This research review focuses on the need for active cooperation between the university-based researcher and the junior college administrator, to provide the research on teaching and learning necessary for the sound preparation of junior college teachers. Historically, the junior college's main concern has been student learning, and time available for activities like research was at a minimum. On the other hand, such research is of primary interest to those engaged in junior college studies at the university. One indication of the current level of cooperation is the tendency of administrators—especially those engaged in selecting new teachers—to ignore existing research on which qualities are characteristic of the properly prepared teacher. For example, the applicant's teaching ability, theories of learning, course objectives, or knowledge of the junior college commonly are not major selection criteria. Also notable is the negative attitude that many junior college administrators show toward accepting teaching interns. The uniqueness of the junior college role and environment suggests that those who teach there should receive training oriented toward particular needs. Thus, not only must the researcher be knowledgeable about current institutional practices, but also the practitioner must be aware of and contribute toward research. Accepting this, it should be obvious that the quality of both current teaching practice and existing research depends on mutual cooperation. (JN)
Recently, Arthur M. Cohen and Edgar A. Quimby of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges suggested a series of research efforts that might be undertaken in the junior college (Junior College Research Review, September 1970). These recommendations were made on the premise that research is useful only when a user puts the result into practice. However, because the university-based researcher and the practitioner in the junior college do not communicate as well as often as they should, the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges attempts to bridge the gap between them.

One of the Clearinghouse’s special concerns is junior college teacher preparation. This review sketches the relationships—or their lack—between junior college administrators and the university programs that address themselves to junior college instruction.

Reviews of Programs Are Available

Many aspects of teacher preparation have been discussed in previous issues of the Junior College Research Review. The titles of these issues reveal their special viewpoints: “The Preparation and Characteristics of the Junior College Teacher” (February 1968), “Research on Junior College Teachers” (March 1968), “Selected Teacher Preparation Programs” (May 1968), “Faculty Recruitment” (September 1969), and “Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving Instruction” (January 1970). As with all JCRRs, pertinent research is cited and commented on for the information of the practitioner.

A number of teacher preparation programs have been given detailed treatment in these reviews; others are cited in various documents in the ERIC collection—e.g., the internship program for William Rainey Harper College (ED 035 407), the Faculty Development Project, co-sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Carnegie Institute (ED 034 518), the proposed Doctor of Arts in College Teaching, supported by the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges (ED 031 205), the Appalachian State Teachers College Program (ED 015 759), and the Eastern Washington State College Interinstitutional Program (ED 016 488). Each of these programs is built on some research that relates to teaching.

In addition to these documents, many other materials related to teacher preparation are available through ERIC. An extensive account of the Junior College Teacher Program at UCLA is given by Arthur M. Cohen in Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College (ED 019 938). Florence Reiser’s Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College (ED 026 015) is an in-depth investigation of the personnel now teaching at the junior college with emphasis on identification of personality traits. More a descriptive study, it suggests the kinds of research that might be undertaken on teachers and teaching.

Administrators Seem to Ignore Research

Meanwhile, what is or is not happening at the junior college? The practitioner looks with disdain on “esoteric research” conducted at the university. Generally, research is considered remote from the daily problems of teaching. It is questionable whether those who recruit and hire in the junior colleges (division chairs, deans, presidents, and personnel directors) are even vaguely aware of the special aspects of the teacher preparation programs described in the reports mentioned above.

Several links are missing between the teacher trained to teach in a junior college and the means whereby the junior college recruits and selects teachers, as pointed out by Wattenbarger (ED 014 440) and Heinberg (ED 019 938), to mention but two sources. Little concern is given to whether an individual has the ability to teach. The major criterion seems to be whether or not he has a master’s degree in the subject matter taught. It is costly and time-consuming for individual junior colleges to conduct extensive searches for “qualified junior college teachers”—90 per cent of fifty-eight junior colleges in California that responded to a survey indicated they had advisory committees for locating and selecting teachers in vocational fields (ED 019 938). At least one junior college district spends thousands of dollars on “recruitment trips” throughout the state and even, until recently, throughout the nation.

There are several well-established patterns followed by the junior college bureaucracy in its teacher recruitment ritual. Gerald Kennedy outlines some procedures used for junior college recruitment (ED 009 912) and Northern Virginia Technical College reports the use of 1,225 man-hours in a four-month period merely to determine faculty needs (ED 010 020). There is much to be desired in this bureaucratic method of recruiting junior college teachers. One might ask when, if ever, the administrator discovers if the candidate can teach; what, if any, learning theory he favors; what, if any, learning objectives he attempts to achieve; and what, if anything, he knows about the junior college.

Many Teachers Come from Secondary Education

Wattenbarger reports that 33 per cent of the nation’s junior college teachers are recruited from secondary education (ED 014 283). The fact that a teaching candidate has taught in a high school merely means that the same college graduate has added several years of secondary teaching experience to whatever subject-matter knowledge he had. It is debatable whether this experience gives the prospective teacher any particular knowledge either about the junior college or about how to cause learning. In fact, a recent survey (Park, in press) showed that the majority of junior college teachers at three institutions considered themselves to be below average or average in understanding and accepting the junior college philosophy. Indeed,
most ranked themselves as average or below in causing student learning. Nearly 50 per cent of these teachers were recruited from the secondary schools.

One might seriously question why the junior college recruits so heavily from high school. Is it because the administrators themselves are primarily from the high school—bringing with them their secondary school methods and criteria—or is it because they are unaware of the special programs at the universities and colleges developed specifically to train junior college teachers? Do they really think former secondary school instructors are preferable better teachers?

How Junior College Teachers “Qualify”

Every junior college administrator knows that employing teachers affects instruction, the finances of a district, and the very core of institutional operations. Staffing within budget, a practical and relevant concern, is no longer a problem of supply and demand, but of obtaining qualified teachers. The term “qualified” is a matter of judgment, for, other than personal characteristics and a few years of teaching experience, the common denominator for junior college teaching training is that teaching license. How much does a master’s degree does not necessarily qualify an individual as a teacher. Unfortunately, subject-matter specialists are not necessarily prepared to teach in a junior college. If the junior college is to survive it must cooperate with the agencies involved in research on teaching. Teaching is a skill that must be learned; a master’s degree does not necessarily qualify an individual as a teacher.

A document published by the National Council of Teachers of English on Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College reports that junior college teachers are part of the established methodology used by the secondary and elementary levels for years. The teaching chair might be compared with the student-teacher programs currently in practice. Supervisors of student teachers tell of many instances where the prospective teachers affect instruction, the finances of a district, and the very core of institutional operations. Staffing within budget, a practical and relevant concern, is no longer a problem of supply and demand, but of obtaining qualified teachers. The term “qualified” is a matter of judgment, for, other than personal characteristics and a few years of teaching experience, the common denominator for junior college teaching training is that teaching license. How much does a master’s degree does not necessarily qualify an individual as a teacher. Unfortunately, subject-matter specialists are not necessarily prepared to teach in a junior college. If the junior college is to survive it must cooperate with the agencies involved in research on teaching. Teaching is a skill that must be learned; a master’s degree does not necessarily qualify an individual as a teacher.

A number of intern programs throughout the country are reviewed in the May 1968 issue of the Junior College Research Review. Other programs, especially in the state colleges in California, follow the high school training pattern with student teachers. Both the interns and the student teachers are part of the established methodology used by the secondary and elementary levels for years. The teaching chair might be compared with the student-teacher programs currently in practice. Supervisors of student teachers tell of many instances where the prospective teacher gained little or no actual teaching experience. Indeed, frustration to the point of depression and resignation is more often the case. The student teacher seldom has the opportunity to teach; he generally sits out his assignment in the last row of the classroom. When he actually does teach, it is usually only because the regular “master teacher” is ill or attending a conference. Whatever benefit might result from student teaching is negated by such remarks of the master teacher as “You automatically flunk 00 per cent of the students on the first exam—otherwise you get the reputation of being an easy grader.”

Contrary to the negative attitude of junior college administrators toward teaching interns (noting that the junior college is supposedly a teaching institution) is their attitude toward administrative interns in the state of California. The rationale often given is that the administration contributes to the confused image of the junior college.

The research undertaken by various institutions and foundations obviously points to the idea that the junior college is a unique educational entity. Its purpose is supposedly teaching, not research, as compared with the university. If we are to believe that the junior college is a teaching institution, should it not be interested in research on teaching and learning? If the junior college is unable to carry on the necessary research, is it not logical for it to participate in developing teacher-training programs with institutions already engaged in such research? It is as necessary for the researcher to be knowledgeable about current institutional practices as it is for the practitioner to know about research being conducted in junior college education. As one cannot exist without the other, the problem is to involve the junior college in this research. As Gleaser points out, it is a task that must be “shared alike by the universities and the junior college . . . research of the universities must be pooled with the . . . resources of the junior college” (ED 018 489).

Causing the System to Change

The avowed purpose of the junior college teacher program at UCLA is not only to train teachers to work in the junior college, but also to cause change within the junior college system. The program actively recruits and trains those candidates capable of operating within a special teaching-learning situation (ED 017 269). The missing connection between research and application might be found in a practical and feasible suggestion by Arthur M. Cohen, the program director. Each junior college would establish a “teaching chair” to be filled by an intern actively enrolled in a teacher-training program. The intern would occupy the chair for a year, with full pay and responsibilities, under the supervision of both the institution’s administration and the university or college. It would be understood that this chair must be vacated and filled with a new intern each year. Variations to the basic idea are obvious, e.g., the chair could be designated for the first semester only or could be a half-time position, depending on enrollment and need.

With the increasing number of programs being created to train junior college teachers, the junior college, if it wants a voice in how teachers are trained, must decide whether it will support a profession that requires a specialization in teaching and learning. If the junior college is a unique educational entity, it should participate actively in teacher-training research. A number of intern programs throughout the country are reviewed in the May 1968 issue of the Junior College Research Review. Other programs, especially in the state colleges in California, follow the high school training pattern with student teachers. Both the interns and the student teachers are part of the established methodology used by the secondary and elementary levels for years. The teaching chair might be compared with the student-teacher programs currently in practice. Supervisors of student teachers tell of many instances where the prospective teacher gained little or no actual teaching experience. Indeed, frustration to the point of depression and resignation is more often the case. The student teacher seldom has the opportunity to teach; he generally sits out his assignment in the last row of the classroom. When he actually does teach, it is usually only because the regular “master teacher” is ill or attending a conference. Whatever benefit might result from student teaching is negated by such remarks of the master teacher as “You automatically flunk 00 per cent of the students on the first exam—otherwise you get the reputation of being an easy grader.”

Contrary to the negative attitude of junior college administrators toward teaching interns (noting that the junior college is supposedly a teaching institution) is their attitude toward administrative interns in the state of California. The rationale often given is that the administrative...
The Danger of Bureaucracy

Junior college teachers and administrators have reached the point of development that generally leads to the establishment of a rigid bureaucracy. Roscoe Martin describes it as follows:

It may be argued, indeed, that bureaucracy (in the invincibly sense) is a natural concomitant of professionalism. Thus the most advanced professions are those most affected by sclerosis; by certitude of the rightness of any professional course or stand adopted; impatience with any contrary view; and suspicion of all criticism. Critical and harsh as this appraisal may be, the features of a closed system have become obvious in the junior college.

One indication of it is found in Pratt's study of the relationship between the degree of authoritarianism in the personalities of public community college presidents in New York and the number of authoritarian personalities in the respective faculties they hired (ED 023 382).

The fact seems to be that the junior college bureaucracy does not wish its steadily solidifying structure to be reorganized. This applies to teachers as well as to administra-
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