DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 396 RC 013 663

AUTHOR Gardener, Clark E.; Edington, Everett D.
TITLE The Preparation and Certification of Teachers for Rural and Small Schools.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Las Cruces, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 82
CONTRACT 400-78-0023
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM New Mexico Center for Rural Education, Publications Department C-1, Box 3-AP - NMSU, Las Cruces, NM 88003 ($9.00 each; price includes postage and handling; 10 or more, 5% discount; 20 or more, 10% discount).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Branch Around (888)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Change Strategies; College Role; Community Characteristics; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Internship Programs; Models; Needs; Preservice Teacher Education; *Rural Schools; Small Schools; State Departments of Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Generalists

ABSTRACT

Teachers and administrators preparing for small or rural schools need better preparation in the sociological and economic factors prevalent in nonmetropolitan education. Although each geographic area has different needs, educators must be made aware of the cultural, social, and economic factors of the areas they serve. Preparation programs for teachers going into rural schools should be focused on producing a generalist in education, thus preparing teachers to cope with multi-grade-multi-subject teaching loads and with extracurricular activities. Leadership from state departments of education and from colleges of education is needed to upgrade rural and small school teacher preparation and certification programs. Preservice teacher programs alone do not suffice; inservice programs are essential to the continued growth of rural educators and to the promotion of better relations between communities, schools, and colleges of education. This state-of-the-art review describes the need for better teacher preparation and certification for teachers going into rural or small schools, looks at current preservice and inservice programs and models, and suggests ways to upgrade the status of rural teacher preparation and certification. (Author/AH)

THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS FOR RURAL AND SMALL SCHOOLS

By

Clark E. Gardener
New Mexico Center for Rural Education
New Mexico State University

Everett D. Edington
Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
New Mexico State University

December 1982

ERIC

ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools is funded by the National Institute of Education. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to contract no. 400-78-0023 with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was critically reviewed for determination of professional quality. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Clearinghouse's parent organization or the National Institute of Education.

Cover designed by Marta Recio

This document is available for $9.00

from the

New Mexico Center for Rural Education
Publications Department C-1
Box 3AP, NMSU
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Prepayment or purchase order required. Prices include postage and handling. Discount rates: 10 or more of each title, 5%; 20 or more of each title, 10%.

ABSTRACT

Teachers and administrators preparing for small or rural schools need better preparation in the sociological and economic factors prevalent in nonmetropolitan education. Although each geographic area has different needs, educators must be made aware of the cultural, social, and economic factors of the areas they serve. Preparation programs for teachers going into rural schools should be focused on producing a generalist in education, thus preparing teachers to cope with multi-grade/muli-subject teaching loads and with extra curricular activities. Leadership from state departments of education and from colleges of education is needed to upgrade rural and small school teacher preparation and certification programs. Preservice teacher programs alone do not suffice; inservice programs are essential to the continued growth of rural educators and to the promotion of better relations between communities, schools, and colleges of education. This state-of-the-art review describes the need for better teacher preparation and certification for teachers going into rural or small schools, looks at current preservice and inservice programs and models, and suggests ways to upgrade the status of rural teacher preparation and certification.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1970s, there has been an increased interest and concern for education in rural and small schools; educators from schools and training colleges, statesmen, philanthropists, and writers have focused on the small school as the most important factor in rebuilding country and small town life.

The school is seen as the key to the development of a true democratic community which demands that all children be initiated into the knowledge, culture, and experience necessary for life adjustment and into activities that will enhance their ablities to become good members of the community. The rural and small schools must not only prepare their students for life in the local community but also for the adjustment into more urban communities so that their students are able to function efficiently in both environments.

The school has also been asked to accept many duties previously reserved for the family and society. Because of societal change, the school has slowly enlarged its responsibilities to its clients, the students. The school has become an enlarged family and a miniature community with one central interest - the child - and its aim should be to prepare that child for an ever-changing society.

Teachers and schools are being held accountable for these added responsibilities as well as for the basics of education. Accountability, which centers on planning the educational needs within the local community, holds promise for the improvement of the quality of education in rural and small schools. Because of the close ties in the small or rural communities, the ease of controlling for accountability is appropriately diminished if the responsibility for satisfying the needs is shared by the schools, the community, and the teacher education institutes.

The age of specialization in nearly all lines of human endeavor is here. The general practitioner is giving way to the specialists, and we are realizing a shortage of the general practitioner in education as well as in other fields. This trend presents problems for small, rural school districts. Well-trained teachers are necessary to a school system if it is to effectively develop its students' abilities. Teachers must be able to guide and inspire students during their formative years. The student-teacher relationship often determines whether or not the students are motivated to succeed in school. Because the retaining and hiring of qualified teachers is one of the major problems of rural and small schools (Muse, 1977), it is necessary for teacher-education institutes to inaugurate programs to prepare their students for teaching in rural areas.

THE NEED FOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The need for preparation programs for rural and small school teachers has existed for some time, but it has only been during the past ten years that the need for such programs has been re-emphasized. Many of the books and reports from the early part of the nineteenth century such as those by Woofter (1917), Betts (1914), Cubberly (1922), and Slacks (1938) indicated that rural and small school teaching was different from teaching in the urban setting. Very little was written on the subject until 1958 when Clifford Archer wrote about elementary education in rural areas. However, all of the literature has indicated the need for preparing teachers specifically for teaching in rural and small schools.

Since 1958, there have been studies indicating the strengths and weaknesses of small schools. These studies, in turn, point to reasons why special preparation programs are necessary. Although this report will not reiterate a list of all the strengths or weaknesses, two sources of that information are: Brim and Hanson (1980) and O'Neal and Becken (1982).

A number of studies indicate that the recruitment and retention of qualified teachers for rural schools is one of the principal problems (Moriarity, 1981; Gardener, 1982; Beck and Smith, 1982). Although there may be many applicants for positions in the schools, few are capable of accepting the geographic and/or cultural isolation that normally is experienced in rural areas.

Wilson (1982) placed teachers working in rural and small schools into four categories. The most desirable teachers are called the "steady turn-ons." The teachers in this category find their work to be internally rewarding and enjoy the nonmetropolitan environment. The "steady turn-ons" are the heart of quality education in the rural and small schools.

The second category of teachers is called the "turn-ons." These staff members enjoy what they are doing and usually remain until interpersonal relations, status, technical supervision and/or growth possibilities become dissatisfying. Teachers from this category may become leaders in the development of innovative programs in the schools and could become instrumental in the development of preservice preparation and inservice programs for rural and small schools.

"Turn-overs" is the third category of teachers. Normally these teachers have taken the position because nothing else was available in an area more desirable to them. They find the position unsatisfactory and are not motivated to remain in their present position. The "turn-overs" remain only until an opportunity for a more desirable position becomes available.

The group that Wilson calls the "turn-offs" are the most detrimental to nonmetropolitan education. The "turn-offs" are not pleased with anything in the school system. Most often they remain in the rural areas for external reasons (fishing, hunting, spouse's position, etc.).

Many feel that it is up to the colleges of education to prepare and recruit individuals for the small schools. The categories above may offer guidelines for the recruitment of personnel and for the development of preservice programs.

Many small schools also have difficulty in preparing and organizing appropriate curriculums. Few, if any, of the nonmetropolitan schools can afford to hire a specialist to develop their curriculums. Therefore, the burden of organizing the curriculum falls upon the shoulders of the teachers within the school (Gardener, 1982; Archer, 1958). Sher (1977) lists at least three reasons why the curricular offerings remain scarce for the rural areas: (1) there is no profit for commercial publishers to produce books specifically for rural or small schools; (2) neither the government nor philanthropic organizations has subsidized the development of curricula or curricular material; and (3) the rural areas lack the funds, expertise, and time to develop their own curricular materials (p. 284).

In a survey completed in 1980, Benedict Surwill (1980) from Eastern Montana College found that administrators felt students should be required to demonstrate how to effectively plan a curriculum for the small school. Archer (1958) and Ivey (1979) have also concluded that teachers in nonmetropolitan areas need preparation in preparing and organizing curriculums.

The curriculum must prepare the student to become a part of either a rural or an urban community (Sher, 1977; Cushman, 1967). Because of the lack of employment opportunities in the small towns, many of the nonmetropolitan youth, by necessity, must migrate to the metropolitan areas. If they are not prepared for both alternatives, they may become dependent upon society and not be able to fend for themselves.

In many of the small schools, public or private, the teachers may have to teach multiple grade level classes or teach subjects in which they have an inadequate background. Therefore, it is suggested that those preparing for teaching at the elementary level receive experience at more than one grade level (Sher, 1977; Muse, 1977; Ivey, 1979). It is suggested that those preparing to teach in small high schools have more than one minor and one major area (Surwill, 1980). Since the small schools cannot financially afford special teachers for each subject, the need arises for teachers to be proficient in more than one or two areas.

Sher (1977), Muse (1977), Ivey (1979), and others imply that rural and small schools do not need specialists, but rather that they need generalists who are proficient in many areas.

> Rural schools need teachers who are (contradictory as it may sound) specially trained to be generalists. The best rural teachers are the ones who are able to cope with sparsity, utilize community resources, invent curricular materials, and, above all else, are oriented toward teaching children rather than subjects. (Sher, p. 287)

Other studies have also indicated that teachers in small schools must work under adverse conditions. Often the school has limited supplies and equipment (UNESCO, 1980; Ivey, 1979), thus requiring the teacher to be very creative and innovative. Sher (1977), Muse (1977), Horn (1981), and Brimm (1980) have stated that in the rural or small schools the teachers have three to five preparations daily in different subjects and are also expected to take extra-curricular assignments. Very few teacher preparation programs prepare the prospective teacher to accept or expect the added responsibilities. Surwill's report (1980) added that those preparing to teach in the small school should be knowledgeable about working in extra-curricular areas.

In the rural or small school community, the teacher can and should become more involved with community activities. The teacher knows and is known by everyone in the community. This closeness to the people often results in the teachers becoming the leaders within the community. They must, therefore, be able to use the resources available within their community as well as to work with the community.

The teacher must be able to understand the social values and culture of the community in which he or she works. Involvement with the values of adults in the community helps the teacher to better understand the students they teach.

Many teachers are not well-prepared to diagnose and prescribe programs for the students. In this age of specialization, the small, nonmetropolitan schools often lack the expertise of a special education resource person, curriculum advisor, bilingual specialist, or speech pathologist. These tasks are delegated to the classroom teacher. Amodeo (1982), Ivey (1979), and Muse (1977) have found that teachers in the small schools and rural areas felt a need to know more about diagnosis and prescriptions for students when those students have learning difficulties or cultural handicaps.

Nonmetropolitan teachers must be able to adapt to the conditions prevalent in the small schools and must have the flexibility to work with the resources available to them. They must also be able to handle the autonomy and added resonsibilities that are inherent in the small communities. The ability to relate to the community and to be concerned about its cultural development becomes part of the small school educator's repertoire. In general, educators in rural and small schools must become "jacks-of-all-trades" (Office of Education, ED 143 660, 1977).

HISTORY

Rural and small school teacher preparation programs were more numerous during the first third of the twentieth century than they are now. The agrarian economy and the opening of western lands to settlement demanded the need for teachers in rural and small schools. In 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a Commission on Country Life which called for training of rural teachers both in educational and social leadership. By 1927, nearly all normal schools and colleges offered some courses in nonmetropolitan education, and the majority of the institutions used rural schools for practice teaching experience. Rural instruction programs had reached their zenith between 1926 and 1931.

The depression years were devastating not only to our economy but to nonmetropolitan education. During this period, many of the small schools were forced to close. This, in turn, caused many of the rural education courses to be integrated into urban programs or to be completely excluded from the curriculum of teacher colleges. The sharp decline in the number of farms meant that fewer teachers were needed in the rural areas. The closing of the schools and other jobs meant that there was a very tight job market for teachers.

World War II brought about a complete reversal in the teaching job market. During this period there was a teacher shortage. Without teachers, many of the remaining small schools were forced to close. With fewer rural and small schools, the preservice programs were further curtailed.

The final "coup de grace" to small school preservice programs was the movement to redistrict and consolidate. The proponents of these movements maintained that small schools could not offer the diversity of courses that were necessary and that their programs were not efficient financially. Conant's report (1959) of the American high school implied that the small schools were not adequately able to offer the courses necessary for the "modern" world and that they were not economical to run.

During the mid-1960s, with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a massive federal intervention program emerged to equate the educational opportunities of the poor minorities and disadvantaged. Many of the experimental school programs were developed in the small schools throughout the country. Most of the projects are no longer in existence because the majority of the programs were not developed and coordinated at the local level. Nachtigal (1980) concluded that "planning done for rural people does not lead to successful implementation" (p. 35). Those who live in the rural areas and who teach in the small communities must take most of the responsibility for making innovative changes.

With the arrival of the 1970s, the migration of people from urban to rural areas became vogue. The economic, environmental, and social problems caused many to develop a dream of a more simplified old-fashioned life. As a result of that dream, reversed migration brought increased emphasis on rural and small schools. The Gallup Poll of February 1978 indicated that a majority of the people thought that small schools had a better educational system. Thus, the late 1970s and early 1980s have brought about a rethinking of the education for nonmetropolitan youth.

TEACHER PREPARATION AND INSERVICE PRACTICES, INCLUDING MODELS

In general, preservice teacher preparation programs can be classified into categories. Rather than attempting to list all the programs that are now available, this paper shall give examples of various classifications and models of the program.

The most common preservice programs for rural educators are field-centered or field-based practicum where the student teacher is exposed to the realities of teaching and living in rural communities. The field-centered approach allows the student teacher to have a better perception of the demands and rewards of teaching in rural areas. The program has produced teachers who are willing to teach in the small schools and are more content with the life and work in rural communities, thereby decreasing the teacher-turnover rate (Muse, 1978).

The leader in field-centered education programs was Berea College in Eastern Kentucky (Buckland, 1958; Ivey, 1979). The Appalachian region of that state was having difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified teachers. Through a program which allowed the students to work in the community on improvement programs not necessarily related to the schools, the potential teachers gained a better understanding of the social and economic conditions of the area. Also, the prospective teachers were accepted as a part of the community.

Western Michigan University has had a rural education program in field-centered education since 1927. Recently the university has re-examined its program to better meet the needs of rural educators (Muse, 1977, p. 33).

Brigham Young University and 10 rural Utah school districts have developed a field-based, competencies-centered approach that has been emulated by several other colleges since its conception in 1972. Student teachers are required to spend from 8 to 16 weeks living and teaching in a rural community. While in the rural communities, the trainees are assigned to a collaborating local teacher. Trainees complete much of their professional coursework on-site by using two rural training centers, each over 100 miles from the university, which provide training manuals, instructional materials, and individualized teaching units. The centers are also used for seminars, social occasions, and for conferences with university supervisors, center directors, and others. During the initial program, the regular teachers are given in-depth inservice training on campus while the student teachers are in the teachers' classrooms under the direction of university personnel. Upon completion of the program, a high percentage of the students has shown a preference for teaching and living in a rural area, and participating schools have generally hired the students who have served in the program (Muse, 1977, 1978).

Brigham Young University has expanded its program of rural education to include an Ed.D. program for rural educators and a program for recruitment and training of teachers for employment in Utah's rural Indian reservation schools (Rural Education Association, 1980).

Texas A&M University (Garcia & Parker, 1981-82) has developed a program called "Teacher Preparation for Rural Schools" which is a field-based approach. The program provides potential rural teachers with opportunities to play key instructional roles in rural schools while gaining formal academic training at the university. It is a four-year program with on-the-job experience which culminates in a B.S. degree and certification as an elementary teacher. The program offers experience in the following areas: (1) teacher aide; (2) curriculum developer/resource person; (3) ombudsman/community school relations; (4) student teacher. The students are also required to attend a bi-monthly seminar where participants discuss their experiences and relate them to essential academic training.

Another system of teacher preparation is that of recruiting potential teachers from among local people. In Idaho (Muse, 1977), 53 districts found that their local districts contained a number of long-time residents who were outstanding teacher prospects but who lacked the necessary credentials. The districts, in conjunction with Idaho State University, developed individual course syllabi for 12 separate disciplines and professional courses which were offered in the local communities by the College of Education. The student teachers taught in the classrooms, prepared media/materials for the classrooms, and performed other tasks common to teachers in small schools. Courses necessary for completion of requirements were provided by the university. The program reduced the adjustment problems usually experienced by new teachers and also reduced teacher turnover.

A third program that can be used for teacher preparation combines preservice and inservice teacher training. Professors, graduate students, and other students who have completed their student teaching take the place of the teachers in the school. While the university personnel are teaching the students, the school staff is involved in an intensive inservice training program. The exchange program has received enthusiastic support from participants.

In Oregon (Hull, 1979), a group of 15 students went to a small community where they lived with the teachers in the community for three days. The faculty from the school received inservice training from graduate students and professors while students in the teacher training program taught classes for the regular classroom teachers. The program helped prospective teachers change their attitudes toward rural education while giving the classroom teachers a chance for inservice training.

The exchange program requires a great deal of cooperation and preplanning to be successful, but it is a very effective program for developing and increasing relations between the universities and the communities.

In 1976, Western Montana College (Montana Schools, 1980; Zetler, 1981) became the Rural Education Center for Montana. The college is unique in its approach which emphasizes personal contact with rural staff members. Western Montana College conceives its role as a linker or change agent between rural classrooms and those who generate potentially useful knowledge and delivery systems. A field coordinator is used as a linking agent who travels throughout the state visiting the various areas to determine the needs of rural educators. This agent helps the college develop its delivery system.

Western Montana College is also using a field-based approach with its student teachers. Student teachers have been placed throughout rural Montana. This involves traveling great distances for college supervisors.

Each spring for the past three years, Western Montana College has also conducted Rural Education Workshops for rural teachers where new techniques, programs, and available resources are shared. During the workshops, the teachers are given an opportunity to share their ideas and the problems of rural educators with each other and with the center's staff. In the fall of 1981, the center also conducted workshops in six areas throughout the state specifically for rural educators.

Because of the vastness of the state and the differences in social and economic bases, Western Montana's linkage model, combined with the field-base and inservice programs, has promise of becoming very effective and may eventually serve as an exemplary model.

The state of Arkansas has also developed a linkage model to facilitate innovations in rural and small schools (Murphy, 1982). Their program was developed by the Department of Education to be a resource to funnel information to the districts. The Arkansas Department of Education has consolidated its information bases into one unit. A field facilitator serves as a linker who helps school districts analyze their needs, serves as a catalyst, and helps the districts with services to match their needs.

Utilizing this system has increased communications and solved problems at a lower level, increased the creativity of the local districts in finding solutions, and increased school staffs' use of information and research. The program has helped the small schools to find viable and financially feasible changes in their educational programs.

By necessity, four preservice programs (field-based, recruitment of local people, teacher exchange, and linkage models) have included some inservice programs. If a training program is to be efficient and is to help retain those already in the rural schools, it must also contain inservice programs to meet the current needs and to develop better school, institutional, and community relationships.

Staff training as an inservice program can involve in-school workshops, classes on university campuses, outdoor training in environmental education, and leadership training (Hoyt, 1981).

Programs and rural education conferences and workshops have developed in many areas. Because of the short duration of these staff training or information programs, many are not reported in the literature.

Another variant for inservice training is the field-based professor. In a rural Georgia area (Bruce & others, 1975; Hubright & others, 1974), the community and the administration were unwilling to have educators who knew nothing of the community's needs instructing their teachers and their students. The university sent four professors to the school who taught on-site courses which could meet the needs of the community. The courses were abbreviated in class hours and featured the professors working in the classroom with the teachers, using the class hours as a laboratory for introducing new ideas, and helping the teachers develop innovative approaches.

Cadre training (Cashmere Consolidated School District, 1979) was used for a project in Washington state. During a 10-day workshop, 51 participants trained in a program for rural educators. Upon completion of the course, the 51 trainees gave the workshop to other teachers, administrators, school board members, guidance and media specialists, and community members.

Self-instructional materials have been used to develop inservice training in particular subjects. Utah State University (Henderson, 1976) developed packets of self-instructional materials to train elementary teachers to deal with mildly handicapped children in their classrooms. With the technology of today, many of the packets can contain slides, audio or video tapes, workbooks, and other multi-media materials. This approach is very efficient as it saves faculty instructional time and saves travel time for the university staff and the recipient.

Television and satellite technology are also being used to bring inservice training to rural teachers in isolated areas. The Appalachian Education Satellite project (Bramble & others, 1975) conducted four graduate courses for teachers in Appalachia by using NASA's AT-6 communications satellite at 15 sites throughout the Appalachian region, from New York to Alabama.

Satellite radio has also been used for teacher-to-teacher professional communications and to provide continuing educational opportunities for teachers in isolated areas. In Alaska (NEA, 1975), a 13-week course, accredited for three hours by the University of Alaska School of Education and sponsored by the National Education Association, was implemented to help teachers in remote areas. Support material on each topic was mailed to the participants in the villages well in advance of the radio broadcasts.

Although there is no "one" method which will always be effective, many universities are realizing the need to implement rural teacher preparation programs. The type of program to be implemented is dependent upon the needs of the area served. Jonathon Sher in his book, Education in Rural America; A Reassessment of Conventional Wisdom, says it well:

The primacy of local circumstances must be respected. Rural America may well represent the single most diverse and heterogeneous group of individuals and communities in our society. Thus the notion of an educational panacea--that is, an educational reform strategy that is applicable and effective throughout rural America--is ludicrous. Any reform strategy that seeks to circumvent local traditions, values, beliefs, and capabilities, rather than building upon them, is bound to fail. (pp. 274-275)

MEETING THE NEEDS

Quality personnel is the key to quality education. To prepare quality teachers for the small schools, better preservice programs must be developed by the universities. The universities must be charged with the recruitment and training of teachers for small schools. Presently, they handicap the small schools in approaching change by maintaining a monopolistic control over both the population that is authorized to teach young people and the ideas they bring with them into the classroom (Horn, 1981; Muse, 1977).

Most of the programs are now urban oriented, and rural or small schools are viewed as training grounds or stepping stones, either directly or indirectly, by educators (Nachtigal, 1980; Moriarty, 1981; Edington, 1976). In a nationwide questionnaire circulated by Charles (1969) to rural school teachers, he found that 97.4% felt that they were inadequately prepared to teach in rural schools. More recent studies done in Montana (Gardener, 1982) and New Mexico (Amodeo, 1982) have reached similar results.

By 1977 very few programs for rural educators had been developed to serve the 70% of all school districts in the United States that have populations under 2,500. In contacting over 200 colleges, Ivan Muse of Brigham Young University found that only 15 colleges indicated that they were involved in rural teacher training programs. William H. Dreier reported similar results for the four-state area of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa in 1977 (Muse, 1977, Dreier, 1977).

Jerry Horn (1981), in a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, reported that 40 institutions of higher education in 28 states that were thought to have a substantial rural population were sent questionnaires to indicate preparation programs for small school educators. Replies were received from 24 institutions representing 23 states.

The respondents indicated that they had practices/programs specifically designed to prepare educational personnel for and/or to meet the needs of rural/small schools in the following areas;

33.3%	pre-service education
25.0%	inservice education
29.2%	graduate education
25.0%	credit workshops/seminars
20.8%	noncredit workshops/seminars
37.5%	consultant services
29.5%	information services
25.0%	research services
29.2%	curriculum development services
20.8%	grant proposal development services
8.3%	other (includes Teacher Corps, small school conference, and rural small school certification program)

(Horn, 1981, pages 7 and 8)

Horn's survey indicates that very few colleges have initiated programs since the survey done by Muse (1977). However, it must be noted that Horn has listed precentages, which can be misleading. Since about one-third of the population is rural, it would seem that having 33.3% of the institutions with preservice programs for rural and small schools would be sufficient. But, since only 24 schools replied, it indicates a very small portion have actual programs. There are several other questions that could be asked concerning the survey. How many students have taken advantage of the programs? How many districts or schools have taken advantage of the services that the institutions offer? How many of the workshops and inservice programs are continuing?

BASIC THEMES IN PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

A review of the literature available on teacher preparation for rural and small schools identifies several basic themes that are prevalent in preservice programs. The following concepts represent the starting points in the development of an instructional program for small school teacher preparation.

One of the most basic themes that is prevalent in past or present preparation programs for small schools is that teachers preparing to teach in the nonmetropolitan areas should do their student teaching in similar areas (Muse, 1978; Evans, 1978; Ivey, 1979; Archer, 1958; Betts, 1914; UNESCO, 1980; Sher, 1977). This may necessitate the establishment of college centers throughout the state to serve as "off-campus" schools. This is being done in Utah (Muse, 1978) where student teachers receive additional instruction while student teaching. Other colleges have developed "circuit riders" (Egerton, 1966) who travel the state helping to supervise interns and the supervisors of the interns. Ivey (1979) and Gartner (1974) imply that often the smaller colleges may be able to implement such programs more easily than the larger institutions. The authors suggest that, through a cooperative program involving all the colleges of education in a state, a less costly yet more efficiently run program of nonmetropolitan teaching experience could be implemented.

Muse (1978), reporting to the People United for Rural Education in Iowa, found that over 90% of the students in the Brigham Young University program who went to rural areas to student teach wanted to take their first job in a small school district. He also indicated that school administrators found recruitment of teachers easier and that teachers with known qualities were being hired for the nonmetropolitan areas following the program.

A second theme that is prevalent in past and present literature is that students planning to teach in the small schools must be aware of the cultural, social, and economic factors involved in the rural areas (Betts, 1914; Gjelten, 1978; Ivey, 1979; Sher, 1977; Woofter, 1917; Archer, 1958). Each area of the United States is unique in its cultural heritage; therefore, there is no one sociological idealogy that can be taught to all persons preparing for small schools.

> The rural educator needs to study the children and the community--to understand the traditions, customs, social values, and habit patterns of the family and community life and realize how they differ from those other areas, even other rural areas. (Archer, 1958, p. 12)

Archer's quote leads us to the realization that even within a state, especially the larger states, the variations in the cultures or sociology of areas may be quite diverse. An understanding of the economic base of a community (for example, farming, ranching, mining, lumbering) is essential to an understanding of a community's educational needs. The community's cultural heritage must also be considered.

Therefore, the prospective teacher in the small schools must be able to assess the needs of the community he or she will serve. Berea College found that if the teachers know the community and the community knows the teachers, the program of educational opportunities is more easily implemented.

The program developed for each area requires increased cooperation of the schools, communities, and institutes of higher learning (Horn, 1981). A good communications network among these three entities is necessary for the implementation of an effective preservice program for the preparation of teachers for small schools.

Finally, a teacher preparation program for small schools should deal with more than the preservice of classroom teachers.

> Competent and well-qualified teachers, administrators and other professional personnel are equally essential for all children, youth, and adults. To obtain such a staff, it is of prime importance that there be continued re-evaluation of teacher preparation, both preservice and inservice, focused on the unique aspects of preparing teachers, teachers of teachers, supervisors, and other educational specialists and administrators for rural and rural-related schools. Such evaluation is mandatory in meeting the objective of quality and quantity education. (Department of Rural Education, 1967, p. 2)

The preservice program must be augmented by an inservice program which will keep teachers presently in the field up-to-date on methods for use in small schools (Edington, 1976; Sher, 1977; Muse, 1977). The inservice programs should include both on-site and college-based programs so that as many as possible may be served.

Horn (1981) indicated that there are four restrictions which have prevented small school preparation programs. First, the money, time, and personnel necessary for implementing such programs are not available. Second, many areas have not taken their responsibility to small schools seriously and, therefore, have not committed themselves to the preparation of teachers for nonmetropolitan areas. Third, political and bureaucratic constraints have hindered the funding and implementation of programs. Fourth, there is no widespread knowledge of what is needed for such programs. Many of the research concerns have not been communicated to the necessary channels.

Four basic components are essential to the development of a small school preparation program: (1) the program must be field-based; (2) cultural, social, and economic factors must be considered; (3) needs of the community must be assessed; and (4) inservice programs must be offered. Continuous development will be necessary to meet the needs within any given area. Development will necessitate keeping abreast of the current literature available pertaining to rural and small schools. The need for better formal and informal networks of communication is necessary for the development of preservice programs (Horn, 1981).

CERTIFICATION

A serious problem exists with the certification requirements of teachers in the various states. The majority of these certification programs have been built around the larger school and have failed to recognize that teachers in some small rural schools may be teaching a multi-grade classroom or may be teaching a number of subjects at the secondary level. Most of our certification programs fail to recognize this. Thus our teacher education programs fail to educate teachers to be generalists rather than specialists. Horn's survey (1981), mentioned earlier, indicated that a very small proportion of the colleges were involved or interested in certification requirements for the small schools.

"A certified teacher is not same as a qualified teacher" (North Dakota State Department of Public Instruction, 1967). Teachers preparing for small schools must have a full range of knowledge and technology. Preparation and active experience is the best indicator of quality teaching.

> Studies clearly illustrate that teachers in the primary grades should teach differently from those in the intermediate grades and that teachers of low-socioeconomic-status students should teach differently from teachers of upper-socioeconomic-status students. One implication of these studies is that certification requirements will need to change. (Hall & Houston, 1981)

The certification standards for teachers in small schools must also change. If the certification standards are changed, administrators may discover that it is easier to find and retain high caliber personnel for their schools.

CONCLUSIONS

> The gap between what we do and what we know how to do seems even more pronounced and critical in small, rural schools than in the educational system as a whole. (North Dakota State Department of Education, 1967)

The gap between what has been done and what needs to be done in rural education is slowly closing. Many people in teacher education throughout the nation recognize that teachers going to the rural schools need a different type of preservice experience from those going to urban or suburban areas. The majority of our teacher education programs train teachers to go to metropolitan or suburban areas. It is not surprising, therefore, that personnel who go to small, rural areas soon become dissatisfied and want to move on to the larger cities. Research indicates that the curriculum must prepare the student to become a part of the rural community.

The rapid closing of the rural schools across the nation has slowed almost to a standstill, and the large majority of those that still exist are necessary due to either long distances between schools or geographic terrain which make it impossible for consolidation or other types of reorganization with other schools. We can no longer say that the needs of the small school will pass away, because it will be with us for an indefinite period of time.

Those concerned with teacher education must realize that teaching and administering small schools is different from teaching and administering metropolitan schools. Isolation, limited resources, limited services, and staff limitations increase the responsibilities of rural teachers and administrators. A few preservice programs have recognized this need for a differentiated type of training, and evaluation of these programs has shown them to be fairly successful in training the teacher for the rural area as well as in educating personnel to want to stay in the rural areas.

Any program that recognizes both the preservice and inservice training needs of teachers for rural areas must recognize the need for a field-centered education program which gives the students early experience within the rural setting. As a result of this early experience, a great many of these people find out that they do not want to teach in rural America. This in itself is an advantage. It is much better to find this out early in their educational program than after they have prepared themselves and are out on the job.

Preparation programs should prepare the teachers of small and rural schools to be generalists rather than specialists. Teachers must be prepared to teach more than one or two subjects or grade levels and to handle various extra-curricular activities. Teachers and administrators need additional training in organizing curriculums, particularly curriculums that will better meet the needs of the student and the community.

Teachers and administrators preparing for the small and rural areas need better preparation in the sociological and economic factors prevalent in nonmetropolitan education. Although each area has different needs, the educator must be aware of the cultural, social, and economic factors of the area he or she serves. With a better understanding of needs and resources, the communications between the school and the community can become more open and beneficial to all concerned.

To be effective, teacher preparation programs cannot terminate with just a preservice program. An ongoing inservice program is essential to the continued growth of rural educators and for better relations between the communities, schools, and colleges of education.

The preparation and certification of teachers for rural and small schools need to be upgraded. The leadership must come from both the state departments of education and from the colleges of education. The state departments should assist in developing better certification programs, and the colleges of education should be developing better teacher education programs to prepare the teacher for the rural school.

> The rural teacher must be educated, so that he can lead and inspire; he must be trained, so that he can teach; he must be at heart one of his people, so that he can enter into their lives as a friend and leader. His spirit and attitude must be shaped to this end by his preparation and training. (Betts & Hall, 1914, p. 113)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are suggested as a means of better preparing teachers for rural America:

The first general set is in the area of teacher education, both the inservice and preservice programs:

1. As part of both the general education and the preservice education of teachers and other school personnel, classes must be developed or organized that relate to the problems of the rural school. Part of the general education program of the teacher entering rural America could be in the area of rural sociology. Such courses could replace some of the other general education requirements.

2. Classes in methods and techniques should recognize the specialized problems of the teacher in the small school.

3. Inservice experiences, both before student teaching and during student teaching, should be in a small isolated school where the student could live as well as teach and work within that particular community.

4. Colleges of education should maintain a direct liaison with the personnel from the small rural communities. They should develop an ongoing advisory board from which they could have input as to the needs of the educational personnel going to those areas.

5. Teacher education programs should provide experiences at the primary and intermediate levels in multi-grade situations so those teachers who will teach in small rural schools will be prepared to teach students in two, three, four, and even five grade levels.

The second set of recommendations centers around the certification programs in the state departments of education:

1. Certification at the secondary level should allow a teacher to be certified in a number of areas with less in-depth emphasis than is required for certification in only one or two areas. A teacher may have a combination of three, four, or five minors rather than one major and minor.

2. Specialized inservice programs should be developed to help the teachers in the small rural schools be better able to teach many of the courses which they are required to teach.

3. Certification for elementary teachers should require that they be exposed to teaching at both primary and intermediate grade levels.

REFERENCES

A center for rural education. Montana Schools, Nov. 1980, 2.

Alexander, R. Is the country school the newest thing in education? Instructor, Oct. 1978, 106-111.

Amodeo, L. B. Unpublished report 1982. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Archer, C. P. Elementary education in rural areas. New York: The Ronald Press, 1958.

Beck, J. J., Jr. & Smith, M. L. Small school needs in Texas. The Small School Forum, Spring 1982, 3(3), 19-21.

Betts, G. H. & Hall, O. E. Better Rural Schools. New York: The Bobs-Merrill Company, 1914, 8.

Bramble, W. J. & others. Education on the beam: a progress report on the Appalacian Education Satellite Project. 1975. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 108 660).

Brim, R. P. and Hanson, D. L. Improving the small school. NASSP Bulletin, LXIV, OCT. 1980, 18-26.

Bruce W. C. & others. Field-based teacher education: past, present and future. 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 070).

Buckland, Roscoe V. Rural school improvement project. Berea College, Kentucky, 1958. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 015 801).

Cashmere Consolidated School District, Washington. Training a cadre of rural educators to conduct career education in-service. Final report and executive summary, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 183 862).

Charles, E. B. The preparation of teachers for small and rural schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Tucson: University of Arizona, 1969.

Conant, J. B. The American high school today. Carnegie Series in American Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Cubberly, E. P. Rural life and education. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1922.

Cushman, M. L. The status of education and training of rural youth--the impact of socioeconomic change. 23 Oct. 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 014 363).

Department of Rural Education. 1967 revision of the platform. Washington: National Education Association, Oct. 1967, 2.

Drier, W. H. Teachers from rural America - are they recognized and prepared? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society. Madison, Wisconsin, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 144 732).

Edington, E. Strengthening the small rural school. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., Jan. 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 115 408).

Educational personnel in the North Dakota public schools. Educational Development for North Dakota, 1967-1975. North Dakota State Department of Public Instruction, Bismark, North Dakota University, Grand Forks, Dec. 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 037 302).

Education in a rural environment, 2nd ed. UNESCO, 1980.

Egerton, J. Sometimes it got wild in Arkansas. Dec. 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 020 982).

Evans, J. R. See Jess, J. D. (Ed.) Rural education; yesterday, today and tomorrow.

Garcia, J. & Parker, B. E., Jr. Cooperative education: teacher preparation for rural schools. The Small School Forum. Winter 1981, 3(2), 21-22.

Gardener, C. E. A questionnaire to determine the needs of rural education in Montana. In press, The Rural Educator, Winter, 1982-1983.

Gartner, A. Whale hunting is different there--a report on the Alaska Rural Teacher Training Corps (ARTTC). COP (Career Opportunities Program), bulletin 8, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 103 169).

Gjelton, T. Schooling in isolated communities. Northhaven Project for Career Development, Portland, Maine, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 776).

Hall, G. E. & Houston, W. R. Competency-based teacher education: where is it now?, New York University Education Quarterly, XII, Summer 1981, 20-27.

Hanna, L. Special services for small schools systems. American School Board Journal, July 1962, 145(8).

Henderson, H. S. The development of mediated training programs for workers with the handicapped. Final report. 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177 763).

Horn, J. G. Higher education's response to the needs of rural schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, 13 April 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 201 435).

Hoyt, M. (Ed.) Preservice/inservice training options for rural school personnel. Rural Education Fact Sheet, ERIC/CRESS, Las Cruces, New Mexico, 1981.

Hubright, R. L. and others. Teacher training in a rural Georgia community, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 098 213).

Hull, R. & Hegtvegt, K. A model for a rural school field exprience, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175 598).

Ivey, E., II. Developing and administering a nonmetropolitan teacher education program. West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia, August 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 189 031).

Jess, J. D. (Ed.) Rural education; yesterday, today and tomorrow. Convention Report 1978, People United for Rural Education, 2 February 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 376).

Kunkel, R. The UMSSP - An innovative venture. The College of Education Record. Grand Forks, North Dakota: North Dakota State University, Dec. 1966.

Moriarty, T. E. Problems of rural superintendents in western South Dakota. The Rural Educator, 3(1), 1981.

Murphy, Sara. A three-circle process for rural school renewal. Educational Leadership, April 1982, 39(7), 548.

Muse, I. D. Preservice programs for educational personnel going into rural schools. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Las Cruces, New Mexico, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 506).

Muse, I. D. Rurally responsive teacher training: close encounters of the fourth kind. Jan. 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 936).

Nachtigal, P. M. Improving rural schools. National Institute of Education, Sept. 1980, 35. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 992).

National Education Association. Using satellite technology to increase professional communication among teachers: a report of experiments conducted by the National Education Association, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 140).

O'Neal, L. and Becken, W. Rural education: past and present. The Rural Educator, 3(1), 1981; 3(2), 1982.

Resource guide for inservice teacher education. Washington West School District, Vermont. Teacher Corps reports; Inservice Development Process. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 143 660).

Rural Education Association. Educating all children in the 80's. Conference Reporter for the 1980 National Conference on Rural/Regional Education Programs. Oregon, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 594).

Schneider, B. L. America's small schools. ERIC/CRESS publication, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, March 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 187 508).

Sher, J. P. (Ed.) Education in rural America: a reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1977.

Slacks, John R. The rural teacher's work. Ginn and Company, 1938.

Surwill, B. J. School of Education Quarterly. Billings, Montana: Eastern Montana College, September 1980, 6(3).

Swick, K. J. & Henley, L. L. The rural and small school: a comprehensive information booklet. Springfield: Illinois Local Control of Schools Association. September 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 110 265).

White, M. B. Rural education - partners for accountability. ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico. 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 100 537).

Wilson, Alfred P. The principalship in rural America. ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, Jan. 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 438).

Woofter, T. J. Teaching in rural schools. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.

Zetler, A. G. Rural education at Western Montana College. The Small School Forum, Spring 1981, 2(3), 34.