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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The success of our educational system today depends upon many factors, including recruitment of quality individuals into the profession, good preservice training, and the provision of adequate funds to support research, programs, facilities, and salaries. Teacher Inservice Education (TISE) is crucial because knowledge, society, and teachers are all subject to continuous change. "Teachers can not be prepared in one, two, three, or four years (Lord James 1972, p. 107)."

Before the advent of the money-crunch, declining enrollments, and staff reduction improving the quality of instruction could be accomplished largely by hiring more qualified teachers. The environment in which today's principal finds himself is vastly different. Negotiated contracts, the Fair Dismissal Law and the increased power exerted by teacher unions have greatly complicated the principal's job as the educational leader in his school. Teachers are not the transient group that they used to be in the 1960's and into the 70's. The result of this change is a greater incidence of teachers who remain at the same job over a longer period of time.
"Teacher burnout" is a frequently referred to phenomenon today. This has placed an even greater emphasis on inservice as the way to improve, update, and motivate today's educator.

Teacher unions, namely National Education Association/Iowa State Education Association (NEA/ISEA), are seeking to exert more influence on education. On the national as well as the state level, various committees have been formed to develop and implement various programs from this perspective. The national and state Instruction and Professional Development (IPD) Committee receives thousands of dollars each year to impact on inservice. Each local association has an IPD committee with its objective to influence the local school's TISE program. With all of the apparent controversy and the widespread discontent of teachers toward TISE, more research is needed to conceptualize clearly the various issues emerging in today's educational setting.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to identify the opinions toward TISE in its present form of Northeast Iowa Instruction and Professional Development Committee (IPD) chairpersons and High School Principals. The data was collected and compared in an effort to determine areas of agreement and disagreement concerning TISE. The purpose of the study was to identify,
categorize and compare inservice education preferences.

Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How important is TISE to the total education program?
2. How should the successful TISE program be organized within the school?
3. Who should determine the content of an inservice program?
4. What should the objectives be of an inservice program?
5. What type of inservice delivery system is preferred?
6. When should inservice take place?
7. Are districts budgeting enough money for TISE?
8. What are the roles of the principal and the IPD Chairperson in regard to inservice and what should their roles be?
9. What are the future trends in TISE?

Importance of the Study

In a statement before the United States Subcommittee on Education, former Deputy Commissioner of Education Donald Davies painted a rather pathetic picture of TISE. "Inservice teacher training is the slum of
America's Education--disadvantaged, poverty stricken, neglected, psychologically isolated, whittled with exploitation, broken promises and conflict (Davies, Note 1)." The situation may have improved somewhat since 1967, but many authorities believe the statement applies equally well today. (Valsame, 1977; Howsam, 1976).

A successful TISE program depends upon a clear understanding of the relationship between the principal and the IPD chairperson. The accountability movement and the teacher's quest for more autonomy add a sense of urgency to a study of this nature.

The IPD chairperson is the local education association's key person regarding instruction and professional development. An understanding of this role and its relationship to a TISE program is important from the standpoint of the principal's job security. Ultimately, at stake, is the quality education that young people need today. The welfare of our children depends upon the continual improvement in the methods and techniques of teachers. The principal's ultimate success is dependent upon the ability to understand and deal with the teachers he or she is expected to lead. This leadership can be made more effective by mutual understanding of the goals and objectives of the TISE in each district.
Assumptions

1. TISE is of vital importance for the improvement, updating and motivation of teachers.
2. Instructional leadership in the school is the responsibility of the principal.
3. Teacher unions are seeking to exert more influence in TISE.
4. The IPD chairperson is the local association leader in the area of TISE and has a special interest and knowledge of the TISE program in his or her school.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study were obtained from thirty-eight schools located within Northeast Iowa. The size of the school districts was limited to between 150 and 1,500 students.

Since the study was limited to Northeast Iowa, no attempt was made to relate or compare the findings to programs outside of Iowa.

The study was further limited by the percentage of respondents. A respondent percentage between ninety and one hundred percent was desirable; however, a percentage between seventy and eighty was considered adequate in this study.
The findings were further limited by the ability of the survey instrument to collect the appropriate data to make valid conclusions possible.

Definition of Terms

Inservice. Inservice usually refers to the activities initiated by schools to update, improve, or motivate teachers.

Professional Development. Professional Development is usually used by teachers to refer to the total experiences of a teacher's continuing education.

Staff Development. Staff Development is usually used by administrators to refer to the improvement, updating, and the motivation of teachers which is initiated by the school.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In conducting a review of the literature it became immediately apparent that Teacher Inservice Education (TISE) is fraught with limitless variations and confusion. The number of writings, articles, books, reports, and papers are voluminous. A computer search of the topic, had it been fully carried out, would have yielded over one thousand citations. The great majority of those documents, however, dealt subjectively with the topic. The literature was full of generality and personal opinion. Much of what was found reflected a patchwork approach to the subject of inservice.

The confusion began with the definition of inservice and its synonyms, which include staff development, professional development, teacher training, personnel development and others too numerous to mention. It depended upon the viewpoint as to which definition was preferred. For example, a teacher might prefer professional development, whereas an administrator might use staff development. The term "staff" seems to be less threatening to administrators than "professional" when referring to teachers. The literature was replete with such problems.

The various definitions in the literature can be grouped into two categories. One category includes everything a teacher does that contributes to the
teacher's continuing education (Hass, 1957; Edelfelt & Johnson, 1975; James Report, 1972; Arend, Harsh, Turner, 1977) and the other is restrictive referring only to activities which school districts conduct in order to train teachers whom they employ in the particular mode of education which they choose to use (Howsam, 1976).

Even though the definition of TISE was not always clear, the fact that TISE is important and is, in fact, becoming increasingly more important was abundantly clear (Moffit, 1963; Rubin, 1978; Lortie, 1974; Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Franklin, Nickens, Appleby, 1980). "Teachers can not be prepared in one, two, three or four years (Lord James, 1972, p. 107)." Knowledge, society and teachers are all subject to continuous change.

Today's educational climate differs markedly from that prior to the 1950's and 1960's. According to Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) and McLaughlin and Berman (1977), teachers were long conditioned to prescription and direction without question until they realized that it was not based on competence and understanding superior to their own. The assumption was that teachers were technicians rather than professionals. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) pointed out that most textbooks, teacher guides, published curriculums and inservice materials have been traditionally written by other than school personnel. In the past two decades the Association for Supervision and Curriculum
Development and the National Education Association have had some success in changing that pattern. The general trend toward teachers exerting more influence on inservice was apparent throughout much of the literature.

The teacher center movement, which started in England and spread to the United States, is evidence to support the trend. Much has been written about teacher centers; however, the literature consists of essays and opinions, primarily reports about individual projects (Devaney, 1977; Burrell, 1976; Devaney & Thorn, 1975; Feiman, 1978). The success of the Teacher Center movement appears to be somewhat uncertain, although in theory the idea has widespread support.

The only teacher center in Iowa is located in Waterloo. Even though it has received good reviews from teachers, its future is in doubt because federal spending to education is currently being cut. Other teacher centers across the country are facing a similar uncertain future.

Burrell (1976) pointed out that teachers' views of inservice are very practically based. He wrote that activities run by teachers tend to be of short duration and primarily a recounting of successes and that it is difficult to get teachers beyond that point. He also pointed to the dollar crunch and the fact that adequate time during salaried hours for teacher participation is short (Cichon, Schaffer, and Scheinfeld, Note 2).
There was a lack of hard research, and what does exist does not seem very useful. The theoretical aspect clearly dominates the literature. Rubin (1978) offered the best theoretical background on TISE. He compiled a series of essays by prominent educators. The National Council of States publication *Issues in Inservice Education*, which resulted from a conference in 1976, was also useful, although from a conceptual and theoretical viewpoint only.

There were several significant reviews of TISE conducted in the 1960's and 70's. The first was a report published by NEA (1966). It identified the issues primarily from the teacher's point of view but failed to pin down the solutions, which is typical of later inservice reviews.

Westby-Gibson (1967) of the Far West Laboratory, in her review, included current psychological and sociological research applicable to TISE and a survey of innovations in inservice itself. It seemed to be quite relevant even today. She covered the social setting and structure of the school, the interaction between teacher and school, and the process of change.

Lawrence (1974) examined ninety-seven studies. The message of his findings was that inservice programs which have the best chance of being effective are those that involve teachers in planning and managing their own professional development activities.
Lawrence's study of successful TISE programs identified seven characteristics that seem to reflect the trends in the rest of the literature. He pointed out that successful programs seem to have more of the following attributes than less successful ones.

1. Individualized programs are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that have the same activities for all participants.

2. Programs in which teachers take an active role are more likely to be successful than those in which teachers take a passive or receptive role.

3. Programs based on a demonstration of materials or technique combined with a supervised trial followed by some form of feedback are more likely to be successful than those in which information is learned and stored for future application.

4. Programs in which teachers provide mutual assistance are more likely to be successful than those in which teachers work entirely on their own.

5. Programs occurring as part of an overall staff development plan or general effort of the school are more likely
to be successful than one-shot efforts.

6. Programs of emergent design, in which teachers themselves choose at least some of the goals and activities, are more likely to be successful than programs which are entirely preplanned.

7. Programs which are self-initiated and self-designed tend to have a high rate of success.

Research has shown that programs which start from the assumption that teachers are competent professionals who want to improve and are capable of planning and carrying out their own professional growth may have more enduring effects (Devaney, 1977; Feiman, 1978). This is the "Bottom-up Approach" which assumes teachers to be technicians rather than professionals. Until recently TISE was centrally planned, mandated instructional improvement, designed to fill gaps in skills and knowledge (McLaughlin and Berman, 1977; Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975).

The development of the role of the teacher-researcher was referred to in some of the recent literature (Lortie, 1974; Pine, 1979; McKenna, 1978). Pine described schools as "research goldmines". This sounds wonderful in theory, but in reality, because of time constraints and the average teacher's knowledge of research, the practicability of widespread application of this idea
seems unlikely.

Much appeared in the recent literature about the idea of collaboration. The trend, i.e., collective bargaining, in recent years has brought an increase in teacher power and as a result a decrease in management's power. Collaboration, or sharing of responsibility for TISE, is being referred to more and more (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975; Breckenridge, 1976; Miller, Note 3; Andersen, Note 4; Joyce, 1976; Allen, 1978). The accountability movement in education possibly has been a unifying force to encourage cooperation among the various parties involved in TISE, including teachers, administrators, state agencies, and institutions of higher education. If any one group has gained more influence than the other, it would be the teachers (Joyce, 1976). Joyce found TISE was viewed by educators as a responsibility of teachers or teachers in cooperation with other groups, although in practice TISE is mostly out of the teacher's control.

Undoubtedly the most comprehensive study done in the area of TISE was the Inservice Teacher Education Project sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Teacher Corps and coordinated by Bruce Joyce and Lucy Peck. The study involved interviewing of over 1,000 educators about their perceptions about TISE with the objective of clarifying the existing status of TISE. It pointed to questions on which information is needed, and identified issues which may require further
observation and analysis by educators and researchers.

The study involved a huge expenditure of time, money and manpower. It seemed to accomplish its purpose, but it certainly has not lessened the confusion or established any breakthroughs in TISE.

Several lesser studies deserve mention. There was a significant difference between the teachers' needs and the principals' perceptions of the teachers' needs (Green, Note 5; Cane, 1969; Schurr, Note 6; Johnston and Yeakey, 1977; Lehr, 1979). These studies all pointed to the need for improved communication and increased teacher participation in the planning of TISE. A collaborative effort with teachers in addressing and identifying mutually agreed upon priorities, needs, and weaknesses was recommended (Johnston and Yeakey, 1977). Inservice effectiveness depends a great deal on teachers' support, and their support is greatly enhanced when they are included in the planning. The problem is to attend to teachers' individual needs "Bottom-up Approach", which Schurr found to vary according to grade level and subject assignment, while meeting the "top-down" goals that concern administrators (Watt, Note 7).

It appeared that no clear-cut solutions exist as to a specific methodology for curing TISE to everyone's satisfaction. There is a definite need for more research, though progress has been made in identifying the areas where research is needed.
The Commission on Schools of the North Central Association (NCA) asked principals to rank in order of priority four role functions: educational leadership, general administration, management and crisis, and conflict resolution (Lozeau, 1977). They ranked educational leadership as number one. This was supported in other research (Franklin, Nickens, and Appleby, 1980). It seemed ironical that less is clearly understood about the first responsibility than any of the others.

Rubin perhaps summed up the complexity of the issues best when he stated:

"What we most need, in the immediate future, is a rationale that accommodates the political differences that exist; preserves the teacher's autonomy in self-directed improvement; incorporates activities directly related to major educational inadequacies; provides for progressive enhancement of technical mastery; permits sharing of local-state-federal support; generates more dollars for inservice activities; and of greatest significance demonstrates tangible benefits. Whether we strive for more money, or attempt to make do with less, the new programs will be closely monitored by observers who will make judgements as to their worth. (Rubin 1978, p. 15)."
Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Sources of Data

The subjects in this descriptive study were the High School Principals and IPD Chairpersons of thirty-eight schools in Northeast Iowa. These schools make up the Northeast Iowa Education unit which includes ten counties in Northeast Iowa.

These subjects were selected because of their geographic location and because the role of the principal and IPD Chairperson are of special interest to the researcher who lives in Northeast Iowa.

Procedures

A letter explaining the purpose of the study and the survey instrument was sent to each subject to collect the data for this study. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included. A postcard reminder was sent to those who did not return the survey by July 10, 1982.

The survey data information was received on a strictly confidential basis. The results of the study were made available to those respondents who requested it at no cost to them.

Methods of Gathering Data

The most logical way to gather data on TISE is to actually ask those individuals in key positions to know
about inservice in their respective school systems. They were asked to respond to a questionnaire dealing with the relevant issues referred to in Chapter One.

**Description of the Data**

The data from the questionnaire were reported as a number and percentage response to a particular item. The Likert scaling technique was used to analyze the data.

Each response was assigned a value, which was compared with the opinion of the question. From the respondents a total score for each statement was compiled, and they were analyzed and reported numerically as to the respondent's agreement or disagreement with the statements.

Respondents were asked to rank various items pertaining to TISE. Comparisons were drawn between principals and IPD chairpersons based on their preferences.

Individual comments of respondents were used to add a more personal perspective to the data. Information about individual districts and other relevant, but difficult-to-obtain, information was gathered this way.
The TISE survey was mailed to 76 educators, with 58 responding, for a 76 percent return. The number of respondents was fairly equally divided, including 28 IPD chairpersons and 30 principals. Prior to comparing the responses and analyzing the data of the respondents, some important observations were made concerning their backgrounds. This study dealt with facts and individual views that were combined to form a collective opinion.

The survey data was compiled on a master sheet to find average responses to each item as well as the number of similar responses. The following analysis reflects the pertinent data drawn from the survey.
### DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

#### Table 1
**Years of Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 58**

#### Table 2
**Job Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Assignment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High &amp; H.S.</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 58**
The demographic profile, (Table 1), revealed some important information. For the most part, the respondents appeared to be veteran teachers having an average of 15 years teaching experience with 12 years in their current school districts. Only two teacher respondents had less than five years of teaching experience. This abundance of experience enhanced the respondent's credibility.

The IPD Chairpersons (Table 2) were equally distributed among primary, intermediate, junior high and high school, though the largest percentage, 30 percent, taught at the high school level. IPD Chairpersons are predominately academically oriented as there were no IPD respondents working primarily in the areas of music, art, industrial arts, home economics, and vocational agriculture. One respondent, however, taught in the area of physical education.

The high school principals (Table 1) on the other hand, had an average of 21 total years of experience, which was more than the IPD people, but the number of years in the current district (12) was the same in both cases. About half of the principals (Table 2) were responsible for grades 7-12 or 10-12. Virtually all of the principals checked teacher inservice as part of their employment assignment. Another interesting finding was that 27 percent indicated that they were involved in classroom teaching along with their other administrative duties. Principals are definitely widely involved in all aspects
of school operation. A question arises that is a subject for further research. Do principals have adequate time to deal with teacher inservice when there are so many things that demand their attention?

It was assumed that teacher inservice is regarded with some importance to the total education program, since it existed to some degree in virtually all school districts. The question of how really important is TISE was a difficult question to investigate.

On the surface TISE would seem to be very important. When asked to respond to the statement, "TISE is necessary for quality education," all but two respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and both of those were principals. However, when asked to respond to the statement, "At my school TISE is regarded as very important," only 27 percent of the IPD Chairpersons agreed or strongly agreed. The rest were undecided or in disagreement. On the other hand, 66 percent of the principals indicated they were in agreement with the statement. It appears that the principals generally regard TISE as very important, but the IPD people often have the opposite perception.

The response to the statement, "More emphasis should be placed on TISE by Administrators," further illustrated this discrepancy. Sixty-five percent of the IPD people agreed or strongly agreed with the statement,
but of the principals 46 percent felt that more emphasis should be placed on TISE.

The implications for principals were quite obvious. Even though they felt TISE was very important, they had not done enough to demonstrate to the teachers that indeed TISE is very important at their school.

Lawrence (1974) concluded that inservice programs that have the best chance of being effective are those that involve teachers in planning and managing their own professional development activities. It appeared that the solution to the above problem rests with including teachers in the planning and management of inservice. Several studies pointed to the need for collaboration between administration and staff for good inservice.

In looking at the problem of how should the successful TISE program be organized within the school, some interesting discoveries were uncovered. It was no surprise that all respondents, both IPD people and principals, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "The objectives of TISE should be agreed upon by administrators and teachers." The same agreement was true concerning the statement, "The content of the TISE program should be determined through the collaborative effort of administration and teachers." However, it appeared often teachers were left out of the planning. About 37 percent of the IPD people and 19 percent of the principals felt that teachers do not have adequate input into TISE. The fact
that almost 57 percent of the principals reported that their school had no inservice committee further illustrated that there may be lacking the means to bring teachers into the planning process. Those schools that did have inservice committees appeared to have few meetings and the principals and IPD chairpersons seldom agreed as to the number of meetings held last year. Surprisingly, there were two instances where the principal and the IPD chairperson from the same school disagreed about whether their school even had an inservice committee. This comment came from the IPD chairperson of one of the larger schools in the survey: "Administration makes the major decisions. More teacher input is needed. The establishment of a TISE committee would meet this need and make TISE programs more beneficial for the staff."

It is apparent that often teachers lack a formal means through which to express their inservice views. Sixty-eight percent of the principals felt their teachers were given adequate input, but it was unclear how this input came to them. Formation of a committee certainly does not guarantee better inservice, but it does provide a format where all parties may be represented. Further research into the workings of inservice committees is indicated.

Opinions varied quite widely as to what the inservice objectives should be for. Of the IPD people, 42 percent ranked "to motivate teachers" highest with 35
percent ranking "implementation of new or innovative programs," highest. "To change attitudes of teachers" and "remediation to fill gaps in skills," were much less popular objectives. Less than 7 percent preferred them over the other two. By far the most popular with principals was "implementation of new or innovative programs."

While 46 percent ranked it highest, 23 percent did choose "remediation to fill gaps in skills and knowledge." "To motivate teachers" and "to change attitudes of teachers" each were ranked highest by 15 percent of the principals. The Rand Corporation study (Note 8) concluded that the most serious obstacles to professional improvement are not technical, but motivational. The technical information will not be put to good use if the intrinsic motivation is lacking. It seems principals often fail to take this into consideration.

More emphasis today seems to be placed on the motivational aspect of teaching. This was borne out by the popularity of workshops dealing with teachers' stress, image, and morale, and various discipline strategies. One IPD chairperson made this comment about his school's in-service program, "Our program was an attempt to give us variety and current information about the teacher-student relationship and teacher morale. We felt it was a good effort to help us and give us a break from curriculum writing."
Teacher inservice is commonly defined as the activities initiated by schools to update, improve, or motivate teachers. Great variation exists in the forms that TISE can take. In practice it usually referred to some specific workshop activity or meeting. Often a presenter was involved. In order to assess what delivery systems were favored most by the respondents, they were asked to rank a list of the inservice formats from most to least appropriate. Table 3 shows the comparison between principals and IPD chairpersons.
### Table 3

**INSERVICE PREFERENCES OF IPD CHAIRPERSONS AND PRINCIPALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops by teacher, specialist, principal consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group meeting to share ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to other schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice committee work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N = 58 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPD Chairpersons</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops by teacher, specialist, principal consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group meeting to share ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference or convention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal courses or seminars</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to other schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 58
Workshops were the preferred type of inservice by both the IPD people and principals with formal or informal peer group meetings getting the next highest number of top rankings. After that some differences began to appear. The principals preferred activities that involved teachers in planning or developing curriculum or participating in committee work. The teachers tended to prefer attending a conference or convention, or enrolling in a formal course or seminar. Visiting other schools was ranked fairly high by both principals and IPD people. One principal commented, "Teachers view inservice as more extra work on top of their regular load." This could explain why teachers often preferred to attend a conference, visit another school, or share ideas with other teachers. Such things as planning and developing new curriculum, individual research, and committee work were found to be less popular with the IPD people than with the principals.

Little evidence was found to support the teacher-researcher idea expressed in the literature by Lortie, Pine, and McKenna. Only one teacher respondent picked individual research and planning designed to improve classroom instruction as the favorite type of inservice activity. Both principals and IPD chairpersons rated research quite low. There appears to be little incentive for teachers to engage in research which can be very time consuming. Most teachers have failed to see the benefits that their own research could bring to their classrooms.
It was clear that opinions varied widely as to the best way to accomplish inservice. Overall, however, the traditional approach using workshops and sharing of ideas among teachers has the greatest support among both groups.

There was little question among the respondents that school districts should cover the major costs of TISE. Few instances were found where some of the cost fell on the teachers. Quite a large body of opinion indicated that not enough money was being budgeted for TISE. Fifty-four percent of the IPD people and 44 percent of the principals indicated that more money was needed for TISE. With the current financial difficulties facing school districts these data have serious implications for education.

Traditionally the principal has been considered the educational leader in the school. Seventy-eight percent of the principals surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they should have the leading role in TISE. However, only 38 percent of the IPD people held the same view. It was clear that the IPD people resented the arrangement with their principals commanding the leading role in TISE. This adversary relationship was apparent in individual comments as well.

When the principals were asked, "Who is the person chiefly responsible for TISE in your school?", only 33 percent indicated the principal. It was significant that only one-third of the principals felt they had the leading role
in inservice in their district, while almost 80 percent believed that they should have the leading role. Apparently many principals are dissatisfied with the current situation regarding inservice leadership in their district. According to the principals in 26 percent of the schools surveyed, the superintendent has assumed the leading role in TISE. The role of the principal regarding inservice in these schools is unknown and further research is needed in this area.

There was evidence that principals view this part of their job with a certain amount of resignation and frustration. When asked to comment further about the current state of TISE at their schools, only 33 percent responded. Comments such as, "It is difficult to design a single program that meets all teachers' needs" and, "I can't find time to plan a really good inservice," are comments that were an indication of this frustration. The IPD people were much more freely inclined to comment on their school's TISE program. They seldom were directly responsible for teacher inservice so they appeared more open than the principals to discuss it.

IPD people were interested in improving inservice, but their influence appeared to vary greatly from school to school. Surprisingly, 40 percent of IPD people and principals indicated that the IPD chairperson was active in the TISE program. Perceptions vary widely as to the role of the IPD chairperson. The position was totally voluntary,
and the only remuneration was the intrinsic rewards and
the positive recognition to come from fellow teachers and
administrators. It was clear that much variation existed
as to how seriously the IPD chairperson regarded his or her
role, also. Only seven percent of the principals and the
IPD people felt that the IPD chairperson should assume the
leading role in inservice.

There is little disagreement among principals and
IPD people on this point. The disagreement would most
likely be with the representatives of ISEA and NEA.
Further research into the goals and objectives of these
union organizations would be helpful. About 18 percent of
the IPD people disagreed with the idea that more negotia-
tions should be taking place in the area of TISE, but over
73 percent of the principals disagreed. In light of the
teacher autonomy movement, this 28 percent seemed surpris-
ingly low, even for a conservative state such as Iowa.
Further research is needed in this area. Principals have
recognized that their power could be diminished. They seem
to agree that negotiating TISE into master contracts would
be a mistake.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Principals Frequency</th>
<th>Principals Percent</th>
<th>IPD Frequency</th>
<th>IPD Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 58
Both principals and IPD people indicated that there was ample room for improvement. The data in Table 4 indicates that IPD people were more critical than principals in evaluating their school TISE program. Since principals often were responsible for the program, to criticize it may have been more difficult.

The study clearly revealed that both IPD people and principals agreed that the need for good TISE will remain strong in the future. About 85 percent of the total respondents expressed this opinion. A certain amount of skepticism appeared over the statement: "The quality of TISE will improve in the future." Only 25 percent of the IPD people agreed and 14 percent strongly agreed that TISE will get better. The principals were slightly more optimistic with 47 percent in agreement and 7 percent in strong agreement. This seems to point up the need for TISE to concentrate on the motivational aspect even more.
Chapter 5

Summary

Teacher Inservice Education whether from the viewpoint of teacher, administrator or parent has taken on great significance. Although opinions varied about the different aspects of TISE, its importance was well recognized. This importance and the fact that TISE often has fallen short of expectations were the motivating factors which led to this study.

The relationship between the IPD chairperson and the principal has the potential for enhancing or hindering the quality of TISE. The primary purpose of the study was to identify the opinions toward TISE of Northeast Iowa Instruction and Professional Development Committee (IPD) chairpersons and high school principals, and to investigate their implications. The nature of these roles made the principal and IPD person ideal subjects for discussing TISE. It was assumed that the subjects would be in a position to know about the inservice programs in their schools and that their increased interest in the topic would make them willing to discuss the issues.

The TISE Survey was sent along with a stamped self-addressed envelope to both the high school principal and the IPD chairperson of the thirty-eight schools in Northeast Iowa. By surveying two people from each district, the chances were increased that information would come from more
districts. Twenty school districts in the study were represented by both their principal and IPD person. Only two schools in the study were not represented. The percentage of return, 76 percent, was considered quite adequate for this study.

The findings of the study are summarized below:

1. Principals and IPD chairpersons agree that TISE is necessary for a quality education, but IPD people felt more emphasis should be placed in TISE by administrators. Clearly, IPD people placed more importance on inservice than the principals surveyed.

2. Inservice should be determined jointly by teachers and principals. Although principals felt teachers have been given adequate input into TISE, IPD people felt teacher input was inadequate. Only 40 percent of the schools surveyed acknowledged the existence of an Inservice Committee, raising serious questions about how teacher input is obtained and utilized.

3. Both principals and IPD people agreed that the two main objectives of TISE should be to implement new programs and to motivate teachers. IPD people
felt motivation was primary, while the principals felt implementation of new programs was the most important objective. This was quite an important finding and could explain why teachers' expectations about inservice often fall short. Before technical information can serve any useful purpose, the teacher must possess the motivation to use it.

4. The format preferred for TISE was workshops led by a fellow teacher, specialist, principal, or consultant with formal or informal peer group meetings to share ideas, problems and information ranked second. Both principals and IPD chairpersons agreed that the traditional mode of inservice delivery was most effective.

5. There was total agreement concerning the best time to hold inservice. Both felt inservice should be held on non-school days when teachers are free of classroom duties. Early release was ranked second.

6. Principals strongly feel that they should be the educational leader in
the school regarding TISE. IPD people were split on this issue. Often they are dissatisfied with the leadership in their districts. A further complication was that in almost one-third of the schools surveyed, the superintendent has assumed the leading role in inservice. Further research into the role of the superintendent and principal in these schools is indicated to clarify their roles.

7. The role of IPD chairperson varies greatly from school to school. Some are very active and some are not. More research is needed into the relationship between IPD chairperson and principal. Since about 43 percent of the IPD people reported that they were active in their school's TISE program, what factors were influencing the other 57 percent to be inactive?

8. The need for quality TISE will continue into the future. Both principals and IPD people generally agreed that more negotiations with TISE being included in master contracts would not be beneficial, although 40 percent of the IPD
people expressed the need for bargaining inservice. This was surprising since it was thought that a much higher percentage of IPD people would favor more collective bargaining. The fact that IPD people are generally older veteran teachers may also account for them being conservative on the issue of collective bargaining regarding inservice.

9. There was found to be ample room for improvement in TISE. Only 50 percent of principals and 32 percent of the IPD people graded their school's TISE program with 'B'. All of the others, with the exception of one 'A' by an IPD chairperson, gave grades of 'C' or below. It was no surprise that IPD chairpersons were more critical of inservice than the principals. Since principals were more often in control of inservice, to be critical of the inservice program meant that they also would be under criticism.
It is well documented that teacher unions have been increasing their influence over the last ten to fifteen years as evidenced by the lobbying effort generated to pass the Collective Bargaining Law and the Fair Dismissal Law. Likewise, in the area of inservice more effort is being put forth. Mobile Inservice Training Labs (MISTL) have been very popular among teachers. This comment was made by one IPD chairperson, "I attended MISTL two years ago and will attend again during the next school year. I feel this provides excellent inservice." The programs, held at a host school, are put on by a cadre of experts assembled by ISEA. Because of the great variety of topics presented, teachers are able to choose among several alternatives. It would be difficult or impossible for the average school district to duplicate this kind of inservice program. It is not surprising that the typical district inservice would seem rather dull in comparison. However, this is the model by which many teachers judge inservice.

The Instruction and Professional Development chairperson is a force to be reckoned with in the school. He or she has many resources at his or her disposal that can be used to the benefit of the inservice program and the school. Although few teachers are allowed to add responsibilities beyond their own classrooms, the principal should be aware of potential good that could result from drawing upon this added resource. The time has come with
all of the pressures being exerted on the educational system to put aside political differences. Teachers and principals should demonstrate professionalism, fairness, and objectivity to bring about high motivation and improvement on behalf of the children put in their charge.
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Appendix
Once again the summer vacation has given us some opportunity to relax. It is always too short, so we have little time to reflect back about the past year's positive and negative aspects before a new school year confronts us. A topic of deep concern to all educators is professional development. I would like your opinion concerning a very important aspect of this subject.

I am a graduate student completing work on a masters program in education at the University of Northern Iowa in Cedar Falls. For many years Inservice Education has been of particular interest to me. I have been involved in its various aspects from participation to planning and delivery. The variations seem limitless, and the uncertainty and confusion concerning the topic is certainly well-documented. In order to clarify the issues, I am doing a research project involving high school principals in Northeast Iowa and the Instruction and Professional Development (IPD) Chairpersons of the local education associations in those same schools. In this way I hope to identify their opinions and to compare them to determine areas of agreement and disagreement concerning Inservice Teacher Education.

Your help will be invaluable for the successful completion of this study. Please complete the survey and use the self-addressed stamped envelope to return it to me. If you would like a copy of the survey results, just check the box at the bottom, and I will gladly send it to you. Thank you for your help in responding to the survey.

Yours truly,

Craig A. Gingrich

Craig A. Gingrich
TEACHER INSERVICE EDUCATION (TISE) SURVEY

INSERVICE DEFINITION: Activities initiated by schools to update, improve, or motivate teachers.

PART I
Directions: Please complete the following demographic information.

School District__________________________ Years in Education ______

Years in Current District ______ Grade Levels ______________________

Employment Assignment: (Check as many as apply)

____ All Subject Areas  ____ Physical Education
____ Reading  ____ Media/Librarian
____ Language Arts  ____ Guidance
____ English  ____ Art
____ Foreign Language  ____ Vocal Music
____ Social Studies  ____ Instrumental Music
____ Home Economics  ____ Special Education
____ Business Education  ____ Learning Disabilities
____ Science  ____ Mathematics
____ Driver's Education  ____ Vocational Agriculture
____ Industrial Arts  ____ Other

PART II
Directions: Please answer the following from a district-wide perspective regarding TISE at your school:

1. Approximately, how many days were provided for TISE this past school year? ______

2. Who is the person chiefly responsible for TISE? Title__________________________

3. Is the same person above the one who leads the planning of the inservice? ______

4. Do you feel the teachers have adequate input into TISE? ______________________

5. Does your district have an Inservice Committee? ______

6. If Yes, above, how many times did the committee meet last year? ______

7. Please rank the following objectives of TISE using 1, 2, 3, and 4.
   ____ Remediation to fill gaps in skills and knowledge.
   ____ Implementation of new or innovative programs.
   ____ To change attitudes of Teachers.
   ____ To motivate teachers.

8. Who should determine the content of the TISE? (Rank from 1 (best) to 5)
   ____ Principal without teacher input.
   ____ Teachers alone.
   ____ Total School Administration alone.
   ____ Principal with teacher input.
   ____ Principal and teachers jointly.

9. Please rank below from 1 (best) to 4, when you feel is the best time to have TISE.
   ____ At the end of the regular school day.
   ____ On non-school days when teachers are free of classroom duties.
   ____ In the morning before the regular school day begins.
   ____ On a school day when students are released early.

10. Using the traditional (ABCD5F) grading system, how would you grade your school's TISE program?_____

PART III
Directions: Feel free to comment further in the space below about the current state of affairs regarding TISE and about changes that need to be made in the future.
PART IV
Directions: Please circle one response for each statement.

1. TISE is necessary for quality education.  
2. At my school TISE is regarded as very important.  
3. Most teachers have a negative attitude toward TISE.  
4. More emphasis should be placed on TISE by Administrators.  
5. The objectives of TISE should be agreed upon by administrators and teachers.  
6. At my school the objectives of TISE are contained in the Master Contract or Board Policies.  
7. At my school the objectives of TISE are understood by most teachers.  
8. The content of the TISE program should be determined through the collaborative effort of administration and teachers.  
9. School Districts should pay the total cost of TISE.  
10. The teachers themselves should pay for TISE.  
11. At my school the objectives of TISE are contained in the Master Contract or Board Policies.  
12. More money should be budgeted for TISE.  
13. At my school the district pays the total cost of TISE.  
14. The content of the TISE program should be determined through the collaborative effort of administration and teachers.  
15. More negotiations should be taking place with TISE programs being included in master contracts.  
16. The IPD Chairperson should have the leading role in TISE. He or she is most familiar with the teacher's needs and should be given the means to carry it out.  
17. At my school TISE is totally the Administration's responsibility.  
18. At my school the IPD Chairperson is active in the TISE program.  
19. The quality of TISE will improve in the future.  
20. A system similar to what the medical profession has adopted with a certain number of hours or continuing education units required periodically for recertification should be adopted.  
21. More Districts will pay stipends to teachers for participating in TISE.  
22. As higher qualified teachers are being graduated into the profession, the need for TISE will be less.

PART V
Directions: Realizing the TISE can take many forms, please rank from 1-13 the types of activities you deem most appropriate as effective formats for TISE. (1 = Most Appropriate)

- Workshops led by a fellow teacher, specialist, principal, consultant.
- Formal courses or seminars led by a fellow teacher, specialist, principal, consultant.
- Visits to other schools on release time.
- Receiving visits from teachers from other schools.
- Planning/Developing new curricula.
- Participating in formal or informal peer group meetings to share ideas, problems, & information.
- Committee work related to inservice. (e.g. K-12 Articulation)
- Working at a Teacher Center.
- Individual research and planning designed to improve classroom instruction.
- Self-evaluation for professional growth purposes.
- Being evaluated formally with a view to improvement of professional performance.
- Attendance at a professional conference or convention.
- Travel. (e.g. Spanish teacher going to Spain, or Science teacher to the Smithsonian).

Please check the box if you would like a copy of the survey results.

**Please return as soon as possible, preferably no later than July 10, 1982.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR HELP IN THIS PROJECT
Dear Educator,

Thank you for your interest in Teacher Inservice Education. Though this study fell far short of solving all the problems and controversy regarding inservice, it has been a tremendous learning experience for me to carry it out.

I am indebted to you for the time you took to respond to the survey. It is my sincere hope that the results contribute in some small way to the present body of knowledge so that education may continue to grow and improve to meet the challenges of the future.

Thank you,

Craig A. Gingrich