

1981

A study of elementary inservice programs in the state of Iowa

Craig Robert Campbell
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1981 Craig Robert Campbell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Campbell, Craig Robert, "A study of elementary inservice programs in the state of Iowa" (1981). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2141.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2141>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

A study of elementary inservice programs in the state of Iowa

Abstract

The key question now confronting public education in America is how to provide more and better education in the coming decades for the school children of our country. The elementary school plays a vital role in the process of educating students. Elementary teachers, supervisors, and administrators must assume major responsibilities if the elementary school is to meet successfully today's critical challenges. Preparation for teaching elementary students is a process that is never completed. The elementary school exists for the purpose of providing instruction, therefore educators must strive continuously to upgrade instruction to stay relevant. To facilitate this idea within the last decade, inservice programs have been widely used to instruct elementary teachers on the newest and most successful programs in teaching. Their main function has been to help teachers become more effective in their classrooms.

A STUDY OF ELEMENTARY INSERVICE PROGRAMS
IN THE STATE OF IOWA

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Department of School Administration
and Personnel Services
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education

by
Craig Robert Campbell
May 1981

This Research Paper by: Craig Robert Campbell

Entitled: A STUDY OF ELEMENTARY INSERVICE PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE OF IOWA

Has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Norman McCumsey

4/28/81

Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

Norman McCumsey

4/28/81

Date Received

Graduate Faculty Adviser

Donald L. Hanson

April 30, 1981

Date Received

Head, Department of School
Administration and Personnel
Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Significance of the Study.	2
Assumptions.	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Definitions of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA	19
IV. SUMMARY.	25
Summary.	25
Conclusions.	27
Recommendations.	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	29
APPENDIX A	31

Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The key question now confronting public education in America is how to provide more and better education in the coming decades for the school children of our country. The elementary school plays a vital role in the process of educating students.

Elementary teachers, supervisors, and administrators must assume major responsibilities if the elementary school is to meet successfully today's critical challenges. Preparation for teaching elementary students is a process that is never completed. The elementary school exists for the purpose of providing instruction, therefore educators must strive continuously to upgrade instruction to stay relevant. To facilitate this idea within the last decade, inservice programs have been widely used to instruct elementary teachers on the newest and most successful programs in teaching. Their main function has been to help teachers become more effective in their classrooms.

After almost ten years of functioning in most elementary school systems across the state of Iowa, this question remains. Are these programs doing the job they were set out to do? Very little research has been done in the area of elementary inservice programs and evaluation. Most research has been directed towards a total school program. Each segment of a school system, elementary, junior high, and high

school, should be evaluated separately.

Statement of the Problem

The education of an elementary teacher does not end when he receives his Bachelor of Arts degree. Professional growth is essential in the teaching profession as in other professions. This study will seek to determine the various kinds of elementary inservice programs used in the state of Iowa and the degree of importance these programs have on the teachers that participate in them.

Because professional growth in education is important, elementary inservice programs which are stimulating and diversified enough to meet teachers needs are essential. An elementary inservice program developed cooperatively by classroom teachers, local administrators and the superintendent can provide an opportunity for effective professional growth for teachers from which the students, the community, and the classroom teachers can benefit.

Significance of the Study

The total quality of education in elementary schools is strongly influenced by experiences elementary teachers have after entering the profession (9, p. 258.) We live in a land of fluctuating life styles which result in a need for constant personal change and growth. The complicated technology and new knowledge exert pressure on all avenues of teaching and learning. The demands now being made upon schools and people make it impracticable to place full dependence upon preservice preparation and the

initiative of the individual to better himself. Environmental conditions, both social and educational, are changing at an increasingly accelerated rate, so that much of what teach teachers know and do, quickly becomes obsolete. If elementary instructional programs are to continue to be relevant to the needs of the students, elementary teachers must be prepared to make necessary changes.

It is hoped that this study will answer some of the questions that local educators and the community have concerning the successfulness of elementary inservice programs in the state of Iowa. Knowledge is rapidly expanding and experts are continually gaining new insights into the teaching-learning process. The elementary instructional program is by no means a static one. When a person becomes an elementary teacher he accepts not only a responsibility for his own professional improvement, but also for the additional development of the students learning capacity. Providing useful elementary inservice education can be the best available mechanism in the fulfillment of these responsibilities.

Assumptions

This study assumes that the population I will be studying is representative of most elementary teachers in the state of Iowa. This study also assumes that the results will be generalized to most elementary inservice programs in the state of Iowa.

Limitations of the Study

There is almost no limit to the number of programs in which an elementary staff may become involved in a year's time. The limitations of such a study are the lack of time due to heavy teaching loads, poor professional attitude on the part of the teacher, little or no planning, and a shortage of funds for inservice programs. These four often limit the amount and kinds of elementary inservice education made available to a faculty.

It is not the total intention of this paper to be a comprehensive study of the sum and total of elementary inservice opportunities in the state of Iowa, but rather an analysis of representative samplings of programs now being offered in the state of Iowa. Readers of this study should be able to determine the two following objectives which are of importance to this study.

1. An increased awareness of the need for elementary inservice.
2. A knowledge of illustrative approaches and techniques available in implementing a good elementary inservice program.

Definition of Terms

Inservice education - The continuing education of the staff within each school directed towards educational change and the strengthening of professional staff to improve learning by using new models and innovations.

Preservice education - The educational experience of a person before he starts his first teaching assignment.

Workshops - Inservice activities developed throughout the school year. These activities can take place during time periods designated as: preschool, postschool, during the school year and in the summer.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the last decade elementary inservice education has become a widely employed strategy for introducing new ideas, methods, and materials to education in the continuing effort to improve the quality of education in America. It is hard to imagine a single elementary school system in the state of Iowa that doesn't have a commitment to continuing the professional development of its teachers after they get on the job. It is equally hard to imagine an elementary school system of the future that will not have a much greater commitment to vastly improved professional growth programs.

The need for inservice growth has been part of the professional teaching picture from the time of the earliest schools. But it is only in more recent years that compelling forces have high-lighted the necessity for providing teachers with opportunities to increase their knowledge, insight, understanding, and skills in working with young people.

Elementary inservice education encompasses many fields and need not be confined to experiences that provoke only academic growth. Elementary inservice experiences can promote a growing together of a faculty as well as making them more efficient and effective in the classroom. Broadly conceived, inservice education includes all activities

engaged in by professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job (19, p. 465).

Effectively planned and implemented elementary inservice programs must be given more emphasis than ever before. Social, technical, and educational changes are taking place at an increasingly accelerated rate, rendering much that is known obsolete more quickly than before. There is a great need for updating techniques of teaching, more pressure for evaluation processes based on performance skills and increasing public pressure to scrutinize what is being accomplished in the schools.

Much has been written concerning the mistakes made in the past, such as an apparent failure to relate the programs to the genuine needs of the teaching staff and a failure to be careful in selecting the most appropriate kinds of elementary inservice activities for implementing programs.

Tyler states that elementary inservice programs should be based on staff experience, training, nature of the pupil, population, status of curriculum development in the district, and all other factors, thus making elementary inservice education relevant and meaningful (20, pp. 6-7). It is generally agreed that an elementary inservice program involves teacher learning on the job. If this be the case, that teachers recognize the need for continuous learning, then several questions concerning an elementary inservice

program could be formulated.

1. Is inservice training the best method?
2. What are the most effective types of inservice training?
3. Who initiates such training in the school? Teachers, superintendents, supervisors?
4. Who plans them?
5. What part of the planning is done by the teachers themselves?
6. Are the programs offered during the school day, or are they added to the duties of the teachers after the teaching day is over?
7. Are teachers paid extra for the time they have expended, and the new learning they have acquired?
8. Are funds provided by the school board when such training is to be taken at a college or university?

HISTORY OF INSERVICE

A historical review of elementary inservice activities reveals that today's inservice activities are not markedly changed from activities conducted in the early 1900's (20, p. 8). From 1880 until the first world war, the summer courses in the normal schools were strategically the most important agencies of elementary inservice education in America (20, p. 8).

During this period, some educators were influenced to try new ideas in the classroom as a result of the teachings of Dewey, Darwin, Parker, Barke and others (20, p. 9). This was a period of questioning, promotion of new ideas, and recognition of new educational problems.

The inservice education programs of institutes and summer sessions were the chief means for helping teachers to deal with the changes that were proposed.

After the first world war, until twenty years later, elementary inservice programs were not aimed primarily at helping teachers meet new problems but rather at filling gaps in college degree requirements. This had a detrious effect in that teachers came with the purpose of getting certification renewed instead of becoming more competent (20, p. 11).

The second world war, followed by a sharp increase in the birth rate, created conditions in which there was an acute shortage of elementary teachers. Elementary inservice education during this period largely consisted of courses that would enable teachers to fill the gaps in meeting certification requirements (20, p. 12).

However, since 1952, according to a report published that year by the federal security agency, most of the states had some form of inservice education programs in operation in their respective public school systems. From that time many different elementary inservice education programs have been developed for the improvement of knowledge and skills (20, p. 16).

Evidently most major purposes regarding elementary inservice education were well established before 1930. The only new major purpose of elementary inservice education since 1930 is to aid the schools in implementing new

educational programs by helping teachers acquire understanding, skills, and attitudes essential to the roles they are to play in the new programs.

WEAKNESSES OF ELEMENTARY INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Each fall across Iowa, most teachers engage in an activity that has become as widespread an educational ritual in this state as the annual Thanksgiving Day football game. It goes under different names - orientation day, teacher workshop, or whatever - and is often described as part of the inservice training program. Usually there are several things wrong with these autumnal rites, beginning with the lamentable fact that the speaker is uncommonly dull and uninspiring and ending with the fact that in many school systems that is it, so far as inservice training is concerned.

There is perhaps no better summary of the state of elementary inservice education today than the words of Thomas Crammer. "We have left undone those things which we should have done; and we have done those things which we should have left undone; and there is no health in us." Crammer also states that elementary inservice education is clearly suffering as much from the sins of omission as from those of commission. The list of what has been left undone is long and varied, and in the vacuum created by these failures, often trivial and inconsequential program substitutes have flourished (8, p 26).

Many elementary inservice programs are virtually

useless (1, p. 14). In some places elementary inservice education is even ridiculed. Negative attitudes are partly due to poorly planned programs that the schools develop without the real needs of the teachers in mind. The one day preschool sessions or scattered speakers throughout the school year rarely contribute to the overall development of a positive attitude of teachers toward elementary inservice education. Beginning teachers are usually not adequately prepared for their professional responsibilities and experienced teachers have the problem of keeping up with new developments. Elementary teachers need more than sketchy attempts at inservice education.

Doherty contends that a large portion of elementary inservice activities are really tractive in their effects. This is to say that most inservices are against change of most kinds (7, p. 26).

Means contends that much of the confusion and frustration associated with some inservice training practices results from a failure to recognize elementary inservice programs need to seek changes in behavior that lead to more effective teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom in terms of established goals. He further states that there is a need for developing ways to determine whether the changes brought about by inservice activities improve the quality of the instructional programs (14, p. 293).

Roberts lists two major reasons for inservice

failure:

1. They fail to utilize what is known about behavioral change.
2. They appear to be unconcerned with the lack of a positive relationship between the particular activity itself and improvement in the instructional program.

John Bahner sees salary advancement for inservice participation as a negative side effect for elementary inservice. Bahner contends that it is high time we divorce the salary schedule from programs and demolish the assumption that courses taken to qualify for advancement somehow promotes professional growth. It should be acknowledged that relating salary advancement to the accumulation of course credits hasn't contributed very much to professional growth in many cases (2, p. 12).

OTHER MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF ELEMENTARY INSERVICE PROGRAMS

1. Members who do not contribute, who are not interested, or who do not accept responsibility.
2. Poorly planned faculty meetings.
3. Too much repetition.
4. Poor leadership.
5. Lack of pre-planning.
6. Little use of professional material.
7. Inadequate preparation.
8. People dominating the group.
9. Lack of consultant services.
10. Not enough time to pursue a problem to its conclusion.

11. Lack of opportunity to visit other schools.
12. Too large of a faculty.
13. Extra hours for teachers, but no compensation.
14. Frequent interruptions of previously announced plans.
15. Kindergarten through twelfth grade programs do not benefit the elementary teacher, most programs are directed towards the high school level.

COMPONENTS OF GOOD ELEMENTARY INSERVICE PROGRAMS

The best unit of organization of elementary inservice education for most problems appears to be the individual school faculty (15). Elementary inservice programs need to be organized by recognizing the kinds of principles of learning that are also appropriate to classroom practices. One such principle of learning is that a person grows in insights and skills as he works on problems of genuine concern. This means that those who participate in the experience should be involved with identifying the problems on which work is to be done, having the opportunity to share in the planning, and taking part in determining the success of their efforts. The system must involve all personnel in the setting up of activities to meet their needs.

Inservice education for elementary teachers requires careful planning and a great deal of action and effort on the part of the entire school staff. This is an utmost responsibility and the school can neither shirk the

duty of inservice education nor delegate all the authority to just a few people.

Darlington contends that the following proposals are inherent in good inservice programs (5).

1. Schools and school systems should provide alternative and even rival systems of inservice education.
2. Stimulation of inservice education should be centralized but the means and methods decentralized.
3. Significant models of teacher growth should be publicized.
4. Adequate time for inservice should be provided. Carefully planned programs must be built around the summer months, sabbaticals, and other released time arrangements.
5. Schools should overhire by ten percent and at any one time have ten percent of the faculty pursue agreed upon professional growth activities.
6. Schools should encourage variety in workshops and study groups.
7. Outside assessment teams should be brought into the school district. These teams would act as objective inquirers to provide an independent analysis of the needs of the system.

Most elementary teachers would agree that the improvement of elementary inservice education as a facet of supervision is one of the most significant professional challenges in education today. Those responsible for supervision must help to stimulate teachers to constant growth.

Elementary principals must begin to recognize that preservice training is not enough to appropriately prepare

the teacher for many aspects of his role that can only be internalized after he has accepted a teaching assignment. Preservice education is only an introduction to the task and the true practice awaits placement in an actual position. Continuous inservice education should come with the acceptance of a teaching position. In a sense, the inservice program is the best available mechanism for the realization of continuous growth which is so much demanded by the nature of the teaching role itself.

The following set of principles seem to be characteristic of good elementary inservice programs:

1. An atmosphere of growth and change has been established.
2. A library of professional books, periodicals, teaching guides and other professional publications should be available.
3. A program of meaningful and thorough orientation for new teachers is maintained.
4. Elementary inservice meetings are scheduled with a minimum of conflicts to accomodate the faculty and others.
5. Aid from all the faculty is sought in the planning of inservice programs.
6. Observation and visitations are arranged upon suggestion or request of teachers, when possible.
7. Inservice programs are made a continual and integral part of the school system.
8. Programs for inservice education are conducted to meet the needs and interests of teachers.
9. Inservice education is viewed as a project of the entire staff.

Opportunities for elementary inservice have been increasing throughout the country in the last decade but the same kinds of experiences, discussion topics, and results have been reported. Educators should then expect to find clear evidence that such programs are having a positive effect on improving education and are an effective method for bringing about change in teacher behavior. To the contrary though, educators know very little about the results of elementary inservice training. Evaluation of most inservice programs is limited to some measure of skill attainment or attitudinal response of the participants at the close of the program. Participants are typically asked to assess the program in terms of whether it was helpful, relevant, well organized, and worthwhile. This method of collecting data imposes some serious limitations on the meaning of the evaluations (9, p. 258).

The real value of inservice education lies in the extent to which these programs achieve their objectives. Teachers must feel intrinsically satisfied with their efforts to improve. If not, then teachers are either victims of misguided efforts, or they have shared in the planning for elementary inservice activities and are anxious to re-examine their purposes and outcomes. This kind of evaluation leads to higher levels of growth and as a result the inquiry as to strength and weaknesses of the program leads to improvement.

Ann Adams states five guides which should be used

in planning evaluation procedures for elementary inservice education (1, p. 14).

1. Evaluation is planned and applied in the light of specific purposes.
2. Evaluation is an integral part of any inservice activity.
3. Evaluation that is comprehensive employs a variety of devices and techniques.
4. Evaluation is based on evidence gathered through meaningful, quantitative indices.
5. Evaluation is concerned with means as well as ends.

Elementary teachers must keep up with a changing world. This requires a keen sensitivity in deciding what areas need improvement. In the last several years the elementary curriculum has been undergoing a constant change because many well informed elementary teachers aid in bringing about this change.

Bahner poses the challenge to inservice education when he describes the type of elementary teacher needed in the future (2, p. 12). He calls for teachers to be different kinds of human beings, for new attitudes more than new skills, for new assumptions more than for new knowledge. He also states teachers who are able to do a good deal more than take refuge in telling students something and able at the same time to do a good deal more than merely providing a comfortable classroom are meeting this challenge.

It seems clear that such a change cannot be satisfactorily met unless good quality elementary inservice

programs are used in the elementary schools of the future.

Chapter III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

A total of forty questionnaires (see appendix) were distributed to elementary teachers in Area Six. Of this total, thirty-two questionnaires were completed and returned for a response of eighty percent.

The data was analyzed by tallying the responses on questions 1-13 which required circling the most appropriate number, one being least important and five being most important. Questions 14-17 were of the open ended type which required short phrase answers. The feelings voiced towards these questions were compared in all thirty-two responses.

SURVEY RESULTS

1. When asked to what extent does an elementary teacher have in determining what inservice education is to be used in your school, the following results were given.

Sixty percent of the responding teachers felt they had little voice in determining what inservice programs were offered at their schools. Thirty percent of the teachers felt they had a voice in determining inservice policy. The remaining ten percent felt they had an adequate voice in inservice programs.

2. When asked to what degree have elementary inservice education programs stimulated you as a teacher,

many answers were given.

Thirty-five percent of the teachers questioned felt that inservice programs have not stimulated them as a teacher. Fifteen percent of the teachers felt that their inservice programs had stimulated them. The majority or fifty percent of the teachers questioned had no strong feelings either way.

3. When asked to what degree does your inservice programs offer more alternatives than workshops for inservice education, the following results were given.

Fifty-five percent of the teachers responding felt their inservice programs offered no major alternatives to workshops. Twenty percent of the people said their schools offered different programs compared to basic workshops. The remaining twenty-five percent had no strong feelings in this area.

4. When asked to what degree does elementary teachers learn from colleagues in the same school or district, many fine answers were given.

Thirty-five percent of the teachers surveyed said their inservice programs did not continue after the initial preservice at the beginning of the school year. Forty-five percent responded by saying that their programs did continue throughout the school year. The remaining twenty-five percent felt their programs uses a mixture of the two.

5. When asked to what degree does your elementary inservice education program continue throughout the school

year, the following results were given.

Thirty-five percent of the responses I received reported they did learn new ideas from colleagues in the same school or district. Twenty-five percent of the teachers felt they learned little from other colleagues. The remaining forty-five percent of the teachers had no strong feelings toward this question.

6. When asked have elementary inservice programs motivated you to spend more time in preparing and providing for individual differences in your classroom, the following results were given.

Twenty-five percent of the teachers reporting felt that elementary inservice programs motivated them to spend more time in preparing for individual differences in the classroom. Forty-five percent of the teachers felt little motivation towards these programs. The remaining thirty percent had no strong feelings towards the question.

7. When asked to what extent does your principal view inservice education as an imperative, the following answers were given.

Thirty percent of the teachers surveyed said that inservice education was imperative to their principal. Sixty percent of the responses indicated that inservice education was not imperative to their principal. The remaining ten percent had no strong feelings either way.

8. When asked do your administrators participate in elementary inservice sessions, the following answers

were given.

Thirty percent of the teachers reported that their principal did participate in elementary inservice sessions. A majority or fifty-five percent of the responses said that their principal did not participate in the inservices. The remaining fifteen percent had no strong feelings on the subject.

9. When asked to what degree does your community understand and support the need for elementary inservice education, the following results were given.

Forty-five percent of the teachers said that their community does support the need for inservice education. Twenty-five percent of the responses said their community did not see the need for elementary inservices. The remaining thirty percent had no strong feelings toward the question.

10. When asked are resources of nearby higher education institutions utilized in planning elementary inservice programs, the following answers were given.

Forty-five percent of the responses felt that higher education institutions are being used to plan elementary inservice programs. Twenty-five percent of the teachers reported that higher education institutions are not being used. The remaining thirty percent had no strong feelings towards this question.

11. When asked to what degree is elementary inservice education intrinsically satisfying to you, the

following answers were given.

Forty-five percent of the teachers surveyed agreed that inservice education was satisfying to them. Twenty percent of the teachers said that nothing worth while came out of their elementary inservice programs. Thirty-five percent of those surveyed had no strong feelings on the subject.

12. When asked to what degree are inservice programs directed towards the junior and senior high teachers, many fine answers were given.

Twenty percent of the participants surveyed agreed that their inservice programs were directed towards the junior and senior high level. Thirty-five percent of the teachers concurred that their inservice programs were more directed towards the elementary area. Forty-five percent of the teachers said that their inservice programs were directed towards all levels of the school district.

13. When asked to what degree do staff members visit schools and teachers outside your district, the following answers were given.

Eighty-five percent of the teachers surveyed said that most staff members visit schools outside their district. Five percent of the teachers said that they rarely visit other school situations. Ten percent of the participants had no strong feelings toward this question.

14. When the teachers were asked what are the most beneficial techniques used for the implementing of their

elementary inservice programs many fine answers were given. The technique that seemed to be used the most was a guest speaker. Other answers given were workshops, films, conferences with teachers in your grade level, and bulletins from the local A.E.A.

15. When asked what topics in their elementary inservice programs would they like to see dealt with in the near future, the participants had many different ideas. Some of the areas of concern were individualized learning, positive teaching approaches, writing skills, vertical coordination, time management, stress, gifted and talented, and relationships with other teachers.

16. When the teachers were asked to comment on any outstanding elementary inservice programs that they had attended in the last two years, many interesting answers were given. C.P.R. training was mentioned by a lot of the teachers as a valuable inservice program. Other worthwhile programs mentioned were career education, area 6 workshops, computers, and math metrics. A few teachers mentioned that they had never attended an inservice that was the least bit outstanding.

17. Question 17 inquired if any of the participants had attended any inservices within the last two years that were a waste of time. Most agreed that two areas were really an eyesore when it came to inservices. These two areas were human relations and drug education. Other bad inservices mentioned were films, testing scores, outdoor education and local speakers.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY

Summary

This study examined the various kinds of elementary inservice programs used in the state of Iowa and the degree of importance these programs had on the teachers that participated in them.

A total of forty questionnaires were distributed at random to elementary teachers in area six, in the state of Iowa. The purpose of the questions were to determine what types of elementary inservice programs are being offered in area six schools and what effect if any they were having on the elementary teachers.

The questions in the survey dealt with many facets of elementary inservice education. The first few questions dealt with the amount of time spent on elementary inservice education in the various schools. The results from these questions showed that most schools follow the same pattern in implementing their programs. Usually in the fall there is a two or three day pre-service workshop followed by occasional inservice days held throughout the school year.

Another area of questions dealt with the principal's role in implementing elementary inservice programs. It was found that few principals really get involved when it comes to setting up and running the yearly programs. Too

many principals seemed to view elementary inservice education as a responsibility for only the classroom teacher.

Many questions in the survey asked the teacher how their elementary inservice program had affected them as a teacher. It was found that if their particular school had a good inservice program, then as a teacher they were very motivated to set new goals and try new ideas in their classroom. On the other hand, if their inservice programs were poor, little motivation was seen from the teacher.

In an other area of questions, it was asked if the elementary teachers' inservice programs were directed towards the elementary level or more towards the senior high level. The results from these questions revealed that most of the teachers surveyed felt their inservice programs were geared towards the senior high level.

When the teachers were asked a set of questions on any outstanding elementary inservice programs that they had attended in the last two years, many beneficial answers were given. C.P.R. training was mentioned by a lot of the teachers as a valuable inservice program. Other worthwhile programs mentioned were career ed, area six workshops, computers, and metrics.

Another set of questions in the survey inquired if any of the participants had attended any inservices within the last year that were a waste of time. Most

agreed that two areas were really inadequate when it came to inservices. These two areas were human relations and drug education. Other bad inservices mentioned were films, testing scores, outdoor ed, and local speakers.

The final set of questions asked the participant what type of elementary inservice programs would they like to see dealt with in the near future. Some of the areas of concern were individualized learning, teaching approaches, writing skills, vertical coordination, stress, gifted and talented and relationships with other teachers. So it seems that teachers are eager to learn new ideas in inservice programs if they are given the opportunity to do so.

Conclusions

The results of this study showed that a majority of teachers in area six are disenchanted with their present elementary inservice programs. The teachers surveyed agreed that their present inservice programs are not fulfilling their needs as an elementary teacher.

After reviewing the survey it seems that there are two major reasons why elementary inservice programs are not working in area six. The first reason is that little teacher input is considered when planning elementary inservice programs. In most instances only a minority of the teaching staff make the decisions on what programs are presented.

Another reason for the disenchantment for elementary inservice programs are that most programs are geared for the

junior and senior high level. Many of the teachers complained that their inservices only benefit the teachers who teach students in the upper levels of education. Unless a lot of changes are made in these two areas, I feel that teacher dissatisfaction will continue at the present rate that it is today.

Recommendations

In light of the evidence presented in this study, school officials need to become increasingly aware of the problems that plague our elementary inservice programs. Teachers and administrators must develop inservice programs that will be beneficial to all of the school staff, not just a small minority.

Inservice planners need to become aware of the good elementary programs that are available in their immediate area. To make it possible for inservice planners to effectively aid their school staff, better communication between schools should be used to locate the best available programs in the school's area.

Further investigation of this topic should include a survey of teachers' opinions on elementary inservices outside the boundaries of area six. Inservice programs could vary between areas of the state, and such a survey would reveal such differences. Also a survey of principals across the state of Iowa could be beneficial in providing new ideas for elementary inservice programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Anne H. "Structure and Content of In-Service Programs," Education, (November, 1971) 92:13-16.
2. Bahner, John M. "Continuing Education," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, (September, 1974), 11-14.
3. Bishop, L.J., "In-Service Education: Balance and Thrust", Educational Leadership, 25:10-11, October, 1967.
4. Chesin, G.A., "Pragmatic Philosophy in Relation to In-Service Education," Peabody Journal of Education, 44:350-2, May, 1967.
5. Darlington, Merideth Whitta and Rose Arlene Skudler In-Service Education of Elementary Teachers, Lincoln, Nebraska: D.S. Wayne Company, 1945.
6. Dionne, J.L. "To Encourage Teacher Growth", Educational Leadership, 24:264-7, December, 1966.
7. Doherty, Victor "Continuity of Pre-Service and In-Service Education." NEA Journal (May, 1968) 57:26-27.
8. Drew, George M., and N. Madore "In-Service Education", Illinois Education, 51:160-161 (April, 1971).
9. Harris, Ben M. "Inservice Growth--The Essential Requirement", Educational Leadership, Vol. 24 (December, 1966), pp. 257-260.
10. Harris, Ben M. and Wailand Bessent and Denneth E. McIntyre, In-Service Education, A Guide to Better Practice, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey (1969).
11. Henry, Nelson B. (ed) In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1957).
12. Hill, T.B. "Put Sparkle and Zing into Your In-Service Training Program," Texas Outline, 49:32-3, (September, 1965).
13. Mauth, Lesli J. "Psychology and the In-Service Education Program," The National Elementary School Principal, XLI, (February, 1962) 12-16.

14. Means, Don "Evaluation of In-Service Programs," Education (February, 1973) 93:292-94.
15. Moffit, John Clifton In-Service Education for Teachers, Washington: Center for Applied Research, (1963).
16. Roberts, J.D. "Hard Look at Quality in In-Service Education," National Elementary Principal, 44:15-21 (September, 1964).
17. Rubin, Louis Improving In-Service Education; Proposals and Procedures for Change, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, (1971).
18. Shannon, Robert "A Style for In-Service Education," The National Elementary Principal (February, 1969) 48:24-27.
19. Taba, H. "Techniques of In-Service Training", Social Education, 29:464-76, (November, 1965).
20. Tyler, Ralph W., In-Service Education of Teachers, ed. by Rubin, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, (1971) pp. 5-17.

APPENDIX A

Dear Fellow Educator,

I am writing you because of my interest in your elementary in-service programs. Let me introduce myself. My name is Craig Campbell and I'm presently a sixth grade teacher in the Iowa Falls school system. For the completion of my Masters Degree from the University of Northern Iowa, I'm currently writing a research paper on elementary in-service programs in the state of Iowa.

As part of this research paper, I'm conducting a written survey to be sent to elementary teachers in Area 6. It is my hope that from this survey I will be able to learn what in-service programs are being offered in your local school district. I am also interested in your opinion of how these in-service programs can benefit you as a teacher.

I would appreciate if you would take the time to fill out the survey that accompanies this cover letter. This survey will be confidential and you need not identify yourself or your school as this information is impertinent to the results of the survey. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
in-service education program activities
throughout the school year

Craig R. Campbell

Have elementary in-service programs been
you to spend more time in preparing
plans for individual differences
classroom

The following survey is divided into two parts. Part one of the survey includes questions 1-13. After reading these questions you will respond by circling the number of your choice that follows the question. The numbers will represent one being least important and five being most important.

Part two of the survey includes questions 14-17. These questions are short answer in nature and will allow you to express your concerns on the value of elementary in-service programs.

Survey items:

1. To what extent do you as elementary teachers have a voice in determining what in-service education is to be?
1 2 3 4 5
2. To what degree have elementary in-service education programs stimulated you as a teacher to re-evaluate your goals?
1 2 3 4 5
3. To what degree does your in-service program offer more alternatives than workshops for in-service education?
1 2 3 4 5
4. To what degree do elementary teachers learn from colleagues in the same school or district?
1 2 3 4 5
5. To what degree does your elementary in-service education program continue throughout the school year?
1 2 3 4 5
6. Have elementary in-service programs motivated you to spend more time in preparing and providing for individual differences in your classroom?
1 2 3 4 5

7. To what extent does your principal view in-service education as an imperative?
1 2 3 4 5
8. Do your administrators participate in elementary in-service sessions regarding new curriculums, teaching methodology, and materials of instruction?
1 2 3 4 5
9. To what degree does your community understand and support the need for elementary education days during the school year?
1 2 3 4 5
10. Are resources of nearby higher education institutions utilized in planning and implementing elementary in-service programs?
1 2 3 4 5
11. To what degree is elementary in-service education intrinsically satisfying to participants?
1 2 3 4 5
12. To what degree are in-service programs directed towards the junior high and senior high teachers?
1 2 3 4 5
13. To what degree do staff members visit schools and teachers outside your district?
1 2 3 4 5
14. What do you feel is/are the most beneficial technique/techniques for the implementing of elementary in-service programs at your school? (Speakers, meetings, bulletins, and professional libraries would be a few examples of techniques sometimes used.)
15. What topics in your elementary in-service program would you like to see dealt with in the near future?
16. List any outstanding elementary in-service programs that you have attended

in the last two years. (If so, please describe.)

17. List any elementary in-service programs that you have attended in the last two years that were a waste of time. (If so, please describe.)

Please use the back of this sheet for more comments that would give a more complete evaluation of your elementary in-service program.