

Student Work

5-1-1981

A Study to Determine Inservice Perceptions of the Area Education Agency Employees

Gene A. Sanders

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Sanders, Gene A., "A Study to Determine Inservice Perceptions of the Area Education Agency Employees" (1981). *Student Work*. 2502.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2502>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

A STUDY TO DETERMINE INSERVICE PERCEPTIONS OF
THE AREA EDUCATION AGENCY EMPLOYEES

A Field Project
Presented to the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
Gene A. Sanders

May 1981

UMI Number: EP74047

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74047

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name

Department

Jean Bressler Teacher Education

Paul Kennedy Educational Adm.

Kirk E. Wray
Chairman

April 3, 1981
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	4
Importance of the Study	4
Limitation of the Study	5
Organization of the Study	5
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
A Model of Inservice Education.	6
Goals of Inservice Education Programs.	8
Governance of Inservice Programs	10
Context of Inservice Programs.	12
Delivery Systems of Inservice Programs	14
Content of Inservice Programs.	15
An Overview of Needs Assessment Procedures	16
Experience as an Influence on Perceptions.	17
III METHODS AND PROCEDURES	23
Selection of the Population	23
Procedures.	23
The Sample.	24
The Instrument.	24
Treatment of Data	25
IV DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	26
V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	77
APPENDICES.	80
A. COVER LETTER AND OPINIONNAIRE.	81

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Types of Inservice Education	27
II	Usefulness of Seventeen Types of Inservice Education Activities by Area Education Agency Personnel.	29
III	Methods Preferred for Conducting Inservice Education	32
IV	Degree of Agreement of Selected Types of Inservice Education Provided by the Area Education Agency.	34
V	Defining Effective Inservice Education	40
VI	Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice Activities as Perceived by AEA Personnel	46
VII	Responses to When Inservice Education Activities are Scheduled and When They Should be Scheduled.	47
VIII	Types of Inservice Activities Staff Members Should Be Compensated For	48
IX	Types of Compensation for Time Spent on Inservice Activities Outside Regular School Day.	49
X	Responses Concerning Follow-up Activities to Inservice Education Conducted in the Area Education Agency	50
XI	Restrictions to Participation in Inservice Education	51
XII	Sources of Effective Inservice Education	54
XIII	Obstacles to the Implementation of New Ideas That Were Learned Through Inservice Education	57
XIV	Seriousness of Instructional Problems.	59
XV	Respondents Interest In, Knowledge of, and Involvement in 75 Inservice Education Topics, By Rank Order	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A significant concern of educational administrators is the quality of their staffs. Schools and other education agencies frequently provide inservice education to help their employees improve their skills and grow professionally. Since inservice education plays such a vital role in developing a quality staff, it is important that inservices be designed to meet the needs of participants. How these participants perceive inservice education and its role in their professional development is important to any school or education agency that is attempting to improve its inservice education.

This study concerns the determination of the inservice perceptions held by the professional staff employed by the Loess Hills Area Education Agency (hereafter referred to as the Area Education Agency). The intent of the analysis is to provide the inservice education committee with data to plan and develop inservice education programs that will meet the needs of the staff and the Area Education Agency. Because of the structure of the Iowa Area Education Agencies, there was considerable impact on the variety of professional job classifications as well as on the number of staff employed in each agency.

The Area Education Agency is one of fifteen Area Education Agencies created by the Iowa General Assembly in 1974. Through the enactment of HF1163, the Iowa Legislature abolished the County School Systems and replaced them with Area Education Agencies whose boundaries

are conterminous with those of the Merged Area Community Colleges established in 1966. The geographical service area of the Area Education Agency is identified as Area 13.

Area 13 is composed of the following counties in Southwest Iowa: Cass, Fremont, Harrison, Mills, Page, Pottawattamie, and Shelby. There are thirty-three community school districts with an enrollment of 38,813 students, and eight non-public schools with an enrollment of 1,692 students.

The Area Education Agencies are intermediate educational agencies which provide support services to both public community school districts and non-public schools. The organizational structure of each Area Education Agency is composed of three major divisions: Special Education, Media, and Educational Services. The Special Education Division employs thirty-four speech clinicians, nineteen school psychologists, four hearing clinicians, four hearing teachers, seven school social workers, three consultants for mental disabilities, three consultants for learning disabilities, four consultants for emotional disabilities, two hospital teachers, two homebound teachers, three work experience instructors, one vocational clinician, one physical therapist, one occupational therapist, two school nurses, six preschool teachers for the handicapped, and twenty-nine administrative and classified support employees. The Media Services Division employs one consultant for media, one consultant/supervisor for media production, and twenty-three administrative and classified employees. The Educational Services Division employs three reading/language arts consultants, two values clarification consultants, one consultant for gifted and talented, one

general learning consultant, one specialist for staff development, and seven administrative and classified support staff.

During the school year of 1978-79, the Area Education Agency had an employee force of one hundred eighty-three members.

The Area Education Agency Board of Directors recognized from the beginning the need for a set of board policies which would allow for the professional growth and staff development of all employees.

(Professional Development Opportunities, Policy GADA, May 5, 1975)

These policies encourage the professional staff, as well as the classified employees, to involve themselves in activities which would improve their individual skills and competencies.

In the fall of 1977, the professional employees organized themselves into an association under the collective bargaining laws of Iowa, for the purpose of negotiating an agreement with the Loess Hills Area Education Agency Board of Directors.

Article XIII of the Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for the formation of the Area Education Agency 13 Professional Inservice Education Committee consisting of three members designated by the Association and three members designated by the employer. The Director of Educational Services, the Association President, and the Association Vice-President were designated to serve as ex-officio members. The committee is empowered to make recommendations to the Administration concerning professional inservice education.

The committee functions in an advisory capacity, suggesting and recommending inservice activities for the professional staff. The first priority identified was to determine the needs and preferences

of professionals in the area of inservice activities.

An analysis of the expertise and competencies of the professional staff revealed them to be both varied and diverse; therefore, making it difficult to determine the wise use of the professional time and money allocated for inservice activities.

This study provides insights into past effectiveness of professional growth and inservice activities as well as an indication of high potential preferences for future inservice needs.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the inservice preferences of the Area Education Agency employees for professional growth activities. A secondary benefit is the use of the data gathered to plan future inservice activities so as to maximize efforts to meet the needs of the Agency's staff.

Importance of the Study

The motivation for this study stems from the belief of the Inservice Education Committee that if the professional staff can present its preferences for inservice activities, the administration can determine the content of inservice activities. The study shows the needs of the staff for inservice topics. The administration of the Area Education Agency believes in the need to plan for activities to meet individual expectations, to meet needs of common staff groups, and the need to develop a model for self-development and inservice so that the needs of the staff can be determined annually and recycling can occur as needs change.

Limitation of the Study

The study was limited to the opinions of the professional staff of the Area Education Agency.* The respondents were individuals known personally by the Administration of the Area Education Agency. This restriction was appropriate since the responses to the opinionnaire are to be used to provide the data necessary to support the planning for inservice activities for the Area Education Agency.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the foundation necessary for the following research. Chapter II includes a review of related literature and research concerning the problem of inservice preferences. Chapter III includes a discussion of the methods used in the gathering and treatment of the data. The results of the opinionnaire are analyzed in Chapter IV, and Chapter V contains the conclusions and recommendations.

*Respondents were the staff members of the Area Education Agency in 1978-79.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter briefly reviews the literature on inservice education, approaches to inservice, needs assessment procedures, and selected research findings on assessing teacher inservice needs.

A MODEL OF INSERVICE EDUCATION

Nicholson, after completing a review of more than 2,000 periodicals, books, and studies published since 1957, stated:

The literature on inservice education is as voluminous-- and as haphazard--as the programs it describes. It is a hodge-podge of unorganized information, of unrelated opinions, findings, and suggestions which have no unifying framework. The literature resembles the state of inservice education itself. (Nicholson, 1976, p. 4)

Broadly speaking, inservice education includes all activities that teachers engage in which are designed to contribute to improving their teaching and effectiveness in their assignments. These activities may include traveling, professional reading, participating in supervision and curriculum development programs, attending summer session courses, observing other classrooms, taking sabbatical leaves, viewing films or television programs, and working on total personal involvement of great depth and long duration. (Good, 1959, p. 676)

Inservice education, inservice training, inservice growth activities, staff development, and professional growth are all terms used frequently and often interchangeably when referring to the continuing education activities of professional school personnel.

True inservice education is more than inservice training or on-the-job training. Training implies that the trainee learns to use various methods, procedures, and processes or, at times, tools that improve his/her ability to perform. Inservice education is concerned with the established practices and procedures of school districts, the profession, the subject field, or grade level. To be effective today, however, inservice education must involve more than practices and procedures. It must be concerned with attitudes of mind and with ways of approaching and influencing the lives of the people who make up the educational team--administrators, teachers, pupils, and publics. "Most staff development programs lack any solid conceptual model. Instead, they are a conglomerate of incompatible workshops and courses." (McLaughlin and Berman, 1977, p. 193)

The emphasis of inservice education is on professional growth. A statement by the Montbello (California) Board of Education illustrates the rationale for the professional aspects of inservice growth activities:

Almost everything a teacher does can be interpreted as professional growth but specifically, professional growth is that part of his/her total conduct which makes him/her a more mature and competent member of the teaching profession.

Professional growth is maturation growth as well as improvement of skills. It is continuous but takes place at different rates as needs and opportunities arise. Every teacher should bring to the profession at least minimal professional competence and should strive to become an expert in his/her professional assignment.

The teacher who fails to grow professionally fails his/her responsibility to pupils and such a teacher also fails to assume his/her obligations to the community, which has the right to expect continuing improvement through varied experiences and studies.

Inservice education is based upon the assumption that every teacher will select activities which will lead to improvement in

teaching, staff membership, and professional membership. Inservice education offers an opportunity to further strengthen areas where he/she is especially competent as well as to remedy areas identified as needing improvement.

Professional growth is a continuous process of becoming a more competent person, while developing flexible and openminded attitudes toward life, other persons, and oneself. It requires a balance of thought and action, study and experience, solitude and companionship, enrichment of mind and maintenance of health, pleasurable recreation, and spiritual growth. (Montbello Unified School District, 1961)

One noteworthy attempt to depict relationships among major components of inservice education programs has been made by Joyce, who says that there are four interrelated systems of inservice programs: governance, substance, context or modal, and delivery systems. (Joyce, 1976, p. 6) For example, a school faculty may decide (governance) to attend teacher-directed workshops held on released time (delivery) in which math concepts treated in several textbooks (substance) are explored to decide on a new series for the coming school year (context). (Joyce, 1976, p. 7)

Goals of Inservice Education Programs

The ultimate purpose of inservice education is the same whether attention is focused on the needs of teachers as individuals or on the needs of the school building or system staff as seen by the administrator and/or teaching staff, board of education, and/or the public.

Historically, inservice education programs grew out of the need of the educational establishment for teachers with greater skills and knowledge in relation to both subject matter and methods. As knowledge began to increase by leaps and bounds, it was no longer enough to issue a county certificate to a high school graduate and send the

teacher out to a rural school to teach the three "Rs." As Americans began to congregate in towns and cities and exchange ideas and points of view, they became increasingly sophisticated and informed. As they began working an eight-hour day or forty-hour week and had more time and energy to think about their home, church, and school, they began to ask questions and make demands. The answer to these questions and demands, then as it is now, is to have teachers with greater skills, increased knowledge, and widened understanding. The profession has moved ahead in terms of effectiveness and accomplishments because the practitioners of the profession have become increasingly skillful. They have accomplished this in terms of experience but even more so because they have discovered much about how students learn, about scope and sequence of organized knowledge, about interrelationships, and about human nature. Therefore, a major purpose of the teachers as they engage in inservice education activities is to become more skillful in the management of people (students), the management of learning (his/her primary task), and the management and advancement of their profession.

In most communities and for most teachers, the goals and objectives of inservice education are the same for both the professional staff and the school district. For both, the overriding objective is maximum pupil growth which is positively correlated with effective teacher growth.

Administrators may decide that the existing emphasis on a college preparatory curriculum is not adequately meeting the needs of a significant portion of the students. If so, they may direct an inservice program that is to the teacher's advantage which contributes

to the positive growth of pupils. (Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, 1974, p. 101)

Governance of Inservice Programs

Governance structures attempt to answer the question, "Who shall make the decisions on what matters?" Joyce describes the present state of governance arrangements for inservice programs as "a chaos of legislation, various bargaining agreements and myriad types of teacher centers and other collaborative arrangements which have left governance in a state of disarray." (Joyce, 1976, p. 8)

The various entities mentioned most frequently in matters related to governance of inservice programs are local school districts, higher education institutions, teacher organizations, and, to some extent, community organizations. The federal and state government is generally involved in inservice programs on specific topics rather than in direct participation in governance procedures. (Joyce, 1976, p. 9)

Different degrees of authority exist in planning and implementing inservice programs. Howey postulated three levels of governance: Level One relates to the authority to create and maintain inservice units, programs, or centers. Level Two deals with the authority to govern centers, programs, or units after they have been created. Level Three concerns the authority to regulate the individual teacher's relationship to such programs. (Howey, 1976, p. 62)

The leaders in the Level One areas are the local education agencies and higher education institutions. Local school districts have the authority to create programs, to contract with another agency to create them, and to compel teacher attendance at them. Higher

education has the authority to create programs but cannot compel teachers to participate. Teacher organizations share in the authority to create inservice programs, but they are not generally able to compel attendance. (Joyce, 1976, p. 9)

When state and federal agencies utilize their authority to create inservice programs, their interest is usually programmatic. (Pais, 1976, p. 100)

The representation of program clients in Level One decisions is important, but the participation of teachers becomes particularly important in Level Two decision-making structures since matters decided at this level relate directly to content, delivery system, context, and goals of inservice programs.

The Level Three area of governance deals with individual teachers and their relationship to the inservice programs which have been created. This area frequently includes concerns about: (1) the degree to which someone other than the teacher can determine inservice education needs; (2) how much participation in district programs can be required of teachers; and (3) what proportion of the inservice programs should focus on personal interests and professional needs of individual teachers. (Joyce, 1976, p. 11)

Although participation in Level One and Level Two decision-making structures has increased in recent years, governance matters in Level Three seem to reflect the confusion presently found in perceptions of the teacher's role. Some parties view teachers as autonomous professionals with the right and duty to direct inservice activities without interference. Others, however, see teachers as employees of a

hierarchically-structured school system in which inservice decisions are made by administrators and communicated to teachers. (Yarger, 1976, p. 11)

To adopt either position totally would seem to deny many of the realities of today's schools. While it is true that "teachers must have more dominant voices than they have had in the past since inservice education is primarily intended for teachers," it is also true that "inservice education is virtually useless if the objectives of the training programs are not valued and rewarded--if with nothing more than esteem--by the power structure of the school." (Bhaerman, 1976, p. 142)

A third factor, often ignored in a discussion of the relationships between teachers and the system, is the influence of other teachers in the school. This "collective staff personality can be a strong force in establishing participation in inservice programs." (Rubin, 1971, p. 16)

Thus, it seems that governance procedures must work toward collaborative processes which can relate effectively to individual, group, and system needs.

Context of Inservice Programs

The context of inservice education programs refers to the relationship of the program approach to the situation in which the program is to take place. This component addresses the question, "What form of inservice will meet the needs of the situation?" (Nicholson, 1976, pp. 15-20)

Nicholson proposes five different, but related, contexts for inservice education: job-embedded, job-related, credential-oriented,

professional organization-related, and self-directed. (Nicholson, 1976, pp. 15-20)

Job-embedded inservice programs are directly related to the teacher's immediate needs in his/her current teaching position. Four typical methods of job-embedded inservice are committee work for program planning and organization, interaction with other teachers in team teaching, interaction with consultants provided by the school district, and professional reading.

Job-related inservice programs are designed to assist teachers in improving teaching competencies in general and are not necessarily limited to program topics related to immediate teaching positions.

Credential-oriented inservice efforts are directed toward meeting teacher needs related to certification or professional advancement. Credential-oriented programs are the most pervasive types of inservice efforts. (Pais, 1976, p. 102)

Professional organization-related programs generally have one of two purposes: Either they are channeled toward teachers' needs as members of a specific discipline, or they focus on teachers' needs as employees of school systems.

Self-directed activities are a means for the teacher to continue his/her educational activities in areas which interest him/her personally but are not related directly to a teaching position or role.

Much of the criticism of "irrelevant" inservice efforts may, it seems, result from planners and participants basing their expectations on different program contexts. When Ainsworth asked selected teachers in Prince George, Maryland to describe effective inservice

programs, seventy-nine percent replied that the inservice programs should be of a practical nature with direct applications to their classroom situations. (Ainsworth, 1976, p. 107)

Delivery Systems of Inservice Programs

Delivery systems address the question, "How shall programs be structured, staffed, and implemented?" Edelfelt listed options for inservice as courses, workshops, seminars, curriculum development projects, conferences, institutes, identified teacher centers and clinics, sabbaticals, institutional visiting, educational travel, exchange programs, minicourses, microteaching, independent study, tutorial sessions, correspondence study, simulations, role playing, video-taping, and television lessons. (Edelfelt, 1975, p. 1)

A summary of inservice activities prepared by the NEA presented many of these same activities but enlarged Edelfelt's list by including field trips, camping, work experience outside of education, professional writing, professional organization work, cultural experiences, and involvement in community organizations. (National Education Association (NEA), 1976, pp. 6-10) Although much of the literature on inservice education discusses the desire which teachers have to be actively involved in their continuing education, Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen noted in their sample of South Dakota teachers that they were "most enthusiastic about activities which involved them in a somewhat passive, rather than a direct role." (Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen, 1976, p. 545)

Research in the area of staffing preferences seems to suggest that administrators and teachers have different perceptions of who

should lead inservice activities. Ainsworth found that administrators saw teachers as leaders of inservice activities, but teachers themselves did not generally view themselves in that role. In fact, many of the respondents in the study who indicated that they had previously acted as inservice leaders stated that they did not feel that they had the time to plan, or the expertise to conduct, such activities. (Ainsworth, 1976, p. 107)

The literature on delivery system preference was summarized by Bush as he stated,

In regard to specific questions of where inservice activities should be carried on, who should do it, who should determine the objectives and methods, and when it should take place, I suggest that inservice education, properly concerned, is not a monolithic entity carried on in one place, designed by one individual or group following a common pattern. It needs to be more varied, carefully thought through, and more realistic than it now is. (Bush, 1971, p. 46)

Content of Inservice Programs

This component of the inservice model is, "What should be the focus of materials presented or discussed in the program?" The choices can be influenced by many factors such as community concerns, legislation, research findings, teacher interests, and district thrusts.

Asher contended that program content should focus around four areas: information-gathering, attitude changes, general self-improvement, and skill training. (Asher, 1967, p. 7)

Future trends in inservice education are reflected in seven characteristics of successful inservice programs identified by Lawrence in 1974. The following generalizations are the result of his research:

- (1) Individualized programs are more likely to achieve program

objectives than activities that have the same format for all participants.

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

(3) Programs based on demonstration of materials and techniques, combined with supervised trials, are more likely to be successful than those in which information or instruction is learned and stored for future application.

(4) Programs in which teachers provide assistance are more successful than those requiring teachers to work on their own.

(5) Programs which are a part of an overall staff development plan are more successful than "one shot" efforts which have no follow-up activities.

(6) Programs in which teachers choose at least some of the goals and activities are more successful than those which do not involve participants in such activities.

(7) Programs which are self-initiated and self-directed by teachers tend to have a higher rate of success than those which are planned and initiated by administrators or outside consultants. (Lawrence, 1974, p. 80)

An Overview of Needs Assessment Procedures

Identifying needs is not new in education. Informal needs assessments have long been conducted to determine gaps between learning and performance. However, traditional needs assessments in inservice education have relied almost entirely on input from administrators or depended solely on insights of teachers. (Firth, 1977, p. 215)

Factors which have provided direction for planning inservice efforts have included conventional wisdom, past experience of the school district, expertise of professional educators, pressure from lobbyists, "bandwagon" approaches to innovation, "sales pitches" from publishers, and, most importantly, the influence of tradition. (Withins, 1975, p. 14)

Needs assessment procedures have been described by Withins as a five-step cycle:

- (1) Determining the desired results or outcome.
- (2) Evaluating present conditions
- (3) Identifying discrepancies between desired outcome and present condition
- (4) Seeking courses for the discrepancies
- (5) Prioritizing needs and planning remedies (Withins, 1975, p. 14)

Such procedures have been used for a variety of purposes such as improving curriculum planning, aiding in evaluation of programs, and providing documentation for needs in an age of increased accountability. The emphasis which the federal government has put on needs assessments as a requisite for project funding has also been a major factor in increasing the use of needs assessment techniques. (Withins, 1975, p. 3)

Experience as an Influence on Perceptions

Differences in experience appear to be factors in the respondents' perceptions of inservice needs. As Ingersall noted, competencies associated with planning instruction to provide individualization were seen as greater needs by teachers with one to five years of experience than they were by teachers having five or more years of experience. (Ingersall, 1976, p. 172) Pitts found that beginning teachers were more interested in items related to administrative duties, interacting and communicating, and developing pupil self-concept than were experienced teachers. Experienced teachers perceived inservice needs in areas of student behavior, planning and conducting instruction, and developing personal skills. (Pitts, 1975, p. 72)

For this study, Frances Fuller's work was a primary source of ideas for personalization. Fuller's research (1969) was built around her developmental conceptualization of the "concerns" of teachers, as they progressed from being new teachers in pre-service education

programs to being teachers with inservice experience. Personalized teacher education entails instruction matched to the cognitive/pedagogical needs of the students and their personal needs, as indicated by their concerns. (Fuller, 1976, p. 11)

In 1968, the Research and Development Center staff at the University of Texas developed a "Personalized Teacher Education" program which relies heavily on assessing and responding to teacher concerns. (Hall, Rutherford, 1977, p. 1) Beginning in 1972, Hall's research shifted to studying teachers as they adopted the innovative teacher education materials and procedures.

This research indicates that professors and teachers have identifiable and developmental "concerns" about change that are similar to those which Fuller had documented with pre-service teachers. From this research, Hall was able to identify seven stages of concerns about the many educational priorities and programs:

(1) Awareness: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.

(2) Informational: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation. He/she is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner, such as general characteristics, effects, and requirement for use.

(3) Personal: The individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands and his/her role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision-making, and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structure or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the programs for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

(4) Management: Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organization managing, scheduling, and time demands are of utmost importance.

(5) Consequence: Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on students in his/her immediate sphere of influence. The

focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcome, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcome.

(6) Collaboration: The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.

(7) Refocusing: The focus is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. The individual teacher has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of this innovation. (Hall, Rutherford, 1977, p. 1)

Concerns about innovation provide a diagnostic base for identifying individual teacher's concerns and delivering "personalized" staff developmental activities. Based on assessment of the concerns of innovation, personally relevant staff development activities which also relate to innovation and support implementation can be planned and put into practice. Furthermore, staff development activities that are targeted toward/around concerns will most likely be seen as meaningful and useful by the participants.

There is a need to be empathetic, always aware that teachers are persons, as well as an understanding that educational change is a process, not an event. In addition, the inservice program must be a positive one.

Depending upon the teacher's make-up, knowledge, and experience, each teacher perceives, and mentally contends with, a given inservice program differently. Inservice education may be interpreted as an outside thrust to one's well-being or it may be seen as rewarding. There may be a feeling of confusion and lack of information about what "it" is. The demand to consider inservice education may be self-imposed in the form of a goal or objective that is to be reached. In response to the demand, the mind explains ways, means, potential barriers,

possible action, risks, and rewards in relation to the demands of the inservice education. The mental activities of questioning, analyzing, re-analyzing, considering alternative actions and reactions, and anticipating consequences are a concern to the teacher. An aroused state of personal feelings and thoughts about inservice education is a concern in the teacher's preferences for and perceptions of inservice education. (Zigarami, 1975, p. 550)

Recognizing that there are many approaches to staff development, Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen studied teachers' performances in the perception of inservice education in order to help them improve their work with students.

What kinds of inservice education do teachers prefer? In 1975, Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen believed that the answer to this question would be helpful in planning some effective staff development programs; therefore, a state-wide study of each teacher's attitudes toward and experiences with inservice education was conducted. The first purpose was to report and describe the kind of staff development experiences that teachers had. A second purpose was to explain each teacher's perceptions of the usefulness of each kind of staff development experience. By looking at the kinds of staff development teachers had found useful, the researchers tried to identify inservice activities that these experiences had in common and the reasons they were perceived as useful. Using these observations, teachers, curriculum specialists, administrators can plan more objective staff development programs.

In order to determine the kinds of inservice education in which teachers had engaged, teachers were asked to react to a listing of

different types of inservice activities. They were asked whether they had been involved in each activity during the past two years and how useful each activity was in their teaching. The types of workshops frequently used (one-day regional workshops involving several school systems and after-school workshops) were judged to be the least useful by respondents. The teachers who had been involved in full-day, half-day, and one- to two-hour workshops conducted by outside consultants did not view them as highly useful when compared to other types of inservice activities. The teachers who had been involved in workshops or courses carried out on a college or university campus rated these staff development experiences as moderately or very useful. Faculty meetings planned by teachers, or by teachers and administrators, were judged to be more useful than faculty meetings planned solely by administrators. The respondents who had received assistance from another teacher in their classrooms rated this as a highly useful type of inservice activity. Observation was also judged to be highly useful. The teachers who responded viewed the inservice aspects of their professional organizations (conventions, conferences, workshops) as moderately useful when compared to other inservice activities. Reading professional journals and newsletters was also viewed as only moderately useful by a majority of the respondents. (Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen, 1977, p. 551)

Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen reported that there are certain characteristics and useful types of inservice education relating to qualities of newness or innovativeness that these types have in common. (Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen, 1977, p. 551) The first characteristic is activities that introduce teachers to new ideas in education, and

activities that respond to a teacher's needs in ways other than through traditional college courses or after-school education. The second characteristic that most useful types of inservice education share is that they seem to build on a teacher's interests. The third characteristic of the most useful types of inservice education is "choice." Staff development experiences that provide choices are more "personalized," in a sense that teachers probably do not have about most traditional non-volunteering types of inservice activities. In all of the types of inservice education, teachers found volunteering to be most useful. In the most useful types of inservice education, teachers also have a choice about what to focus on, when the "inservicing" is to take place, and who the resource people are to be. A fourth characteristic is that larger inservice experiences are seen as more useful than inservice activities that last only a day or part of a day. A fifth characteristic seems to be support for the idea that teachers like to learn from each other and find inservice experiences that promote the exchange of ideas helpful. With the exception of workshops held on college/university campuses, teachers consistently viewed inservice experiences conducted by outside consultants as less useful than experiences that promote teachers showing ideas or working on a mutual problem. Sixth, the idea that teachers regard inservice experiences over which they have some control as useful is supported by an observation that teachers seem to prefer inservice experiences that occur in the local setting.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The basic concern of this study was to determine the inservice education preferences of the professional staff of the Area Education Agency.

Selection of the Population

This study was based on the responses to an opinionnaire by one hundred professional staff personnel employed by the Area Education Agency during the 1978-79 school year. These educators were individuals personally known by the administration and included various age groups as well as many diverse job classifications.

Procedures

The initial step in this study was a review of literature to become more aware of previous studies on the subject of inservice preferences of professionals in education. The literature and research in the field revealed that the identification of inservice preferences of professional staff would be made through an analysis of major areas that was used by Zigarami, Betz, and Jensen who surveyed the teachers of South Dakota in 1975. Their study was the only one of its type available for comparison when the parameters for the Area Education Agency study were established. The major areas analyzed were: Types of Inservice Education, Methods Used in Conducting Inservice, Inservice Education Provided by the Area Education Agency, Defining Effective Inservice

Education, Purposes of Inservice Education, Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice Activities, Scheduling of Inservice Education, Compensation for Inservice, Follow-up Activities, Participation in Inservice, Inservice Resources, Obstacles to Implementing New Ideas, Problems of Inservice Education, and Inservice Topics. The priority of the Inservice Committee was to determine the needs and preferences of the professionals concerning inservice activities; therefore, the decision was to use these areas and to survey the opinions of the staff to determine their preferences.

The Sample

The sample was limited to the one hundred professionals employed by the Area Education Agency. The opinionnaire was distributed by inter-office mail to the staff in two parts. The staff was informed that by responding to the opinionnaire, they would be providing information that would be used by the Inservice Committee in planning a more effective inservice program. Of the one hundred staff contacted, eighty-two returned the completed instrument.

The Instrument

The primary source of data was an opinionnaire. This instrument was used to provide information about the various preferences that the professional staff may have about inservice activities. The instrument contained fourteen areas of concern: Types of Inservice Education, Methods Used in Conducting Inservice, Inservice Education Provided by the Area Education Agency, Defining Effective Inservice Education, Purposes of Inservice Education, Responsibility for Initiating and Planning

Inservice Activities, Scheduling of Inservice Education, Compensation for Inservice, Follow-up Activities, Participation in Inservice, Inservice Resources, Obstacles to Implementing New Ideas, Problems of Inservice Education, and Inservice Topics. A copy of the instrument used in this study and the cover letter are in Appendix A.

Treatment of the Data

The data were analyzed by compiling in tabular form the responses by areas of concern and item responses. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data obtained from the opinionnaire sent to the professional staff of the Area Education Agency.

The opinionnaire contained fourteen areas of concern: Types of Inservice Education, Methods Used in Conducting Inservice, Inservice Education Provided by the Area Education Agency, Defining Effective Inservice Education, Purposes of Inservice Education, Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice Activities, Scheduling of Inservice Education, Compensation for Inservice, Follow-up Activities, Participation in Inservice, Inservice Resources, Obstacles to Implementing New Ideas, Problems of Inservice Education, and Inservice Topics. The responses to the fourteen areas of concern in the opinionnaire were tallied and will be discussed in order.

1. Types of Inservice Education

Respondents were asked whether they had been involved in seventeen different types of inservice activities during the past two years. Each inservice activity required a response as to whether or not they had been involved. Table I shows that the percentage of involvement ranged from 86 percent to 10 percent. The data indicate that 86 percent of the respondents had been involved in local staff meetings planned by administrators specifically for inservice; 77 percent in local staff meetings planned by staff specifically for

TABLE I

TYPES OF INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Types of Inservice	Involved	Not Involved	Percent Involved
1	Local staff meetings planned by administrators specifically for inservice. N=70	60	10	86
2	Local staff meeting planned by staff specifically for inservice. N=70	54	16	77
3	Local staff meeting planned by staff and administration specifically for inservice. N=68	52	16	76
4	Half-day inservice program conducted by an outside consultant. N=69	43	26	62
5	Workshop carried out on a college or university campus. N=70	42	28	60
6	Full-day inservice program conducted by an outside consultant. N=68	37	31	54
7	One day regional workshop involving several AEAs. N=70	37	33	53
8	One two-hour inservice program conducted by an outside consultant. N=70	36	34	51
9	Convention sponsored by professional teachers' organization. N=70	33	37	47

TABLE I (continued)

Rank	Types of Inservice	Involved	Not Involved	Percent Involved
10	Workshop: Block of time set aside during the work year for intensive study of an educational problem in AEA #13. N=70	31	39	44
11	Presentations by Educational Sales Representatives. N=70	31	39	44
12	Observation of staff in AEA #13. N=69	26	43	38
13	Summer School Classes for credit. N=70	26	44	37
14	Conferences or workshops sponsored by professional teachers' organizations. N=70	26	44	37
15	Workshop: Block of time set aside during summer for intensive study of an educational problem in AEA #13. N=70	9	61	13
16	Observation of staff in other AEA #13. N=69	8	61	12
17	Special college courses conducted at AEA #13, by a college or university staff member. N=69	7	62	10

inservice, and 76 percent in local staff meetings planned by staff and administrators specifically for inservice.

There is a moderate decline in involvement after the above three activities. It appears that respondents had been involved more

frequently in activities that were on site and planned by on-site administrators or staff members. It is significant that the lowest area of involvement was "Special college courses conducted at AEA #13, by a college or university staff member." The data are not conclusive, however, because the degree of involvement may be due to the frequency the specific inservice activity was made available.

Table II shows the respondents' evaluations of the usefulness of the inservice education activities in which they had been involved for the past two years.

TABLE II

USEFULNESS OF SEVENTEEN TYPES OF INSERVICE EDUCATION
ACTIVITIES BY AREA EDUCATION AGENCY PERSONNEL

Rank	Types of Inservice	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Not Useful	2 Somewhat Useful	3 Useful	4 Very Useful	
1	Workshop carried out on a college or university campus. N=44	1	10	42	96	3.39
2	Summer school classes. N=35	2	8	36	68	3.26
3	Full day inservice programs conducted by an outside consultant. N=41	0	16	51	64	3.20
4	One day required workshop involving several AEAs. N=45	4	14	48	72	3.07
5	Conference or workshop sponsored by professional teachers' organizations. N=35	4	10	36	56	3.03

TABLE II (continued)

Rank	Types of Inservice	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Not Useful	2 Somewhat Useful	3 Useful	4 Very Useful	
6	Observation of staff in other AEAs. N=20	2	10	9	40	3.05
7	Local staff meeting planned by staff specifically for inservice. N=57	0	28	81	64	3.04
8	Convention sponsored by professional teachers' organization. N=42	4	12	51	60	3.02
9	Observance of staff in AEA #13. N=36	4	12	39	52	2.97
10	Half-day inservice program conducted by an outside consultant. N=45	1	26	54	52	2.96
11	Workshop: block of time set aside during the work year for intensive study of an educational problem in AEA #13. N=39	1	22	54	36	2.90
12	One two-hour inservice program conducted by an outside consultant. N=43	1	30	66	20	2.72
13	Special college courses conducted at AEA #13. N=23	1	18	27	16	2.70
14	Local staff meetings planned by staff and administrators specifically for inservice. N=56	13	28	57	40	2.46

TABLE II (continued)

Rank	Types of Inservice	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Not Useful	2 Somewhat Useful	3 Useful	4 Very Useful	
15	Workshop: block of time set aside during the summer for intensive study of educational problem in AEA. N=26	9	8	18	28	2.42
16	Local staff meetings planned by administration specifically for inservice. N=64	6	68	60	16	2.34
17	Presentation by Educational Sales Representatives. N=41	12	32	24	20*	2.15

Ranking high were "Workshop carried out on a college or university campus," "Summer school classes," "Full day inservice programs conducted by an outside consultant," and "One day required workshop involving several AEAs." Four activities received more negative than positive responses: "Presentation by Educational Sales Representatives," "Local staff meetings planned by administration specifically for inservice," "Workshop: block of time set aside during the summer for intensive study of an educational problem at AEA #13," and "Local staff meetings planned by staff and administrators specifically for inservice."

*Scores on Tables throughout the study containing Rating Scales were determined in the following manner: $N \times R = S$; where N is the number of respondents, R is the rating given by respondents, and S is the resultant score. For example, on item 17 above, 12 respondents gave it a 1 rating, 16 gave it a 2 rating, 8 gave it a 3 rating, and 5 respondents gave it a 4 rating. Scores were then totaled and the Mean Score was derived from the totals of each item.

2. Methods Used in Conducting Inservice

Respondents were provided with a list of eleven different methods of inservice education and asked to indicate their preferences for each, using a five-point scale ranging from "Definitely Dislike" to "Definitely Like." The data are presented in Table III.

TABLE III

METHODS PREFERRED FOR CONDUCTING INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Method of Inservice	Rating Scale					Mean
		Definitely Dislike			Definitely Like		
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Demonstrations of materials or techniques. N=70	0	0	42	152	90	4.06
2	Assistance from another staff member in your assignment. N=70	0	8	54	100	115	3.96
3	Directed small group discussion led by a specialist on the topic under discussion. N=70	2	20	36	132	65	3.64
4	A lecture followed by questions from participants. N=70	4	8	84	92	55	3.47
5	Observation of other staff members. N=70	4	16	72	88	60	3.43
6	Work group resulting in production. N=70	1	20	78	96	45	3.43
7	A lecture followed by group discussions. N=70	2	26	57	104	50	3.41

TABLE III (continued)

Rank	Method of Inservice	Rating Scale					Mean
		Definitely Dislike		Definitely Like			
		1	2	3	4	5	
8	Brainstorming. N=70	8	16	57	96	55	3.31
9	Independent study. N=70	6	28	72	80	30	3.09
10	Role playing. N=70	23	22	51	60	20	2.51
11	Free small group discussion on a topic without a designated leader. N=70	25	46	30	40	10	2.16

The range of the mean was from 4.06 to 2.16. Respondents clearly preferred methods of inservice that had a clear structure such as demonstration, a directed small group, or a lecture to unstructured activities such as brainstorming or free discussion. The four methods ranked highest were structured; the four ranked lowest were unstructured.

3. Inservice Education Provided by the Area Education Agency

Respondents were asked to give their impressions of various aspects of the inservice education program provided by the Area Education Agency during the past two years. Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with each of twenty-six descriptive statements provided in the opinionnaire, indicating whether they disagreed, probably disagreed, probably agreed, or agreed. These data are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

DEGREE OF AGREEMENT OF SELECTED TYPES OF INSERVICE
EDUCATION PROVIDED BY THE AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

Rank	Items	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
1	Some inservice activities in AEA #13 are conducted by staff members and administrators of AEA. N=68	0	2	126	100	3.35
2	Every staff member in my assignment has been required to participate in some inservice activities. N=68	4	24	48	144	3.24
3	My performance in my assignment improved as a result of inservice education. N=68	3	8	126	76	3.13
4	Inservice education has been given a high priority in AEA #13. N=68	5	36	63	96	3.00
5	In AEA #13, some inservice activities have been designed around the common needs of the professional staff. N=68	1	16	147	40	3.00

TABLE IV (continued)

Rank	Items	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
6	Inservice activities in AEA #13 have been evaluated. N=66	2	26	99	72	3.02
7	Inservice education activities for staff members in my assignment have included administrators. N=69	5	22	105	72	2.96
8	Administrators in my assignment have been involved in separate inservice activities focusing on administration responsibilities. N=64	8	14	96	68	2.91
9	Inservice education programs in my assignment have been based on specific objectives. N=70	3	30	117	52	2.89
10	My director assumes a leadership role in planning inservice activities. N=68	6	26	96	68	2.88
11	Inservice education programs in my assignment have been based on various objectives. N=70	4	28	120	48	2.86

TABLE IV (continued)

Rank	Items	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
12	Inservice programs in my assignment have included a variety of activities which allowed for the different interests and needs that existed on the part of the individual staff members. N=68	3	32	120	36	2.81
13	The administrators of AEA #13 demonstrate a real interest in inservice education. N=69	7	32	90	64	2.80
14	In AEA #13, Inservice education activities are more frequently planned on an AEA basis than at the individual program level. N=67	6	38	93	44	2.70
15	Inservice education in AEA #13 has helped improve relationships among the professional staff. N=66	5	38	105	28	2.67
16	I feel that I have an adequate amount of freedom to participate in planning inservice	7	36	99	36	2.66

TABLE IV (continued)

Rank	Items	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
17	education programs in AEA #13. N=67 Inservice education in AEA #13 has helped me become more sensitive to what is happening in any assignment. N=68	6	38	108	28	2.65
18	Inservice activities in this AEA have provided opportunities to become acquainted with new teaching techniques/innovations. N=66	6	34	111	24	2.65
19	Most inservice programs in my assignment arise from a study of needs and problems identified by staff members. N=68	10	34	90	44	2.62
20	The topics undertaken for discussion in our inservice education sessions have been relevant to my assignment needs. N=66	6	50	75	40	2.59
21	The inservice program supported	5	64	57	40	2.52

TABLE IV (continued)

Rank	Items	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
	by AEA #13, contributes to the improvement of staff morale. N=66	5	64	57	40	2.52
22	Staff members in my assignment have the major say in determining what an inservice program is to be.	10	52	66	44	2.49
23	The curriculum in my school has been improved as a result of our inservice education program. N=63	7	54	78	12	2.40
24	Inservice activities in AEA #13 have been well planned and continuous. N=65	6	80	51	8	2.23
25	AEA #13 provides adequate inservice activities to orient new staff members to the system. N=67	20	50	48	24	2.12
26	There are usually follow-up activities in the inservice programs in AEA #13. N=67	14	82	33	4	1.99

Table IV shows the responses to items concerning the inservice education provided by the Area Education Agency. Respondents had a high degree of agreement on the following items: (a) inservice conducted by Area Education Agency staff members and administrators; (b) staff members being required to engage in some inservice education activity; (c) staff performance is thought to improve as a result of inservice education activities; (d) inservice education has a high priority; (e) activities are designed to meet common staff needs; and (f) inservice education activities are evaluated.

◇ Respondents had a low degree of agreement with several aspects of the inservice education that is provided: (a) there is usually no follow-up of activities; (b) there is inadequate orientation of new staff members; (c) inservice education activities have not been well planned and continuous; (d) curriculum in schools has not been improved; (e) staff members do not have a major say in determining the inservice education activities; and (f) inservice education has not contributed to the improvement of staff morale.

The data suggest that inservice education activities provided by the Area Education Agency are a priority, are designed to meet common needs, are useful and evaluated; however, they lack follow-up, planning, consistency, staff input, improved morale, and are not provided for the purpose of orientation of new staff members.

4. Defining Effective Inservice Education

This section of the opinionnaire dealt with the perceptions of respondents concerning the characteristics of effective inservice edu-

cation. Respondents were asked to react to twenty-one descriptive statements and indicate their level of agreement with each. The data are presented in Table V. Most noteworthy are the positive responses

TABLE V
DEFINING EFFECTIVE INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Item	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
1	Inservice programs should include special activities to orient new staff members to AEA #13. N=82	0	2	75	224	3.67
2	Inservice education programs should be based on specific objectives. N=82	0	2	72	224	3.66
3	Inservice activities should provide opportunities to become acquainted with new teaching techniques/innovations. N=82	1	0	90	204	3.60
4	Inservice programs should include a variety of activities which allow the different interest and needs that exist on the	1	0	93	200	3.59

TABLE V (continued)

Rank	Item	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
	part of individual staff members. N=82					
5	Some inservice activities should be designed around the common needs of the professional staff. N=82	0	4	90	200	3.59
6	Staff members should have a major say in determining what their inservice program is to be. N=82	0	4	114	168	3.49
7	Most inservice programs should arise from a study of needs and problems identified by staff members. N=82	1	4	108	172	3.48
8	Inservice education should help the staff become more sensitive to what is happening in his/her assignment. N=82	2	10	96	172	3.41
9	Some inservice activities should be conducted by staff members and ad-	2	8	111	156	3.38

TABLE V (continued)

Rank	Item	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
10	ministrators of AEA #13. N=82 Inservice education should provide a staff member with the opportunity to prepare for career advancement if a staff member wishes to do so. N=82	0	18	117	136	3.31
11	Inservice education should result in the improvement of assignment performance. N=82	1	10	132	128	3.30
12	Inservice education activities for staff members have included administrators. N=82	3	22	99	140	3.22
13	Inservice education should help improve relationships among the professional AEA staff. N=82	3	20	123	112	3.15
14	The financial support of inservice education should be given high priority. N=82	4	22	111	120	3.13

TABLE V (continued)

Rank	Item	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
15	Directors should provide leadership in planning inservice activities. N=82	0	30	153	64	3.01
16	Administrators in any AEA have been involved in separate inservice activities focusing on administrative responsibilities. N=82	8	30	111	88	2.89
17	Every staff member should be required to participate in some inservice activities. N=82	4	44	108	80	2.88
18	Most inservice activities should be carried on within the AEA in which the staff member works. N=82	0	62	141	16	2.67
19	Every staff member should be involved in a continuous or on-going inservice education program. N=82	8	54	93	64	2.67
20	Inservice efforts should focus on a few areas at a	11	34	129	44	2.65

TABLE V (continued)

Rank	Item	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Disagree	Probably Disagree	Probably Agree	Agree	
21	time rather than a mixture of offerings. N=82 Inservice education activities should be planned on an AEA-wide basis than at the individual program level. N=82	9	78	69	44	2.44

given to the statements below. These statements could be used to describe what most staff members view as the important ingredients of a successful inservice program.

a. Inservice programs should include special activities to orient new staff members to the Area Education Agency.

b. Inservice education programs should be based on specific objectives.

c. Inservice activities should provide opportunities to become acquainted with new teaching techniques/innovations.

d. Inservice programs should include a variety of activities which allow the different interests and needs that exist on the part of individual staff members to be considered.

e. Some inservice activities should be designed around the common needs of the professional staff.

f. Staff members should have a major say in determining what their inservice program is to be.

All of the items except 21 received more positive than negative responses. Items ranked low indicate that respondents would prefer programs to be on an individual rather than an Area Education Agency-wide basis, and to be a mixture rather than tightly focused. Also, continuous ongoing programs may not be necessary, and inservice may not need to be carried on in the Area Education Agency in which the staff member works.

5. Purposes of Inservice Education

Seven statements concerning the purposes of inservice education were presented, and respondents were asked to choose the three they believed to be the most important. Respondents were asked to rank their choices. Overall, the respondents ranked the seven definitions as follows: A purpose of inservice education is,

- (1) to keep staff members up-to-date on the latest developments in instructional techniques;
- (2) professional growth and development;
- (3) the exchange of information, ideas, and resources among participants;
- (4) to help the staff members become more sensitive to what is happening in the classroom and to support the teacher's efforts to improve upon what he/she is doing;
- (5) to equip staff members with specific skills or to change specific aspects of the staff member's behavior in the Area Education Agency;
- (6) to provide training for career development;
- (7) to identify and correct things that are wrong with the way in which staff members now teach.

6. Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice Activities

The opinionnaire included a set of questions about who presently assumes the responsibility for initiating and planning inservice activities in the Area Education Agency, and a set of questions about who should assume the responsibility.

An analysis of Table VI reveals that fifty-one respondents indicated that the Area Education Agency administrators were responsible for initiating and planning inservice activities, but only thirty-two respondents believed they should be--a difference of nineteen points.

TABLE VI

RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATING AND PLANNING INSERVICE ACTIVITIES AS PERCEIVED BY AEA PERSONNEL

Person or Group	Persons Who are Responsible	Persons Who Should Be	Difference
Administration	51	32	-19
Interested Staff Members	46	64	+18
Division Directors	45	50	+ 5
Professional Consultants	28	49	+21
Local Association Members	10	23	+13
College/University Personnel	6	16	+10
Board Members	3	7	+4

Respondents recommended more involvement for all other persons and agencies--professional consultants, interested staff members,

local association members, college and university personnel, division directors, and even board members.

7. Scheduling of Inservice Education

Respondents were asked when their inservice activities had been scheduled, and when they believed inservice activities should be scheduled. Table VII shows that 94 percent of the inservice education activities are scheduled during working hours but, for the most part, there is an even division in the preference for scheduling inservice activities during the summer and during the evening.

TABLE VII

RESPONSES TO WHEN INSERVICE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES ARE SCHEDULED AND WHEN THEY SHOULD BE SCHEDULED

Schedule	Are Scheduled		Should be Scheduled		Difference
	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Time	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Time	
During Working Hours	51	94	50	76	+18
Before and After Working Hours	30	15	31	18	- 3
Saturdays & Sundays	9	27	18	15	+12
During Summers	16	24	13	16	+ 8
During Evenings	30	12	22	16	- 4

8. Compensation for Inservice

Respondents were asked if they should be compensated for time spent in inservice activities held outside the regular work day. Fifty persons responded "yes," nine persons responded "no," and twenty-five persons indicated that the compensation should be shared.

Respondents were asked what types of inservice activities they should be compensated for; the responses are shown on Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

TYPES OF INSERVICE ACTIVITIES STAFF
MEMBERS SHOULD BE COMPENSATED FOR

Types of Compensation	Number of Respondents
Expenses to attend professional meetings, travel, workshop projects, and the like	50
Released time from work to compensate for time spent on inservice	46
Stipends and expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshop projects, etc.	30
College credit	25
Advancement or salary schedule	23
Credit for certificate renewal	19
Tuition allotment	16
Subscription for professional journals	12

Table VIII shows that respondents hold a variety of views about how staff members should be compensated, ranging from expenses to attend

professional meetings to subscriptions for professional journals.

Respondents were asked, "Does the Area Education Agency compensate you for the time spent on inservice activities held outside the regular school day?" Fifteen respondents indicated "yes" while fifty respondents answered "no." The fifteen indicated that they had been compensated for expenses for professional meetings, travel, and workshops.

Table IX shows the number of respondents who indicated how they were compensated for activities ranging from expenses for professional meetings to subscriptions to professional journals.

TABLE IX

TYPES OF COMPENSATION FOR TIME SPENT ON INSERVICE
ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE REGULAR SCHOOL DAY

Types of Compensation	Number of Respondents
Expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops	15
Stipends and expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops, projects, etc.	6
Released time from work to compensate for time spent on inservice	5
Credit for certificate renewal	3
Advancement on salary schedule	3
College credit	2
Tuition allotment	2
Subscription for professional journals	2

9. Follow-up Activities

Respondents were asked to describe the follow-up activities to inservice education conducted by the Area Education Agency, by indicating as many of the statements that were applicable. These data are shown on Table X.

TABLE X

RESPONSES CONCERNING FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES TO
INSERVICE EDUCATION IN AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

Activities	Percent Responding
Follow-up activities appear to be the responsibility of the individual participant.	38
Follow-up seems to be haphazard and left to chance.	37
No follow-up activities occur.	15
Follow-up is usually accomplished by asking the inservice consultants or the instructors.	11
Follow-up activities include the development of a written report.	10
Follow-up is usually done in the Area Education Agency with assistance from administrators.	6
Follow-up activities usually include a series of meetings or conferences for those who attend the inservice activities.	6

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that follow-up activities appear to be the responsibility of the individual

participant; 37 percent indicated that follow-up seems to be haphazard and left to chance; and 15 percent indicated that there was no follow-up to inservice activities.

10. Participation in Inservice

Respondents were asked to indicate how often their participation in inservice education had been restricted by each of the selected conditions presented in the opinionnaire.

The respondents indicated that most of the conditions listed were not serious obstacles in their own experiences of participation in inservice education. Table XI shows that respondents believed the most severe restrictions were getting released from the Area Education Agency, discouragement of administrators, shortage of interesting programs, and a hesitancy to ask extra work of colleagues. Spare time, lack of interest among colleagues, and domestic responsibilities were not seen as restrictions.

TABLE XI

RESTRICTIONS TO PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Factors	Rating Scale				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	
1	It is difficult to get released from AEA for inservice. N=63	19	38	48	36	2.24
2	Administrators discourage me from	10	26	51	68	2.71

TABLE XI (continued)

Rank	Factors	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Rarely	
	attending inservice activities. N=57					
3	I find a shortage of inservice programs I am interested in attending. N=66	0	54	81	48	2.77
4	I hesitate to ask extra work of colleagues to I can attend. N=55	14	4	42	100	2.91
5	Inservice activities are scheduled at inconvenient times. N=66	0	28	123	44	2.95
6	I dislike being away from my assignment. N=63	0	26	114	48	2.98
7	Nothing has ever happened as a result of inservice. N=64	0	38	75	80	3.02
8	My cost (I can't afford to attend. N=63	7	18	72	92	3.00
9	My past experience with inservice education has been poor. N=63	1	24	99	68	3.05
10	I am often too tired or have	2	26	69	100	3.05

TABLE XI (continued)

Rank	Factors	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Rarely	
	too much work to do. N=63					
11	No incentive to attend. N=63	2	24	69	104	3.16
12	Other activities prevent me from attending. N=63	3	8	60	144	3.41
13	My domestic responsibilities. N=62	0	10	63	144	3.50
14	Lack of interest among my colleagues. N=63	0	8	60	156	3.56
15	Spare time activities prevent me from attending. N=61	0	2	66	152	3.61

11. Inservice Resources

The respondents were asked to indicate the effectiveness of twelve selected sources of inservice education. The staff members were asked to measure the effectiveness of the resources in terms of the contribution each had made toward the improvement of teaching.

Table XII indicates that those resources deemed to be most effective were: other staff members; the divisions of special education, media, and educational services; and professional journals and profes-

TABLE XII
SOURCES OF EFFECTIVE INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Factors	1 Ineffective	2 Not Very Effective	3 Effective	4 Highly Effective	Mean
1	Other Staff Members. N=71	1	20	141	52	3.01
2	Professional Organiza- tions. N=71	8	24	126	36	2.73
3	Division of Special Educ., Media, and Educ. Services. N=71	1	50	123	16	2.68
4	Professional Journals. N=71	12	16	126	36	2.68
5	Colleges and Universities. N=71	13	16	108	56	2.72
6	Professional Consultants. N=71	11	34	111	24	2.54
7	Research Studies. N=71	17	36	90	24	2.35
8	Community and Social Agencies. N=71	20	56	63	8	2.07

TABLE XII (continued)

Rank	Factors	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Ineffective	2 Not Very Effective	3 Effective	4 Highly Effective	
9	School Administrators. N=71	25	16	99	0	1.97
10	Members of Community. N=71	31	54	36	4	1.76
11	Inservice Programs or ETV. N=71	48	30	39	4	1.70
12	Educational Sales Representatives. N=71	42	28	42	4	1.63

sional organizations. Those believed to be least effective were educational sales representatives, inservice programs or ETV, members of the community, and school administrators.

Overall, there appeared to be a question as to the effectiveness of all the resources listed, in the minds of the respondents.

12. Obstacles to Implementing New Ideas

Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of seriousness that each of nine selected obstacles presented to the staff's implementation of new ideas learned through inservice education.

Table XIII shows that lack of time was by far the major obstacle to implementing new ideas, followed by lack of money and administrators. Board and other staff members were thought to be the least serious obstacles to the implementation of new ideas.

13. Problems of Inservice Education

Each respondent was asked to rate forty-six potential problems as critical, serious, moderate, or negligible to their teaching situations. The responses were summarized with the most serious problem listed first and the last serious problem listed last. These data are shown on Table XIV, page 58.

TABLE XIII
 OBSTACLES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW IDEAS THAT
 WERE LEARNED THROUGH INSERVICE EDUCATION

Rank	Potential Obstacles	Degree of Seriousness				Mean
		Rating Scale				
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
1	Lack of time. N=67	2	40	72	84	2.96
2	Lack of money. N=70	14	56	72	16	2.26
3	Administrators. N=68	23	54	42	16	1.99
4	Plant and equipment. N=67	22	56	39	16	1.99
5	Level of interest or commitment on my part. N=70	34	54	12	20	1.71
6	Students. N=66	35	48	15	8	1.61
7	Parents. N=68	39	44	18	4	1.54
8	Other staff members. N=69	50	26	15	4	1.38
9	Board. N=65	49	26	6	4	1.31

The categories considered to be relatively more serious problem areas by the respondents were: physical facilities of the school, too much time needed for non-instructional duties, lack of communication in the Area Education Agency, and confusion among people in the school districts about the goals of the Area Education Agency.

The least potential problems were: assignment in a non-preferred area, lack of freedom to teach what I want to teach, helping students learn to use their leisure time well, and the rapid rate of curriculum change. Table XIV presents the problem areas and their respective ratings.

14. Inservice Topics

Respondents were asked to indicate (a) whether or not each of seventy-five inservice topics had been covered by an inservice education program in which they had participated during the past two years; (b) the extent of their knowledge of each of the inservice topics presented; and (c) their interest in each of the selected inservice topics for future inservice education.

Table XV, page 64, shows, in rank order, respondents' interest in, knowledge of, and involvement in seventy-five inservice education topics.

The first analysis of these data involved comparing the relative ranking so far as interest in and knowledge of each topic. For example, the most extreme difference between a high interest but low knowledge was item 13, "Crisis intervention." Respondents ranked this topic thirteen in interest, but fifty-two in knowledge of, a difference

TABLE XIV

SERIOUSNESS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEMS

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
1	The physical facilities of the school limit my program. N=70	18	28	63	68	2.53
2	Too much time needed for non-instructional duties. N=62	15	32	51	56	2.48
3	Lack of communication in AEA #13. N=68	9	56	69	32	2.44
4	Confusion among people in the school district about the goals of the AEA. N=71	11	58	60	44	2.44
5	Extending learning beyond the classroom. N=56	14	38	42	36	2.32
6	Too many students to work with each day. N=64	24	28	57	28	2.14
7	Not enough time for preparation. N=68	22	48	51	20	2.07
8	Staff morale. N=72	27	48	30	44	2.07
9	The amount of instructional material available. N=71	21	66	36	20	2.01

TABLE XIV (continued)

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
10	The pressure I feel that I am under much of the time. N=69	28	42	39	28	1.99
11	The quality of instructional materials available. N=71	22	66	33	20	1.99
12	Poor staff member-administrator rapport. N=71	29	44	42	24	1.96
13	Too many students are indifferent to school. N=55	20	40	39	8	1.95
14	How to encourage parental interest in school. N=65	23	52	39	12	1.94
15	Helping students feel successful in school. N=56	26	28	39	12	1.88
16	Constantly changing school policies and rules. N=56	28	26	27	24	1.88
17	Diagnosing student learning problems. N=59	22	54	21	12	1.85
18	My lack of knowledge about appropriate instructional materials. N=70	25	68	30	4	1.81

TABLE XIV (continued)

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
19	Understanding the role of the AEA administrator. N=70	33	42	39	12	1.80
20	Providing for individual learning. N=60	33	22	33	20	1.80
21	There are few opportunities to improve my professional skills. N=70	34	46	33	8	1.73
22	Providing students with opportunities to make choices and develop responsibility. N=54	24	44	21	4	1.72
23	Maintaining student attention. N=56	26	46	15	8	1.70
24	Creating interest in the topic(s) required. N=54	27	40	15	8	1.67
25	Assessing my students learning. N=58	30	40	15	12	1.67
26	Promoting student self-evaluation. N=50	26	34	15	8	1.66

TABLE XIV (continued)

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
27	Evaluating student progress. N=60	36	26	21	16	1.65
28	Not enough free time. N=60	35	30	18	16	1.65
29	Poor community attitude toward staff members and the education profession. N=68	32	58	18	4	1.65
30	Students with health and nutritional problems. N=54	32	24	24	8	1.63
31	The school administration provides little assistance to me for problems. N=62	35	38	18	8	1.60
32	I know little about the home situation of my students. N=62	33	44	18	4	1.60
33	The inflexible routine of my teaching situation. N=52	32	26	18	4	1.54
34	Too great a range of student achievement in classes. N=46	28	26	9	8	1.54

TABLE XIV (continued)

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
35	Conducting effective parent teacher conferences. N=58	36	28	21	4	1.53
36	The total climate of the school is not conducive to learning. N=57	37	26	15	8	1.51
37	Reporting students' performance to parents. N=60	38	34	12	4	1.47
38	Parents do not understand my problems as an AEA staff member. N=64	40	38	12	4	1.47
39	The required curriculum is not relevant. N=44	30	22	6	4	1.41
40	The values and attitudes of students makes it difficult to relate. N=56	39	32	3	0	1.32
41	Students who lack respect for other people and property. N=51	42	8	12	4	1.29
42	The diverse ethnic background					

TABLE XIV (continued)

Rank	Problem	Rating Scale				Mean
		1 Negligible	2 Moderate	3 Serious	4 Critical	
43	The rapid rate of curriculum change frustrates me. N=49	43	6	6	4	1.20
44	Helping students learn to use their leisure time well. N=42	34	16	0	0	1.19
45	The lack of freedom to teach what I want to teach. N=49	42	10	6	0	1.18
46	My assignment is not in my preferred area of preparation. N=52	47	8	3	0	1.12

of thirty-nine. Conversely, the most extreme difference between a high knowledge of, but low interest in, was item 72, "Using behavioral objectives in planning." Respondents ranked this topic seventy-second in interest, but second in knowledge of.

When a topic is ranked high in interest in, but low in knowledge of, this suggests that an inservice education activity concerning this topic would be useful to the respondents. The following topics had a difference of more than twenty-five points and would appear to fall into this category.

TABLE XV

RESPONDENTS INTEREST IN, KNOWLEDGE OF, AND
INVOLVEMENT IN 75 INSERVICE EDUCATION
TOPICS, BY RANK ORDER

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Your teaching subject. N=73	1	1	2
Test and measurement techniques. N=76	2	3	3
Identification and diagnosis of learning disabilities. N=78	3	10	9
Counseling techniques. N=77	4	20	17
Identification and diagnosis of students' reading problems. N=78	5	25	45
The special education child in the regular classroom. N=74	6	18	19
Utilizing community resources. N=79	7	36	31
Techniques for ob- serving and recording study behavior. N=77	8	13	24
Student self-concept development. N=78	9	28	33
Providing for stu- dents with limited social development. N=76	10	42	63

TABLE XV (continued)

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Activities that foster creativity. N=78	11	46	32
Multi-disciplinary approaches. N=71	12	16	12
Crisis intervention. N=76	13	52	47
Achievement motivation. N=75	14	17	53
Providing for students with limited academic development. N=75	15	31	35
Interpersonal communication. N=75	16	6	5
Behavior Modification. N=78	17	4	7
Alternative education programs. N=75	18	43	26
Reinforcement techniques. N=77	19	5	22
Law-related education progress. N=75	20	53	18
Parent involvement. N=77	21	12	13
Individualized instruction. N=75	22	8	6
Discipline. N=78	23	14	48
Monitoring student progress. N=75	24	11	15

TABLE XV (continued)

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Questioning techniques. N=76	25	23	34
Techniques for dealing with students with cultural differences. N=74	26	50	61
Role clarification of AEA personnel. N=74	27	27	20
Discovering learning/open-ended instruction. N=75	28	64	46
Humanizing the classroom. N=74	29	24	21
IGE (Individually Guided Education). N=74	30	59	36
Community relations. N=73	31	33	62
Communication within the school. N=74	32	32	23
Teacher-student relations. N=73	33	34	49
Values clarification. N=74	34	35	8
Group dynamics techniques. N=75	35	49	44
Teaching techniques involving students. N=75	36	57	42

TABLE XV (continued)

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Programmed instruction. N=74	37	26	28
Self-evaluation techniques for teachers. N=75	38	56	27
Application of learning theory in the classroom. N=75	39	22	60
Team planning. N=76	40	29	16
Learning centers. N=78	41	41	39
Staff member-made instructional materials. N=77	42	37	14
Translating student and teacher needs into goals and objectives. N=75	43	9	10
Simulation and gaming. N=76	43	9	10
Teacher-student cooperation. N=74	45	65	70
Utilization of educational television. N=78	46	62	29
Students tutoring students. N=77	47	58	67
Use of AV materials in the classroom and assignment. N=77	48	39	1

TABLE XV (continued)

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Conducting parent-teacher conferences. N=77	49	7	30
Grouping for instruction. N=75	50	30	51
Programs, articulation/coordination. N=76	51	70	58
Nongraded school approach. N=75	52	61	65
Organization and direction of role-playing activities (social drama). N=78	53	44	25
Sexism. N=72	54	21	56
Moral education. N=75	55	55	69
Computer-assisted instruction. N=76	56	74	50
Dial-access and laboratories. N=75	57	75	75
Evaluation for teachers. N=76	58	48	52
Differentiated staffing. N=74	59	69	38
Year-round school. N=75	60	72	74
Curriculum study and development. N=79	61	60	37

TABLE XV (continued)

Topic	Rank		
	Interest In	Knowledge Of	Involvement Past Two Years
Techniques for integrating social issues in the curriculum. N=76	62	68	71
Supervisor of student teachers. N=75	63	67	73
Open classroom. N=75	64	45	64
Team teaching techniques. N=77	65	47	59
Utilizing teacher aids in the classroom. N=77	66	54	54
Racism. N=74	67	40	55
Volunteer aide program. N=75	68	63	68
Grading and reporting. N=73	69	19	40
Record keeping. N=76	70	15	11
Anecdoted record. N=77	71	38	43
Using behavioral objectives in planning. N=78	72	2	4
Micro-teaching techniques. N=74	73	73	72
Text book evaluation. N=75	74	71	57
Use of bulletin boards, displays, etc. N=78	75	51	66

Item Number	Topic	Point Difference
13	Crisis Intervention	39
28	Discovering learning/open-ended instruction	36
11	Activities that foster creativity	35
20	Law related education progress	33
10	Providing for students with limited social development	32
7	Utilizing community resources	29
30	IGE (Individually Guided Education)	29
18	Alternative education programs	25

When a topic is ranked high in knowledge of, but low in interest in, this suggests that an inservice activity concerning this topic would be essentially useless or superfluous to respondents. The following topics had a difference of more than 25 points and would appear to fall into this category.

Item Number	Topic	Point Difference
72	Using behavioral objectives in planning	70
70	Record Keeping	55
69	Grading and reporting	50
49	Conducting parent-teacher conferences	42
43	Translating student and teacher needs into goals and objectives	34
54	Sexism	33

Item Number	Topic	Point Difference
71	Anecdoted record	33
67	Racism	27

A careful examination of the data contained in the table reveals several topics that respondents appear to have mastered. This suggests that additional inservice education activities concerned with these topics should be discontinued or, at the very least, delayed for several years. Item number 1, for example, was first in interest in, first in knowledge of, and first in involvement in the past two years. Item number 12 is less dramatic, but the data suggest respondents have already been served. Item number 12 was twelfth in interest in, sixteenth in knowledge of, and twelfth in involvement in. In laymen terms, things seem to be going along okay in this area. Activities in another area might be seen as more useful. The following topics seem to fall into the above category:

Item Number	Topic
1	Your teaching subject
2	Test and measurements techniques
3	Identification and diagnosis of learning disabilities
5	Identification and diagnosis of students' reading problems
6	The special education child in the regular classroom
9	Student self-concept development
12	Multi-disciplinary approaches

Chapter V presents the conclusions and recommendations of this study.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study, limited to the professional staff of the Area Education Agency, was designed to meet specific needs of this agency. The opinionnaire was sent to one hundred staff members and returned by eighty-two. As a result of the data analyzed, the following conclusions are made:

1. Respondents are involved in a wide range of inservice activities. The most common are those planned by local staff and administrators.

2. Respondents found several inservice activities to be useful, but ranked low those planned by local staff and administrators. Useful activities were those offered by non-Area Education Agency staff.

3. Respondents prefer inservice activities where persons present structured material to them as contrasted to activities that are unstructured.

4. Respondents believe Area Education Agency inservice activities are not well-planned or continuous, have not resulted in improving the curriculum of their schools, feel staff members have no major voice in determining inservice activities, have not improved morale, are not relevant to their assigned needs, and are highly inadequate so far as orienting new staff members and having sound follow-up activities.

5. Respondents believe inservice activities should be made available to new staff members, based on specific needs, be varied but

practical, and allows staff members to have a major say in determining what their inservice program is to be.

6. Respondents believe administrators should be less involved than they are in initiating and planning inservice activities, and that professional consultants and interested staff members should be more involved.

7. Respondents believe staff members should receive some type of compensation for inservice activities, but the type of compensation desired is varied.

8. Follow-up activities are not well-managed--they are either left to the individual or to chance--or simply never occur.

9. The two major restrictions to engaging in inservice activities respondents encounter are that it is difficult to get released from the Area Education Agency for inservice, and administrators discourage attendance.

10. Obstacles to the implementation of new ideas that were learned in inservice were lack of time, lack of money, administrators, and plant and equipment.

11. Considering the data regarding interest in, knowledge of, and involvement in, the following findings appear relevant:

a. In rank order, these topics would be useful in inservice activities: crisis intervention, discovering learning/open-ended instruction, activities that foster creativity, law-related education progress, providing for students with limited social development, utilizing community resources, IGE, and alternative education programs.

b. In rank order, these topics would be useless or superfluous: using behavioral objectives in planning, record keeping,

grading and reporting, conducting parent-teacher conferences, translating student and teacher needs into goals and objectives, sexism, anecdotal record, and racism.

c. These topics seem to be mastered and should not be offered in the immediate future: your teaching subject, test and measurement techniques, identification and diagnosis of learning disabilities, reading problems, the special education child in the regular classroom, student self-concept development, and multi-disciplinary approaches.

The following recommendations are based on data presented and will attempt to reflect the findings discussed in the conclusions. The recommendations will be given to the administration and the Inservice Committee of the Area Education Agency.

1. The Area Education Agency should consider a complete re-examination of its inservice program. The overall impression one gains from analyzing the data is that the present system is not relevant or well-organized.

2. Specifically, the Area Education Agency should seek out and encourage staff members to assume the responsibility for initiating inservice education, rather than having it imposed on them by administrators. The administration should consider a variety of options that lessen their involvement.

3. The Area Education Agency should develop a systematic method for orienting new staff members.

4. The Area Education Agency should develop a more effective method of follow-up of inservice activities.

5. Outside professional consultants should be used as much as possible in conducting inservice education activities.

6. The Area Education Agency should compensate those who attend inservice activities in-state or out-of-state, by paying their expenses.

7. The Area Education Agency should plan to hold as many inservice activities as possible during working hours.

8. A specific study should be conducted to determine the validity of the finding regarding restrictions on staff engagement in inservice activities; namely, difficulty in getting released from the AEA and being discouraged by administrators.

9. The topics offered for inservice should be consistent with the findings reported in this study; that is, the topics reported in the last section of Chapter IV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Bush, Robert. "Curriculum-Proof Teachers: Who Does What to Whom," in Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Ed. by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1959.
- Hall, G.E., A.A. George, W.L. Rutherford. Measuring Stages of Concern about the Innovation: A Manual for Use of the SoC Questionnaire. Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1977.
- Kaufman, Roger. Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, in Association with 18 Contributing Authors. Handbook of Successful School Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Rubin, Louis J. Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

PERIODICALS AND JOURNALS

- Ainsworth, Barbara. "Teachers Talk About Inservice Education," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXVII, 1976. Pp. 107-09.
- Firth, Gerald, R. "Ten Issues on Staff Development," Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXV, December, 1977. Pp. 215-21.
- Fuller, Frances F. "Concerns of Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. VI, March, 1976. Pp. 207-26.
- Ingersall, Gary M. "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXVII, 1976. Pp. 169-75.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey and Paul Berman. "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment," Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXV, December, 1977. Pp. 191-95.

Zigarami, Patricia, Loren Betz, and Darrell Jensen. "Teacher Preferences in and Perception of Inservice Education," Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXV, April, 1977. Pp. 545-51.

REPORTS

- Asher, James J. Inservice Education: Psychological Perspectives. Berkeley, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967. ERIC No. Ed-015-891.
- Edelfelt, Roy. Inservice Teacher Education - Sources in the ERIC System. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1975. ERIC No. Ed-099-308.
- Howey, Kenneth R. "Minneapolis Public Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center: Inservice Training for Open Classroom Teachers," in Creative Authority and Collaboration: Inservice Teacher Education Report IV. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976. ERIC No. Ed-129-735.
- Joyce, Bruce. Issues to Face: Inservice Teacher Education Report I. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976. ERIC No. Ed-129-733.
- Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art. Summary of Research on Material and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Department of Instruction, 1974.
- Montbello Unified School District. Professional Growth Record. Montbello, California, 1961.
- National Education Association, Research Division. Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-71. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. ERIC No. Ed-022-728.
- Nicholson, Alexander, et al. The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education: An Analytic Review. Inservice Education Report III. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976. ERIC No. Ed-129-734.
- Withins, Ruth. An Analysis of Needs Assessment Techniques for Educational Planners at State, Intermediate and District Levels. Hayward, California: Office of County Superintendent of Schools, Alameda County, 1975. ERIC No. Ed-129-735.
- Yarger, Sam (Ed.). Creative Authority and Collaboration: Inservice Teacher Education Report IV. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976. ERIC No. Ed-129-735.

◇

APPENDICES

♠

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER
and
OPINIONNAIRE

COVER LETTER

TO: Professional Employees

SUBJECT: Opinionnaire for Improving Inservice Education

The Area Education Agency #13 Professional Inservice Education Committee is co-sponsoring a comprehensive agency study of the professional attitudes toward inservice education. The Inservice Committee has approved an opinionnaire that was modified for our purposes from an instrument used with teachers in South Dakota.

The Committee has agreed that the opinionnaire be disseminated in two sections, with the first part as an attachment to this letter. The information you provide us in answering the opinionnaire will be used by the Committee in planning more effective inservice programs. Since the information that is collected will be compiled for this Agency, your individual responses will be kept confidential. Your name is requested on the first portion of the opinionnaire so that we may keep track of returns and for follow-up.

Please return this opinionnaire on or before December 20. By filling out an opinionnaire for this study, we think you will make an important contribution to improving Inservice Education in this Agency.

Thank you for sharing your opinions.

Sincerely,

/signed/

Assistant Administrator

Respondent's Name _____

I. Personal Data

Please provide the following information about yourself by checking the appropriate blank and completing the requested information.

1. What is the assignment level at which you are currently doing most of your activities? _____
2. How many years have you been with the AEA? _____
3. Is this assignment your intended career-long occupation?
 1. _____ Yes
 2. _____ No
4. What is your present degree status?

1. _____ Non-degree	4. _____ Specialist
2. _____ Bachelors	5. _____ Ph.D. or Ed.D.
3. _____ Masters	

II. Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice activities.

Initiating is defined as providing the original idea and impetus for making inservice education available.

Planning is defined as determining what inservice is needed, how it will be conducted, and the follow-up and evaluation scheme to be employed.

INITIATING NOTE: IN THE FOLLOWING LIST, CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

	In AEA #13, Who Presently Assumes Responsibility for Initiating Inservice	In Your Opinion, Who Should Assume Responsibility for Initiating Inservice
1. Administration	_____	_____
2. Board Members	_____	_____
3. Interested Staff Members	_____	_____
4. Local Association Members	_____	_____
5. College & University Personnel	_____	_____
6. Division Directors	_____	_____
7. Professional Consultants	_____	_____
8. Other (Specify)	_____	_____

	In AEA #13, Who Presently Assumes Responsibility for Planning Inservice	In Your Opinion, Who Should Assume Responsibility for Planning Inservice
1. Administrators	_____	_____
2. Board Members	_____	_____
3. Interested Staff Members	_____	_____
4. Local Association Members	_____	_____
5. College & University Personnel	_____	_____
6. Division Directors	_____	_____
7. Professional Consultants	_____	_____
8. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____

III. Scheduling of Inservice Education

Approximately what percent of your past inservice activities HAVE been scheduled during each of the time periods listed below? Include staff meetings planned especially for inservice. (Total should add up to 100 percent.)

- _____ Percent during regular working hours during 9-month academic year
- _____ Percent inservice before and after regular working hours during regular academic year
- _____ Percent on Saturday and Sunday
- _____ Percent during summers
- _____ Percent during evening hours
- _____ Percent other (specify) _____

Approximately what percent of inservice activities SHOULD be scheduled during each of the time periods listed below? (Total should add up to 100 percent.)

- _____ Percent during regular working hours during 9-month academic year
- _____ Percent inservice before and after regular working hours during regular academic year
- _____ Percent on Saturday and Sunday
- _____ Percent during summers
- _____ Percent during evening hours
- _____ Percent other (specify) _____

IV. Compensation for Inservice

Does the AEA compensate you for the time spent with inservice activities held outside the regular school day?

1. _____ Yes 2. _____ No

If you responded "yes", how ARE you compensated? Check all of the following that apply.

- _____ 1. Released time from work to compensate for time spent on inservice
- _____ 2. College credit
- _____ 3. Credit for certificate renewal
- _____ 4. Tuition allotment
- _____ 5. Advancement on salary schedule
- _____ 6. Expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops, projects, etc.
- _____ 7. Stipends & expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops, projects, etc.
- _____ 8. Subscriptions for professional journals
- _____ 9. Other (please specify) _____

Do you think staff members should be compensated for time spent with inservice activities held outside the regular work day? (Check one)

- _____ 1. Yes, staff members should be compensated
- _____ 2. No, staff members should not be compensated
- _____ 3. I would be willing to give up some personal time if the AEA was willing to reimburse me for the time I would spend

If you responded "yes", how do you think staff members should be compensated. Check all of the following that apply.

- _____ 1. Released time from work to compensate for time spent on inservice
- _____ 2. College credit
- _____ 3. Credit for certificate renewal
- _____ 4. Tuition allotment
- _____ 5. Advancement on salary schedule
- _____ 6. Expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops, projects, etc.

- _____ 7. Stipends & expenses for professional meetings, travel, workshops, projects, etc.
- _____ 8. Subscriptions for professional journals
- _____ 9. Other (please specify) _____

V. Follow-up Activities

Which of the following best describes the follow-up activities to inservice education conducted in AEA #13? Check all that apply.

- _____ 1. Follow-up is usually done in the AEA with assistance from administrators
- _____ 2. Follow-up is usually accomplished by asking the inservice consultants or instructors
- _____ 3. Follow-up activities usually include a series of meetings or conferences for those who attended the inservice activities
- _____ 4. Follow-up activities include the development of a written report
- _____ 5. Follow-up activities appear to be the responsibility of the individual participant
- _____ 6. Follow-up seems to be haphazard and left to chance
- _____ 7. No follow-up activities occur
- _____ 8. Other, please describe _____
- _____
- _____

VI. Participation in Inservice

To what degree has your participation in inservice programs been restricted by the following conditions? Check a response for each item.

	1	2	3	4
	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely
1. By cost (I can't afford to attend)	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. By domestic responsibilities	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. I hesitate to ask extra work of colleagues so I can attend	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Other activities prevent me from attending	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. I am often too tired or have too much work to do	_____	_____	_____	_____

	1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Rarely
6. Spare time activities prevent me from attending	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. I find a shortage of the kinds of inservice programs I am interested in attending	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. It is difficult to get released from AEA for inservice	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Administrators discourage me from attending inservice activities	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Inservice activities are scheduled at inconvenient times	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Lack of interest among my colleagues	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. My past experiences with inservice education have been poor	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. I dislike being away from my assignment	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. No incentives to attend	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. Nothing has ever happened as a result of inservice	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Other (specify) _____ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

VII. Inservice Resources

How would you rate the following resources as to the contribution they have made toward helping you to become a better staff member through inservice activities?

	0 Non- Existent	1 Ineffective	2 Not Very Effective	3 Effective	4 Highly Effective
1. Division of Special Ed., Media & Ed. Services	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Colleges & universities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Professional consultants	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Research studies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Professional journals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

0 1 2 3 4
 Non- Ineffective Not Very Effective Effective
 Existent Effective Effective Effective

6.	Professional organizations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	School administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	Other staff members	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	Community and social agencies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	Members of the community	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11.	Educational sales representative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12.	Inservice programs on ETV	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13.	Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

VIII. Obstacles to Implementing New Ideas

Each of the following is an obstacle to implementing new ideas learned in inservice activities for some staff members. Check each item to the degree it is an obstacle for you.

1. Critical obstacle - has crucial effect
2. Serious obstacle - has considerable effect
3. Moderate obstacle - has limited effect
4. Negligible obstacle - has little or no effect

		1	2	3	4
		Degree of Seriousness			
		Critical	Serious	Moderate	Negligible
1.	Lack of time				
2.	Students				
3.	Parents				
4.	Administrators				
5.	Other staff members				
6.	Plant & equipment				
7.	Lack of money				
8.	Board				

		1	2	3	4
		Degree of Seriousness			
		Critical	Serious	Moderate	Negligible
9.	Level of interest or commitment on my part	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

IX. Types of Inservice Education

Please respond to each item in the usefulness to you column as follows:

1. Not Useful, and could not apply ideas learned in this inservice activity.
2. Somewhat Useful, and applied some of the ideas in my assignment.
3. Useful, but was not able to implement the ideas in my assignment.
4. Very Useful, and have implemented many ideas learned in this inservice activity.

Type of Inservice Activity	Involvement During The Past Three Years	<u>Usefulness To Me</u>			
		Not Useful	Some-what Useful	Useful	Very Useful
1. Workshop-block of time set aside during the summer for intensive study of an educational problem in AEA #13.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
2. Workshop-block of time set aside during the work year for intensive study of an educational problem in AEA #13.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
3. Workshop-carried out on a college or university campus.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
4. One day regional workshop involving several AEA's.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
5. Local staff meeting planned by staff specifically for inservice.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
6. Local staff meeting planned by administrators specifically for inservice.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4

Type of Inservice Activity	Involvement During The Past Three Years	Not Useful	Usefulness To Me		
			Some-what Useful	Useful	Very Useful
7. Local staff meeting planned by staff and administrators specifically for inservice.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
8. Full day inservice program conducted by an outside consultant.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
9. Half-day inservice program conducted by an outside consultant.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
10. One-two hour inservice programs conducted by an outside consultant.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
11. Summer school classes for credit.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
12. Observation of staff in other AEA's.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
13. Observation of staff in AEA #13.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
14. Special college courses conducted at AEA #13 by a college or university staff member.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
15. Convention sponsored by professional teachers' organization.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
16. Conference or workshop sponsored by professional teachers' organization.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
17. Assistance from another staff member.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
18. Reading professional education journal.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
19. Bulletins, newsletters, brochures, etc.	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4
20. Presentations by Educational Sales Representatives	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1	2	3	4

In the space below, please indicate the three types of inservice activity that you most prefer. Choose the three from the 22 listed on the previous two pages.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

X. Methods Used in Conducting Inservice

Listed below are a variety of methods used to conduct inservice education activities. Please indicate your feelings of preference for each method listed by circling the appropriate number.

1. A lecture followed by questions from participants.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

2. A lecture followed by group discussion.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

3. Directed small group discussions led by a specialist on the topic under discussion.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

4. Free small group discussions on a topic without designated leadership.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

5. Independent Study.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

6. Work group resulting in production.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

7. Role playing.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

8. Demonstration of materials or techniques.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

9. Brainstorming.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

10. Observation of other staff members.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

11. Assistance from another staff member in your assignment.

1 2 3 4 5

Definitely Dislike

Definitely Like

XI. Inservice Education Provided by AEA #13

Please indicate whether you DISAGREE (1), PROBABLY DISAGREE (2), PROBABLY AGREE (3), or AGREE (4) with each of the following statements concerning your experiences with inservice education provided by your AEA during the past three years.

NOTE: If you are new to AEA #13, please respond with reference to your experiences in your previous assignment.

Mark your answer in the following manner:

If you disagree with the statement, circle "1".

If you probably disagree with the statement, circle "2".

If you probably agree with the statement, circle "3".

If you agree with the statement, circle "4".

PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS!

D PD PA A

1. The inservice education programs in my assignment have been based on specific objectives.

1 2 3 4

PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS!

	<u>D</u>	<u>PD</u>	<u>PA</u>	<u>A</u>
2. Staff members in my assignment have the major say in determining what their inservice program is to be.	1	2	3	4
3. Most inservice programs in my assignment arise from a study of needs and problems identified by staff members.	1	2	3	4
4. Inservice programs in my assignment have included a variety of activities which allowed for the different interests and needs that existed on the part of individual staff members.	1	2	3	4
5. Inservice education activities for staff members in my assignment have included administrators.	1	2	3	4
6. Administrators in my assignment have been involved in separate inservice activities focusing on administrative responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
7. My Director assumes a leadership role in planning inservice activities.	1	2	3	4
8. My performance in my assignment improved as a result of inservice education.	1	2	3	4
9. Every staff member in my assignment has been required to participate in some inservice activities.	1	2	3	4
10. AEA #13 provides adequate inservice activities to orient new staff members to the system.	1	2	3	4
11. Inservice activities in this AEA have provided opportunities to become acquainted with new teaching techniques/innovations.	1	2	3	4
12. In AEA #13, some inservice activities have been designed around the common needs of the professional staff.	1	2	3	4
13. Some inservice activities in AEA #13 are conducted by staff members and administrators of the AEA.	1	2	3	4
14. Inservice education has been given a high priority in AEA #13.	1	2	3	4

PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS!

	<u>D</u>	<u>PD</u>	<u>PA</u>	<u>A</u>
15. Inservice education in AEA #13 has helped me become more sensitive to what is happening in my assignment.	1	2	3	4
16. In AEA #13, inservice education activities are more frequently planned on a AEA basis than at the individual program level.	1	2	3	4
17. Inservice education in AEA #13 has helped improve relationships among the professional staff.	1	2	3	4
18. The administrators of AEA #13 demonstrate a real interest in inservice education.	1	2	3	4
19. There are usually follow-up activities to the inservice programs in AEA #13.	1	2	3	4
20. Inservice activities in AEA #13 have been evaluated.	1	2	3	4
21. Inservice activities in AEA #13 detract from the time that should be devoted to my assignment.	1	2	3	4
22. Inservice activities required by AEA #13 have cut into my personal time.	1	2	3	4
23. The inservice program supported by AEA #13 contributes to the improvement of staff morale.	1	2	3	4
24. Inservice activities in AEA #13 have been well planned and continuous.	1	2	3	4
25. The curriculum in my school has been improved as a result of our inservice education program.	1	2	3	4
26. I feel that I have had an adequate amount of freedom to participate in planning inservice education programs in AEA #13.	1	2	3	4
27. The topics undertaken for discussion in our inservice education sessions have been highly relevant to my assignment needs.	1	2	3	4
28. My assignment has improved as a result of the inservice activities in AEA #13.	1	2	3	4

YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

Respondent's Name _____

I. Responsibility for Initiating and Planning Inservice Activities.

Initiating is defined as providing the original idea and impetus for making inservice education available.

Planning is defined as determining what inservice is needed, how it will be conducted, and the follow-up and evaluation scheme to be employed.

II. Defining Effective Inservice Education

Please indicate whether you DISAGREE (1), PROBABLY DISAGREE (2), PROBABLY AGREE (3), or AGREE (4) with each of the following statements relating to what you believe effective inservice education should be. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you disagree with the statement, circle "1".

If you probably disagree with the statement, circle "2".

If you probably agree with the statement, circle "3".

If you agree with the statement, circle "4".

PLEASE NUMBER ALL ITEMS!

	<u>D</u>	<u>PD</u>	<u>PA</u>	<u>A</u>
1. Inservice education programs should be based on specific objectives.	1	2	3	4
2. Staff members should have the major say in determining what their inservice program is to be.	1	2	3	4
3. Most inservice programs should arise from a study of needs and problems identified by staff members.	1	2	3	4
4. Inservice programs should include a variety of activities which allow for the different interests and needs that exist on the part of individual staff members.	1	2	3	4
5. Inservice education activities for staff members should include administrators.	1	2	3	4
6. Administrators in my AEA should be involved in separate inservice activities focusing on administrative responsibilities.	1	2	3	4

PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS!

	D	PD	PA	96 A
7. Directors should provide leadership in planning inservice activities.	1	2	3	4
8. Inservice education should result in the improvement of assignment performance.	1	2	3	4
9. Every staff member should be required to participate in some inservice activities.	1	2	3	4
10. Inservice programs should include special activities to orient new staff members to AEA #13.	1	2	3	4
11. Inservice activities should provide opportunities to become acquainted with new teaching techniques/innovations.	1	2	3	4
12. Some inservice activities should be conducted by staff members and administrators of AEA #13.	1	2	3	4
13. Some inservice activities should be designed around the common needs of the professional staff.	1	2	3	4
14. The financial support of inservice education should be given high priority.	1	2	3	4
15. Inservice education should help the staff members become more sensitive to what is happening in his/her assignment.	1	2	3	4
16. Inservice education activities should be planned more frequently on an AEA-wide basis than at the individual program level.	1	2	3	4
17. Inservice education should help improve relationships among the professional AEA staff.	1	2	3	4
18. Every staff member should be involved in a continuous or an on-going inservice education program.	1	2	3	4
19. Most inservice activities should be carried on within the AEA in which the staff member works.	1	2	3	4
20. Inservice efforts should focus on a few areas at a time rather than a mixture of offerings.	1	2	3	4
21. Inservice education should provide a staff member with the opportunity to prepare for career advancement if a staff member wishes to do so.	1	2	3	4

III. Purposes of Inservice Education

Listed below are seven common "Purposes of Inservice Education". Choose three that you believe are most important and place in rank order by recording the number of the purpose on the blanks below.

<u>No. of First Choice</u>	<u>No. of Second Choice</u>	<u>No. of Third Choice</u>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		

Instructional Problems

Each of the following items is a problem to some staff members. Check each item as to the degree it is a problem to you and your effectiveness as a staff member in your present assignment. If a particular question does not apply, leave blank.

1. Critical problem - has crucial effect on my work
2. Serious problem - has considerable effect on my work
3. Moderate problem - has only limited effect on my work
4. Negligible problem - has little or no effect on my work

	Degree of Seriousness			
	1 Crucial	2 Serious	3 Moderate	4 Negligible

1. the quality of instructional materials available				
2. the amount of instructional materials available				

Degree of Seriousness

a problem is:

1	2	3	4
Crucial	Serious	Moderate	Negligible

3.	my lack of knowledge about appropriate instructional materials				
4.	the required curriculum is not relevant				
5.	creating interest in the topic(s) required				
6.	too many students to work with each day				
7.	too great a range of student achievement in classes				
8.	the diverse ethnic-socioeconomic background of my students				
9.	too much time needed for non-instructional duties				
10.	not enough time for preparation				
11.	not enough free time				
12.	students who lack respect for other people and property				
13.	students with health and nutritional problems				
14.	the values and attitudes of students make it difficult to relate				
15.	helping students learn to use their leisure time well				
16.	helping students feel successful in school				
17.	promoting student self evaluation				
18.	too many students are indifferent to school				
19.	providing students with opportunities to make choices and develop responsibility				

Degree of Seriousness

a problem is:

	1	2	3	4
	Crucial	Serious	Moderate	Negligible

a problem is:	1	2	3	4
	Crucial	Serious	Moderate	Negligible
20. maintaining student attention				
21. diagnosing student learning problems				
22. assessing my students' learning				
23. providing for individual learning				
24. evaluating student progress				
25. extending learning beyond the classroom				
26. the inflexible routine of my teaching situation				
27. the lack of freedom to teach what I want to teach				
28. constantly changing school policies and rules				
29. the pressure I feel that I am under much of the time				
30. the total climate of the school is not conducive to learning				
31. the rapid rate of curricular change frustrates me				
32. the physical facilities of the school limit my program				
33. my assignment is not in my preferred area of preparation				
34. there are few opportunities to improve my professional skills				
35. the school administration provides little assistance to me with problems				
36. how to encourage parental interest in school				
37. parents do not understand my problems as an AEA staff member				

Degree of Seriousness

1 2 3 4

Crucial Serious Moderate Negligible

a problem is:

38. I know little about the home situation of my students				
39. conducting effective parent-teacher conferences				
40. reporting students performance to parents				
41. lack of communication in AEA #13				
42. confusion among people in the school district about the goals of the AEA				
43. poor staff member-administrator rapport				
44. understanding the role of the AEA administrator				
45. staff morale				
46. poor community attitude toward staff members and the education profession				
OTHERS (Define)				
47.				
48.				
49.				

INSERVICE TOPICS

Column 1 below is a list of selected inservice topics

Column 2, please indicate whether or not this topic was covered by an inservice education program in which you participated during the past two school years.

Column 3, please indicate the extent of your knowledge of this particular topic.

Column 4, please respond to each topic, indicating your interest in the topic as the subject of future inservice education programs.

