methods, explains educational principles.
9. a modeling agent: advisor demonstrates an instructional principle by working with students while teacher observes.
10. an appreciative critic and discussant: provides non-judgemental but careful observation and analysis of classroom issues.
11. a provocative and reflective agent: helps stimulate and brainstorm new ideas leading to clarification of teacher's "next steps".
12. a leader and challenger: helps teachers see themselves capable of daring to risk new ways or challenge arbitrary decisions.
13. a " linker": provides a bridge between teachers and relevant resources or programs. Puts teachers and classrooms with common interests in touch with each other.
14. an organizer: assists teachers with preparation and follow through for field trips.
C. Some people say that incentives provide the climate and conditions that permit inservice education to be effective. How important are the following incentives to you? Please decide which three are the most important to you and check them. (Check only 3 from this list of 9.)

1. released time during the school week
2. graduate or inservice credit
3. personal recognition by colleagues or superiors for a special project
4. salary increment
5. reimbursement for mileage and meals
6. desire to meet and interact with colleagues
7. availability of an interesting program near at hand
8. a small grant to fund a self-initiated project
9. other (please specify):

D. How that your teacher's center has been going for several years, how should its programs be organized? Please check any items below that you approve of.

1. strictly on a voluntary basis
2. mostly voluntary, some required for everyone
3. mostly required for everyone, some voluntary
4. strictly on a required basis

E. Many new teacher's centers are beginning around the country. If you were asked to advise a hiring committee on what characteristics and skills to look for in choosing a leader, which of the following would you suggest as most important? Please check the four that you think are most important, from the list below. (Check only 4 from this list of 9.)

1. creativity and follow through on new ideas
2. credibility as a teacher of students
3. administrative and management skills
4. public relations and human relations skills
5. expertise in curriculum
6. knowledge of the field of education: a philosophic breadth of scope that commands respect
7. skill in teaching adults
8. skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults: Advisor skills
9. financial expertise, development and writing skills

F. Please describe the characteristics of a good leader for a small rural teacher's center in your own words.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

OVER PLEASE
G. Is your teachers' center an appropriate format for inservice education in your rural area? Please circle one number on the scale below to indicate your opinion.

| Extremely appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Not at all appropriate |

H. How could your teachers' center do a better job of providing for inservice education needs in your district?

J. How much of your teacher center's programs should be focused on each of the following groups of people? Please fill in the percentages.

- % for teachers
- % for administrators
- % for paraprofessionals, substitute teachers, aids, classroom volunteers, etc.
- % for parents and community people: the general public

Total: 100%

J. At the present time what is your primary role in connection with your teachers' center? Please check the most suitable category.

1. Mostly or entirely a classroom teacher or teacher's aide
2. Mostly or entirely an administrator
3. School board member
4. Parent or community member
5. Teacher center staff (please name your role)

K. In general what is your relationship to your teachers' center?

I have: (check only one)

1. Used the center's resources once or twice
2. Participated in some activities of the center
3. Served and/or used the center regularly
4. Not used the center, but know about it

Thank you very much for taking the time to help me with my research.
APPENDIX B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>V+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate regularly with all constituent groups</td>
<td>3 4 3 3 5</td>
<td>3 3 2 2 2</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td>2 5 3 3 4 6</td>
<td>3 3 3 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage and run the center</td>
<td>1 1 4 1 4</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 3</td>
<td>2 1 2</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 1 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and plan programs</td>
<td>2 3 2 2 3</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td>3 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>1 1 4 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the public of all center programs</td>
<td>6 6 - 6 6</td>
<td>6 6 5 3 3</td>
<td>7 7 6</td>
<td>4 4 5 6 3 7</td>
<td>6 4 7 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise funds to continue programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 6 4 4</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
<td>1 3 4 7 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 2 5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advice in the teachers' center</td>
<td>4 5 1 4 2</td>
<td>5 5 3 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 6 6 4 5 1</td>
<td>4 5 5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/advice in the schools</td>
<td>5 2 - 5 1</td>
<td>7 7 4 5 5</td>
<td>6 6 5</td>
<td>6 7 6 5 5 5</td>
<td>5 6 6 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>25 8 1 7 1</td>
<td>10 10 3 2 2</td>
<td>30 7 4 0 4 2 7 5 1 5 1</td>
<td>22 11 1 6 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, S = Staff
TABLE 19
COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION A ROLE 1

"Our Leader Should Communicate Regularly with..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing/policy board &amp; committees of board</td>
<td>T A S B P/C</td>
<td>T A S B P/C</td>
<td>T A S B P/C</td>
<td>T A S B P/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents &amp; principals</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School boards &amp; community organizations</td>
<td>r r r r</td>
<td>r r r r</td>
<td>r r r r</td>
<td>r r r r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District inservice committees</td>
<td>R r r r</td>
<td>R r r r</td>
<td>R r r r</td>
<td>R r r r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education departments</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' center staff &amp; volunteers</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State depts. &amp; other agencies outside direct service area</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school faculties at regular meetings</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting unanticipated visitors who phone and drop in</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 25 8 2 7 1 10 3 2 1 30 7 4 0 1 27 5 1 5 1 23 11 2 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders
R = a clear majority of responses
r = tied for first, second or third place
NOTE: Leaders' views are recorded in the following eight tables, not those of teachers' center staff.
### TABLE 20
**COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION B ROLE 1**

"Our Leader Should Concentrate on the following Management Functions..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordering, organizing books, resources and recycle materials</td>
<td>R r R R R</td>
<td>R r R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking care of the budget, bookkeeping</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R R r R</td>
<td>R R r R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting activities, keeping records, files</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r R R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making displays for the center and schools</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling center, school and community activities</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing letters, responding to inquiries</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and mailing program information</td>
<td></td>
<td>R R r R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R r R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing paper work connected with credit options for courses, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>R R R r</td>
<td>R R R r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R r R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the center attractive, conducting social events</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total respondents**: 25 7 2 7 1 18 10 3 2 1 29 7 4 0 1 27 5 1 5 1 23 11 2 6

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community, L = Leaders

R = a clear majority of responses

r = tied for second or third place
TABLE 21
COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION A ROLE 2

"Our Leader Should Function as an Initiator by..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tx TA SB P/C L</th>
<th>Ma TA SB** P/C L</th>
<th>Ct TA SB P/C L</th>
<th>Wi TA SB P/C L</th>
<th>Vt TA SB P/C L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating and organizing courses, mini-courses, and workshops</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding and hiring local teachers to run workshops and programs</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning community programs (adult education parent-child activities)</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically assessing needs of individuals and groups, informally and formally</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading educational books and sharing new ideas</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new options and programs for professional growth</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R r</td>
<td>R R R r</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional growth activities to become a better teachers' center leader</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R r</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 25 8 2 7 1.1 17 10 3 2 1 29 7 4 0 1 28 5 1 5 1 23 11 1 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders
R = a clear majority of responses
r = tied for second or third place
** In Massachusetts, School Board Members gave first place to four activities.
### TABLE 22
**Comparison by Location and Position of Top Three Responses to Question B Role 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing a monthly newsletter or calendar</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R  R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing news releases</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making posters and flyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing media displays</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking at community functions</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R R r</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing brochures, evaluations and annual reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending presenting at in-service conferences</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>r R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R r R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings outside the district (State Dept., potential funding agencies)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total respondents** 25 8 2 7 1 18 10 3 2 1 29 7 4 0 1 20 5 1 5 1 23 11 1 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders

** In Wisconsin, administrators gave first place to four activities.

R = a clear majority of responses
r = tied for second or third place
**TABLE 23**

COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION C ROLE 2

"Our Leader Should Attempt to Raise Funds to Keep the Teachers' Center going by..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TX**</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contacting local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding sources</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contacting state</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding sources</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contacting federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding sources</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing fund-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raising events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contacting private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundations</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing grant proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding ways to make</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center self-supporting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total respondents**

18 10 3 2 1 26 7 4 0 1 28 5 1 5 1 23 11 1 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders
* R = a clear majority of responses
* r = tied for second or third place
* ** Raising Funds is not a function of teachers' center leadership in Texas.
TABLE 24
COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION A ROLE 3

"Our Leader Should Provide the following Services in the Teachers' Center itself..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching a course workshop or seminar on a curriculum or instructional topic</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R r</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R r R</td>
<td>R R R r R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching a workshop or mini-course on a topic of interest to the general public</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td>r r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching several students (with or without their teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting people with information, resources and other people</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R r R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping a teacher develop, extend or adapt their own idea</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to non-teaching problems</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled useful discussions with visitors who drop in</td>
<td>r r R R R</td>
<td>R r R r X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 25 8 2 7 1 18 10 3 2 1 29 7 4 0 1 28 5 1 5 1 23 11 2 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders

R = a clear majority of responses
r = tied for second or third place
TABLE 25
COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION B ROLE 3

"Our Leader Should Regularly Visit Member Schools..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T A</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>L*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making informal</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>r R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>r R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staffroom contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading to a future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project with a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging a workshop</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting a staff</td>
<td>r R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with whole staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing and</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking a teacher</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with another teacher,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource or curriculum idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 25 8 2 7 1 18 10 3 2 1 29 7 4 0 1 28 5 1 5 1 23 11 3 6 1

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders
R = one of top three choices
r = less important but tied for one of top three choices
### TABLE 26
**COMPARISON BY LOCATION AND POSITION OF TOP THREE RESPONSES TO QUESTION C ROLE 3**

"Our Leader Should Visit Teachers at Their Request in Their Own Classrooms..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing books and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>SB</strong></td>
<td><strong>P/C</strong></td>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by noticing a strength,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving a boost to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing student or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing, developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a new curriculum idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly teaching a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson to the whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class or a portion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the class</td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing space,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays or learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centers</td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders
  
  R = one of top three choices
  
  r = much less important but tied for second or third place
TABLE 27
CHARACTERISTICS/SKILLS OF AN EFFECTIVE LEADER IN A RURAL TEACHERS' CENTER
BY POSITION AND LOCATION. TOP FOUR RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tx</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ct</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>Vt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity and follow through on new ideas</strong></td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility as a teacher of students</strong></td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative and management skills</strong></td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public relations and human relations skills</strong></td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expertise in curriculum</strong></td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of the field of education; philosophic breadth of scope that commands respect</strong></td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill in teaching adults</strong></td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill as a motivator and facilitator of growth in adults: advisor skills</strong></td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial expertise, development and writing skills</strong></td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRrrRR</td>
<td>RRRRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
<td>RRrRRR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total respondents | 25 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 22 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 1 |

* T = Teachers, A = Administrators, SB = School Board Members, P/C = Parents/Community Members, L = Leaders

R = a clear majority of responses
r = tied for second or third place
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