# Teachers' Centres: A Comparative View

Ernest Stabler
the university of western ontario

Cet article a pour but d'examiner les origines et les caractéristiques des centres d'enseignement en Angleterre et au Pays de Galles, et aux Etats-Unis. En Angleterre et au Pays de Galles il existe plus de 600 centres de ce genre tandis qu'aux Etats-Unis le nombre de programmes de ce genre se chiffrerait à 4500. Aussi trouve-t-on des centres d'éducation dans presque toutes les préfectures au Japon.

Ces centres trouvent leur origine en Grande-Bretagne et ceci explique que leur planification y soit plus complète. Le programme comprend et la recherche en didactique et un élément d'éducation permanente sans qu'il y ait toutefois une distinction bien marquée entre les deux. Les participants qui sont en général des enseignants se réunissent bénévolement pour parler de leur travail, de leurs expériences, de leurs problèmes et de leurs anxiétés. Pour atteindre leurs buts, les centres ont recours à une multitude de ressources y compris un capital humain. Des fonds leur sont octroyés par les autorités régionales et la direction est confiée à un comité parmi lequel les professeurs sont en majorité.

Aux Etats-Unis des projets fédéraux dans le domaine du "renouvellement scolaire", les lois de certains états, les directives de l'administration, le consortium des universités et des commissions scolaires ont établi un lien entre les centres d'enseignement et les institutions préposées à la préparation des enseignants.

De plus, un nombre imposant de centres d'enseignement ont été établis. Parmi ceux-ci, quelques-uns jouissent d'une affiliation avec certains collèges, d'autres travaillent d'une façon indépendante; ils n'ont pas d'habitude une planification à longue haleine et fonctionnent dans une atmosphère détendue. Les professeurs s'inscrivent à des cours de courte durée, à des ateliers, ou bien préparent des projets d'enseignement ou causent entre eux. Tandis que le climat y est plutôt détendu, il n'en reste pas moins vrai que certains centres opèrent selon des objectifs bien établis.

Au Japon, les centres d'enseignement étaient tout d'abord des centres scientifiques pour le récyclage des professeurs de science. Durant la période d'après-guerre, l'importance que le Japon attachait aux sciences, la pénurie de professeurs en sciences et le besoin de récyclage ont contribué à surenchérir le caractère scientifique de ces centres. Les centres au Japon bénéficient de subventions de la part du gouvernement, ils sont logés dans de vastes édifices, ils sont affiliés à des centres de recherches et administrés par un personnel fort nombreux.

D'une façon générale, ces trois pays tâchent de répondre aux besoins des professeurs, d'établir un lien entre la recherche en didactique et l'éducation permanente et de répondre aux besoins de perfectionnement des professeurs tant au niveau local qu'au niveau national.

A variety of colorful images decorate the literature relating to teachers' centres in both Britain and the United States. They range from a diamond in the rough to a fly trap whose color and scent "lured teachers on to the sticky surface of curriculum development"; from a silent educational revolution, or a bandwagon which is the fastest vehicle in a vacuum, to

a phrase from the drug culture to the effect that the teachers' centre idea puts the monkey of educational reform on the teacher's own back.

Claims made for and expectations of teachers' centres are no less colorful and indeed more generous – particularly in the United States:

> . . . one of the hottest educational concepts on the scene today.
>
> . . . one of the most prominent of the cutting edges in educational reform.
>
> Of all the new concepts in American education today, the teaching center is probably the most widely accepted as having significant promise for improving the quality of instruction in our schools.

In England and Wales there are well over 600 centres in operation and an informed guess would place the number of centre programs in the United States at 4500. In Japan, education centres are found in practically every prefecture or school district, and in Holland some 40 institutes or pedagogic centres are actually involved in in-service teacher training. One can, therefore, speak of a teachers' centre *movement* although the sites, programs, governing bodies, sources of support, and patterns of leadership vary tremendously, not only among countries but within a particular country and even within a school district or local authority.

In Britain, where the movement began in the early 1960s, the centres have a degree of unity. Their programs involve both curriculum development and in-service training, frequently without a clear-cut distinction between the two; the participants, who are mainly but not exclusively teachers, come together voluntarily to share their experience and expertise as well as their uncertainties and anxieties, and there is a common desire to deal with problems that teachers themselves believe to be pressing. The centres use a wide range of resources, including both people and things, are supplied with funds provided by the local education authority, and are managed by a policy committee on which teachers are in the majority.

In other words, a British teachers' centre is a local supportive agency; teachers themselves are active in both program and management; and the only physical feature common to all centres is some arrangement for making tea.

In the United States the diversity is much more pronounced, as the variety of titles will demonstrate. More than 200 different titles have been identified, the most common of which are teacher centre or teaching centre, but also included are learning centre, staff development centre, and training complex. There is no dearth of acronyms: UNITE (United Neighborhoods in Teacher Education) and FAST (Federally Assisted Staff Training). Amid the diversity there are no common patterns of governance or sources of support, and few, if any, underlying similarities in matters of organization and function.

Parenthetically, the apostrophe in the British "teachers' centre" is symbolic of the frequently quoted phrase that these centres are *of* teachers,

*for* teachers, and managed *by* teachers, while the American term "teaching centre" does not carry the same implications. American centres serve both in-service and student teachers, paraprofessionals, school administrators, and college teachers. Their most commonly stated purpose is to improve teaching skills; their participants also come together to deal with real and pressing problems, but an emphasis on control by local teachers is not a marked feature of "teacher centring," as the professional literature now identifies the movement in the United States.

The Japanese education centre is typically a large and well-equipped building with a dozen or more highly-qualified full-time staff members. With substantial funding from both local school districts and the Ministry of Education these centres offer both long and short courses to teachers in a setting that is more structured and formal than that in either Britain or the United States.

## ENGLAND AND WALES

The origins and recent development of the centres reflect some of the characteristics of the English system of education and the position of teachers in that system. In England decisions in education, both financial and administrative, rest largely with local authorities, and within a school system a head teacher and his staff are relatively autonomous. Historically, the public examination system strongly influenced the curriculum, but with the gradual disappearance of the eleven-plus examination and the greater flexibility and freedom at O level there is more local control; elementary and secondary school heads, in consultation with their teachers, can pretty well decide their own curriculum. In a more centralized country the Inspectorate may impose an orthodoxy in the classroom; in a decentralized country such as the United States the community will monitor what is being taught in the schools, even to the extent of prescribing or proscribing text books. In England the independence of teachers is further secured through the strength of the unions and professional associations. Within this freedom from both bureaucratic and social pressures, teachers are not overwhelmed by curriculum consultants, LEA advisers, or university professors; and when they felt a need for some kind of help they developed, in the English fashion, an untidy network of loosely-defined voluntary associations in which their peers were to play a dominant role.

What were the compelling concerns that exercised teachers in England and Wales in the 1960s and led them to come together as never before? In a climate of uncertainty educational innovation tends to flourish. Set ways of teaching and learning have given way to discovery and inquiry, exploration and observation, and in the English primary schools the "integrated day" has erased the boundaries between traditional subjects and time divisions. In such a classroom children choose freely from a wide range of activities, each (within limits) following his own interests at his

own pace and, it is hoped, acquiring skills in reading, "research," writing, calculation, listening, and collaborating with others.

> When a teacher tries to deal with the needs of children separately, retail, rather than in the conventional class, wholesale, he has to cope with unprompted questions, unanticipated problems of the widest possible range. He badly needs to draw upon the skill and knowledge of other teachers — and is likely especially to seek advice on the underlying puzzle of how to ensure that individual children, for all their diverse activities, manage to learn what they must for the further stages of their schooling. [Taylor, 1974]

Secondary teachers had a different cluster of concerns. The comprehensive school was spreading, and former grammar school teachers were now face to face with adolescents, frequently intractable and singularly disinterested in the traditional subjects. Further, the government had announced that in 1972 the Raising of the School Leaving Age to 16 (ROSLA) would take effect. Many older students could find no meaning in the orthodox courses and examinations, and ways had to be found for combining school work with community service and work experience.

> Exposed, uncertain, forced to deal with matters beyond his academic competence, even with aspects of life with which teenagers (not to mention their parents) may be considerably more experienced than he is, the teacher naturally seeks advice or help from other teachers at sea in the ROSLA boat. [Taylor, 1974]

Closely related to these needs and concerns was the work of the Schools Council, a unique body that represents a partnership between central and local government. Half its income comes from the Department of Education and Science, and the other half from Local Education Authorities (LEA), each contributing according to the number of pupils in its maintained schools.

The LEAs decided in the mid-sixties to back the Schools Council as a national institution concerned with improving the quality of education through carefully designed research and curriculum development. Behind this support lay the belief that while the LEA had a local responsibility to improve curricula, teaching methods, and examinations, and in other ways to help teachers decide what and how to teach, there was, nevertheless, a part of this responsibility which could quite sensibly be carried out nationally — and for this purpose they were prepared to form a consortium to be called the Schools Council. The Schools Council would produce curriculum materials, research findings, and working papers and bulletins, which teachers in Penzance or Newcastle would be free to adopt, adapt, or discard. At the same time the local authorities would provide teachers with resources and time so that they could meet together, work, learn, and develop their own ideas and materials, and, of course, make use of Schools Council material. Hence the teachers' centres were created primarily to meet the needs of local teachers in a local setting, but were also seen by

the Schools Council as curriculum development centres for creating, as well as vehicles for disseminating, the new curriculum materials.

One further comment about the Schools Council: although supported by public agencies the Council is controlled by the teaching profession, that is, teachers form a majority on its Governing Council and major committees. Nevertheless, Council has no authority over teachers, and the use of any of the materials and methods it recommends requires the agreement of teachers concerned. Finally, the Council operates only in the area of the curriculum; it is concerned with helping teachers take curricular decisions in many different kinds of schools, but is not concerned with school organization, administration, or finance.

One example of the intimate relationship between a national curriculum project and the development and use of teachers' centres is the Nuffield Mathematics Project. The director of the project, Geoffrey Matthews, in a revealing anecdote illustrates the casual way a foundation can make decisions:

> In August 1963 I was handed a slip of paper by Tony Becher, Assistant Director (Education) of the Nuffield Foundation and he asked if I was interested. The paper mentioned quite shortly the possibility of a project for a 'contemporary course in mathematics for children aged 8-13.' The idea of going up to 13, and so overlapping the first two secondary years, seemed excellent, as clearly there would be a need for any 'primary' project to take account of the new secondary developments. But starting at 8? I heard myself saying 'I don't believe you can start at 8. The damage may well have been done by that time — if we could start at 5, I'd like the job.' To my astonishment Tony Becher pulled out his pen and changed the '8' into a '5' on the spot, and there could be no retreat. [E. Matthews, in Thornbury, 1973, p. 50]

The Project in its first phase was organized around 14 "pilot areas," each of which agreed to involve about 100 teachers, take responsibility for their training, and set up a centre with someone in charge who would co-ordinate the distribution and criticism of the Teachers' Guides. The teachers' centres, varied as they were, served as focal points for the project: 7 were in schools, 2 in unused schools, 1 in a technical college, and 4 in separate buildings, one of which was a former aerodrome. The second phase of the project involved another 77 areas, each with a group of trial schools served by a teachers' centre. Throughout the life of the Project the centres provided feedback to the writing team, and teachers themselves became involved in the writing of materials.

> Three guides were largely rewritten as the result of the friendly but tough criticism and another, on *Space*, which I thought was excellent, was literally destroyed because the pilot areas didn't accept it. In this way, at least, the point was well made that 'they listen to us,' though happily 'we and they' has not been a feature of the project. [E. Matthews, in Thornbury, 1973, p. 50]

In addition to providing feedback and criticism the centres were a part

of the in-service network which frequently took the form of half a dozen weekly sessions on one topic. In many instances half of these were on teachers' time, normally soon after the end of the school day, and the other half on released time.

With the burgeoning of Nuffield and Schools Council projects (at one time the Council was involved in 100) and the exhortation and support given to teachers' centres in Council publications ("Our aim must be that no teacher is without an opportunity to use a teachers' centre") the centre movement was fully launched. Its growth can be traced to a number of factors, not least of which is that the centres provided a new and different kind of in-service education. In place of the lecture followed by discursive and usually futile discussion, the centres made in-service education and curriculum development mean the same thing; and whether the leader of a short course was a school administrator, college lecturer, or fellow teacher, the content spoke to the real needs of teachers. For young teachers the centre was frequently a social as well as a professional centre where a probationer could find comfort and solace during a rough first year in Inner London or an isolated rural area. Primary school teachers, and they formed the majority of centre users, used centre workshops for discovering or making new materials, and it was rare for a centre to be without a work room, a collection of materials and equipment, and reprographic services.

Whether the setting has been a redundant school or an old town hall, a country estate or a portable beside a school, the British teachers' centre has had some success in breaking barriers that separate members of the educational hierarchy. Primary and secondary teachers, college lecturers and their students, LEA advisers and parents can meet together as a catholic constituency on common yet neutral ground. But it is the teachers who form the majority of the clientele, and without making exaggerated claims it can be said that the centres have given teachers a marked measure of control over their in-service education and a major role in the strategy of curriculum development.

## THE UNITED STATES

In exploring the origins of teacher centring in the United States, three major strands are evident: the problems and anxieties felt by teachers; the search by universities, colleges, school systems, and state departments of education for ways to improve teacher education; and the enthusiastic support of the United States Office of Education to carry out a "Plan for Education Renewal."

In 1972 Sidney Marland, the United States Commissioner of Education, proposed a plan which would begin on a pilot basis with the creation of 200 "renewal sites," each to work with an average of 10 schools, elementary and secondary, serving approximately 5000 pupils. The linchpin of each

renewal site, said Dr. Marland, would be "a teacher centre on the British model" where teachers and other educational personnel from renewal-site schools "will be able to come together to discuss problems in an atmosphere free of competition or compulsion, receive assistance and advice, improve their competencies, and exchange experience."

The plan would eventually establish 1000 renewal sites encompassing some 10,000 schools. Each site would be funded for five years, would serve as a demonstration model, and would receive, on average, an annual grant of $750,000. The Commissioner expected to divert funds which had earlier been assigned to a variety of federal programs, but he ran into heavy opposition from members of Congress who argued that once Congress appropriates money for specific programs the Office of Education has no discretionary authority to channel such funds to other purposes. Dr. Marland was obliged to scale down his ambitious project, but by early 1973 Houston, Texas, did receive something over a million dollars for teacher education programs including teacher centres; three state departments of education were given $250,000 each to set up centres; and 20 grants of $15,000 were provided for centre planning purposes.

In contrast to the local initiative and modest beginnings of British centres, the Marland Plan was on a massive scale, but behind it was a concern for the classroom teacher:

> No matter how good an innovation may be, no matter how promising a technique, unless the teacher accepts it, believes deeply in it and possesses it as his own, no change will occur. Once the classroom door closes, the teacher is in charge.

The teacher centre movement cannot be divorced from efforts at both the state and local levels to improve the quality of teacher education. The influential *Teachers for the Real World*, edited by Othaniel Smith and published by the American Association for Teacher Education in 1969, advocated a "new institutional mechanism," the training complex, which would have easy access to both schools and universities. Organizationally the training complexes should be co-operative enterprises of the public schools, universities and colleges, and community agencies. The staff of the complex should come from both the schools and the universities, and their commitment to the education and training of teachers should be explicit and firm.

> The complex is a training center, not a research facility and its staff must be completely devoted to the ideal of training. The reward system of the complex must be focused on performance of the training function and not on research and publication. [Smith, 1969, p. 100]

A comprehensive study of teacher centres conducted by Syracuse University in 1973/74 found that partnerships and consortiums had, in fact, developed, the most common kind of collaboration being a free part-

nership between a school district and a university (Yarger & Leonard, 1974). The partnership was free in the sense that it was entered into willingly, and not prescribed by the state legislature or department of education.

At the state level there appears to be a relationship between the provision of teacher centres and the development of competency-based teacher education (CBTE). In the 14 states which in 1974 had made administrative provision for teacher centres, 13 had also taken an official position on CBTE. Four states (California, Florida, Texas, and Vermont) have passed legislation related to teacher centres. Vermont, for example, included in its enabling legislation the specification that only those teacher education programs which were competency-based would be funded, and the administrative regulations supporting this specification called for consortia of schools and universities to create a network of teacher centres. Florida was the first state to enact legislation (Bill 622 of 1973) directly related to the establishment of teacher centres, and Texas, with state and federal funds, is developing a network of 35 or 40 teacher education centres on the premise that the education of teachers is a joint responsibility of the college/university, the schools, and the state.

Federal renewal plans, state legislation or administrative action (one-third of the states reported one or the other in 1974) and consortia of universities and local school systems have linked teacher centres with institutions and agencies involved in teacher education. Under such auspices, the teacher centre has itself become institutionalized, with a structured program which frequently is a compromise between what teachers need and what administrators and teacher trainers believe they need.

The American teacher, no less than his British counterpart, has his problems in coping with the issues and alternatives which have marked American education in the last 10 years. Trends, breakthroughs, and new frontiers may be exciting to the theoretician but confusing to the classroom teacher. How to understand open education and the open classroom, alternative and free schools? How to deal individually with a classroom of multi-ethnic children, and at the same time use the immediate environment while recognizing the implications of "discovery" and "inquiry"?

To help teachers who want to understand the theory and find practical ways of putting it to work, a great number of local centres have appeared. They may or may not have an affiliation with a college or a school system, normally offer no specific program on a long-term basis, and usually have an unstructured, free, and flexible atmosphere. Teachers enrol in short courses or workshops, or make new materials and equipment, or simply talk with other teachers. While the climate may be free and informal, some of these centres are quite openly and visibly committed to a particular philosophy or movement.

The Workshop Center for Open Education in New York is a good example. This centre is related to the School of Education of City College and grew out of the City College Open Corridor Program. It is not concerned with degrees or credits but rather with process and growth, and its main function is "to create a setting and offer activities that will encourage interaction of the experienced, the committed, and the informed with those reaching out to cross what is essentially a new frontier in public education." Teachers may enrol for a workshop on, say, Reading Assessment or the Care of Animals in the Classroom, or work in one of the shops or areas (woodworking, clay, photography, plants/animals) or consult with staff or other teachers; but basically the idea is to allow a teacher to have her own experience with open education.

> The workshop experience gives the teacher a chance to rediscover her own way of learning and encourages her to be reflective about it. Reflecting on her own learning process helps the teacher trust the learning process in a child. Similarly, in pursuing the details of her own work at the WORKSHOP, the teacher once more grasps the significance of the detail that goes into the child's effort. By being given the opportunity and time to pursue the details of a piece of learning, those who participate in workshops illuminate the depths of their own capacity. The parallels with children in the classroom are clear. [Workshop Center for Open Education, n.d.]

This is a far cry, perhaps a reaction, from the national curriculum projects of an earlier day, projects that gave teachers packaged curriculums and occasionally made the boast that they were "teacher proof."

On the other side of the continent a modest teacher centre opened in San Francisco in 1971 when that city, under a court order, initiated a plan for racial-ethnic balance in the elementary schools. To implement the scheme, which meant bringing oriental, Latin, black, and white children together in every classroom of the city, some new kind of in-service education for teachers and preparation of parents and children was needed. In the Park South area of the city, with the assistance of the Ford and Carnegie foundations, a teacher centre was opened with the original purpose of helping teachers to work effectively with desegregated groups of children. During the first year and in spite of teething problems (one of which was the failure of the director to gain the confidence of principals) some 80 per cent of the area's 200 teachers used the centre, which was housed in three classrooms of a former elementary school. A teachers' advisory council was formed with one representative from each of the nine schools of the area. This meant, in effect, that the centre was under the control of teachers and that the director and his staff were accountable to the council. In 1973, when the two foundations withdrew their support, a strong representation of parents, teachers, and administrators appeared at a public meeting and the School District's Budget Committee was persuaded that the centre should continue to operate with School District funds.

I will resist the temptation to offer other examples of centres that are supported by local authorities or by foundations, or that exist as independent agencies. Suffice it to say they exist, including one that was opened by three teachers in a storefront in Harlem. In the United States, teacher centres *differ* tremendously in origin, sponsorship, funding, program emphasis, organization, and setting. But they are *similar* in these ways: they offer teachers new ideas and materials; they engage teachers in new learning and in making their own apparatus; teacher centre staff are usually themselves teachers who are ready and willing to share their expertise; participation by teachers is voluntary and programs are based on what teachers regard as their own needs. Finally, although centres are now widespread and numerous, they are getting relatively little public financial support. The Syracuse University Study revealed that in a sample of 180 school districts the funding of teacher centres represented less than one-half of 1 per cent of the total education budgets of those districts. If this figure is representative of the country as a whole, it is clear that the teacher centre movement is in large part the result of an enormous amount of volunteer effort.

## JAPAN

The education centres of Japan stem from several sources. Following World War II, small, informal, and voluntary groups of teachers formed "Study Circles" as a means of improving their skills. As they continued to meet in homes and schools they felt the need for a new kind of meeting place where expertise and equipment would be available. In the early 1950s the Law for the Development of Science Education gave further impetus to the founding of centres, and by 1960 five prefectures had established science centres for retraining science teachers. The importance of science in postwar Japan, the shortage of well-prepared teachers, and the need for constant updating account for the emphasis on science. By the mid-sixties 50 centres or institutes for science education had been established. In recent years the centres have expanded their work into fields other than science, particularly for those subjects stressed in the National Course of Study, such as Japanese and foreign languages (particularly English), mathematics, moral education, and technical arts (homemaking, for example). There is less stress on the arts, physical education, and the humanities.

The centres are typically large with well-equipped laboratories, work rooms, classrooms, libraries, and offices, and their full-time staffs range from 12 to 140. Both in-service training and research are stressed, and "research" includes a systematic investigation and analysis of curriculum, equipment, teaching methods, and modes of learning. Teachers attend short courses voluntarily, although the Ministry of Education in its concern to dis-

seminate the National Course of Study, and the prefectures in their desire to up-grade teachers' capabilities, provide a climate in which teachers may feel they are "expected" to attend a centre. Nevertheless, in some prefectures the demand by teachers to attend has been so high that lotteries and rotation systems have had to be adopted. On the other hand, there is a militant minority of unionized teachers who, regarding the centres as creatures of the Ministry, oppose them. The centres are funded by the national Ministry (for one-third of the cost), the prefectural Boards of Education, and municipal Boards of Education; and although the budgets for building and equipment are usually generous, there are the usual problems of providing teachers with released time and securing substitutes during their attendance at a centre.

The Science Education Institute of Osaka, a prefecture with a population of 840,000, is a huge multi-storied building which began as a science centre and now includes several other subjects. Course work in science ranges from an intensive, full-time program for 40 teachers, which lasts for six months, to five-day short courses given during the summer, to occasional lectures by staff members on scientific topics. The Mathematics Section offers teachers the chance to study curriculum materials (Japanese centres are entirely familiar with the United States and British curriculum projects) and to become actively and creatively involved in workshops. The Director of the Institute estimates that 90 per cent of the teachers in the prefecture come to the centre over the course of a year.

> The overall impression of the Osaka center was that of content and communication. Like the staff members of the other centers whom I met, these men illustrated the positive effect of having content specialists (as opposed to generalists in methodology) on the staff. Their constant input of information in science, mathematics, and linguistics communicated by lectures, workshops and laboratory work and aimed toward the improvement of classroom teaching — this combination of content and structured activity — gives promise of bringing about significant staff development. If the teachers can actually adapt the same kind of learning in their classrooms for their children, then the promise has been met. [Buxton, 1974, p. 20]

Among the centres of Japan there are many differences, and a particular centre has its unique characteristics; nevertheless, several generalizations can be made. Operation of the centres is government supported, focussed on retraining, housed in large buildings, linked to research activities, and run by large staffs. In these and other respects they are markedly different from the centres of the United States and Britain. Although teachers participate on a voluntary basis there is much less of the spontaneous "drop in" involvement of many United States and British centres. There is also less emphasis in Japan on the social atmosphere of the centres.

Rather than using the centres for the creation, development, and dissemination of new curriculum materials as in Britain, the Japanese

Ministry of Education and the prefectures expect the centres to give more stress to in-service training. The relatively limited emphasis placed on the visual arts, crafts, and music in in-service training is a further contrast. Japanese teachers who are engaged in research, whether in the development of scientific apparatus or an analysis of classroom practice or the investigation of phenomena such as the life-cycle of butterflies, are expected to produce reports which may be published or shared in academic conferences. The individual work of British and American teachers is much less structured.

Japanese university professors may occasionally work with centre staffs, but the ties between the centres and the universities and colleges are less close than in Britain or the United States. The size of staff, their academic qualifications, and the length of time they serve (an average of five years) as full-time professionals provide a marked contrast to the heavy emphasis on part-time staff and volunteers in the United States and British centres.

Teacher centres in both Britain and the United States may be supported by local authorities or district school boards, but the control and management of the centres and the nature of their programs are more in the hands of teachers than in Japan, where the centres are more institutionalized and represent a "top down" rather than a "grass roots up" process of development.

Finally, what, if any, are the similarities or universals within the teachers' centre movement of these three countries? Teachers everywhere appear to be searching for help in coping with the new and added demands that are made of them. Whether they have the freedom to develop new courses or have a national curriculum which is handed to them, their anxieties mount and they feel the need of help from both experts and peers. The educational pendulum never comes to rest, and every generation of teachers finds that educational theory is swinging away from or back to the centre. During the last 10 years several pendulums have all been swinging at once, and it is little wonder that teachers are confused. To find some relief from this confusion, as well as down-to-earth, practical help in the work of the classroom, teachers have turned to teachers' centres.

Closely related to the concerns of teachers were national and official developments. The dissatisfaction with teacher education in the United States, ROSLA and the Schools Council curriculums in Britain, the movement to upgrade science teaching in Japan are but three examples of developments that were accompanied by various kinds of official action that encouraged the growth of teachers' centres. The James Report of 1971, followed by the White Paper of 1972 (U.K.), the Marland Plan (U.S.A.), and the Law for the Development of Science Education (Japan) all gave official impetus to the teachers' centre movement. There were, then, both

local and national pressures for a new kind of in-service education for teachers.

The essential need was to link curriculum development (and all that the term implies) with on-the-job training while meeting needs that teachers themselves felt and articulated. Traditional programs of in-service education were all too frequently randomly structured, severely underfinanced, and unrelated to teachers' major concerns. Teachers were, in fact, seldom consulted by universities or local authorities when in-service programs were planned, and even more rarely given released time to attend. Moreover, courses were normally too brief and spasmodic. The teachers' centre movement is the positive response of both teachers and other segments of the education community to correct those shortcomings and provide in-service training more directly related to teachers' problems, within the context of both local and national educational developments.

## NOTE

This paper was presented at the annual conference of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada, Edmonton, Alberta, June 1975. For the section on Japan the author is indebted primarily to Amity Buxton, Director, Teachers' Active Learning Center, San Francisco, California, and H. Dene Webber, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

## REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, S. K. Teachers' centres: A British first. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1971, *53*, 146–9.

Blount, G., & Rolfe, B. *Teachers centres: Selected bibliographies.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972 and 1974.

Buxton, A. P. *Teacher centers in Japan: A report to the Ford Foundation.* New York, 1974. (Mimeographed)

Buxton, A. P.; Bradford, F.; Kofsky, S.; Brown, A.; Burns, M.; & Tsuruta, K. *The teachers' active learning center: An American adaptation of British teachers' centres.* Syracuse University Teacher Center Conference, 1972. (Mimeographed)

Caston, G. The Schools Council in context. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1971, 50–64.

Cave, R. G. *An introduction to curriculum development.* London: Ward Lock, 1971.

*Curriculum development: Teachers' groups and centres.* London: Schools Council, 1967.

Griggs, A. *Teachers' centres: The British model.* Syracuse University Teacher Center Conference, 1972. (Mimeographed)

Hammond, B. *A working paper on education needs and their link to teacher centres.* Brandon, Man.: Brandon University, 1975. (Mimeographed)

Haner, D. *The Park South Teacher Center, 1972–73.* San Francisco, 1973. (Mimeographed)

Houghton, C. Where teachers help teachers. *Teacher*, 1974 (January), *92* (5), 55–57.

Jones, W. A. *Notes on visits to teachers' centres in Britain.* Toronto: Ontario Teachers Federation, 1972. (Mimeographed)

Marriott, M. Little red school house, *Lighthouse* (Halifax, N.S.), 1975, *2* (2), 14–19.

Pelcher, P. S. Teachers' centres: Can they work here? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1973, *54*, 340–343.

Rasmussen, L., & Rasmussen, D. *The Philadelphia Teacher Center.* Syracuse University Teacher Center Conference, 1972. (Mimeographed)

Schmeider, A. A., & Yarger, S. J. *Teaching centers: Toward the state of the scene.* Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Smith, B. O. (Ed.). *Teachers for the real world.* Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.
Taylor, L. D. *Teachers' centres.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1974. (Mimeographed)
Teacher training centers in America. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 1974, *25* (1), 2–51.
*Teachers' centres and the changing curriculum.* London: Schools Council, 1970.
Thornbury, R. E. (Ed.). *Teachers' centres.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973.
Webber, D. *Report of trip to Japan.* London, Ont.: University of Western Ontario, Faculty of Education, 1973. (Mimeographed)
Workshop Center for Open Education. Brochure. New York: City College, n.d.
Yarger, S. J., & Leonard, A. J. A descriptive study of the teacher center movement in American education. Syracuse University, 1974.
Yeomans, E. Why teachers' centers? *Alpha Delta Kappan,* 1974, *4* (2), 2 and 18.