ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARD CERTAIN INSERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN A GEORGIA COUNTY

DISSERTATION

Presented In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University

By

Newton Crocker Hodgson, B.A., M.A.
The Ohio State University
1954

Approved by:

Adviser

DEDICATION

To the individual classroom teacher,
this dissertation is respectfully
dedicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to the writing of this dissertation. Special gratitude is due C. B. Mendenhall and Harold Alberty whose continuing patience has exceeded all reasonable bounds of human expectation. Louis Raths laid the groundwork many years ago when he shared with me his understanding of value-analysis as a technique for interpreting verbal materials. Floyd Jordan helped me see the full meaning of what it is like to work with teachers in service and helped me catch some of his great and humble faith in the people who teach our children. The teachers and administrative personnel of DeKalb County exhibited a personal interest and concern for the study that lent zest to the entire undertaking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM AND PLAN OF INVESTIGATION

The study that is described in the following pages deals with the perceptions of a group of teachers of certain inservice training activities. It is concerned specifically with the value judgment aspect of their perceptions. Two assumptions underlie the study: (1) that the growth of teachers on their jobs is an important area of concern in the field of education, and (2) that an awareness of the kinds of value judgments teachers tend to make about the arrangements that are provided for such inservice growth can be significant and useful to those who are charged with planning such arrangements.

The importance of inservice training.

The importance of inservice educational activities is widely recognized. The latest summary of the literature speaks of an "increasing interest" in the field and of the need to select from "a growing body of material" on the subject.[1] Most of the great national studies of the last two decades have been concerned in some way with inservice training. One of these, sponsored by the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education,

---

[1] J. Cecil Parker and William P. Golden, Jr., "Inservice Education of Elementary- and Secondary-School Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XXII (June, 1952), pp. 193-200.

produced two volumes that have since become classics in the field, Teacher Education in Service,[2] and Helping Teachers Understand Children.[3] Karl Bigelow, in a foreword to the first-mentioned volume, puts the case for inservice growth in these words:

> When the Commission on Teacher Education was established, it agreed that the quality of teaching in American schools is increasingly influenced by the experiences teachers have after they have entered the profession. Excellent preparation remains essential. What it will lead to in the way of teacher effectiveness, however, must always be significantly dependent on the opportunity and challenge provided by the working situations. Moreover, as teachers have come to serve professionally for lengthening periods, and as rapid social change and the rising accumulation of new knowledge have pressed for corresponding adjustments in school practice, it has become more important than ever that teachers should continue to grow on the job.[4]

More recently a permanent commission of the National Education Association, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, has been concerned with inservice matters. The entire report of the fifth annual work-conference of the commission is devoted to "all the major aspects of in-service education."[5]

In addition to its importance for professional purposes, in-service training deserves attention from the point of view of the time and money that are spent in such activities. Wood has estimated that Oregon teachers spend, on the average, a total of 106

---

[2]Charles E. Prall and C. Leslie Cushman, Teacher Education in Service.

[3]Daniel Prescott and Staff, Helping Teachers Understand Children.

[4]Prall and Cushman, op. cit., p. v.

[5]T. M. Stinnett (Ed.), The Teaching Profession Grows in Service, 1949.

eight-hour days yearly in inservice work. His estimate of the amount of money spent by teachers and school systems on the same activities runs over a million dollars in the one state.[6] Granted that these figures appear somewhat exaggerated, it still must be recognized that teachers spend a considerable sum of money and a great deal of time on inservice work. It is clearly important for both economy and morale that teachers come to regard this time and money as well spent.

Teachers themselves recognize inservice education as important, if the responses of those interviewed in the present study may be trusted. They speak of the need, as in any other profession, for "keeping up to date." They speak of their appreciation for the opportunity to do inservice work and of the "inspiration" they sometimes derive from it. They are grateful for help received in dealing with "my problems" in "my classroom."

Though the need for inservice training appears to be widely recognized by teachers and status personnel alike, there is one assumption underlying inservice work that is rarely examined - namely, inservice activities actually do bring about desirable changes in the behavior of teachers. A very interesting experimental study is reported by Anderson in which an effort was made to measure

---

[6]Hugh B. Wood, Inservice Education of Teachers -- An Evaluation, University of Oregon, Curriculum Bulletin No. 81, pp. 1-2.

changes in teaching behavior over a period of three years in a school system with a highly developed cooperative inservice improvement program.[7] Data were collected by means of a school practices questionnaire and observational techniques at the beginning of the three-year period and again at the end. The results showed that measurable improvement did take place, though the improvement was of limited statistical significance. This may be taken to mean that such gains might easily have occurred by chance, even in the absence of an inservice training program.

> On the basis of the data which were obtained and examined, no positive conclusions can be drawn as to the validity of the hypothesis in either area. Measurable changes which were apparently produced by the Cooperative Study were identified at the classroom level through the School Practices Questionnaire and the observations; but the statistical significance of the gains noted was not particularly great.[8]

It is possible, of course, that the kinds of changes that inservice training brings about at the classroom level may be of a kind not readily measurable by the techniques employed in Anderson's study. The presumption, though, that inservice activities may be having little positive effect on classroom teaching seems clearly indicated.

---

[7]Robert H. Anderson, "The Influence of An In-Service Improvement Program Upon Teacher Test Behavior and Classroom Practices," Journal of Educational Research, XLIV (November, 1950), pp. 205-15.

[8]Ibid., p. 211.

To summarize this point, while the importance of inservice education is generally accepted and a sizeable literature has grown up on the subject, there is limited evidence concerning the effect of such education at the point of application, the teacher and his learning group.

Related Studies.

In addition to the studies discussed earlier under "The importance of inservice education" a number of studies of teacher attitudes have been made which have some bearing on the present study. The difficulty in analyzing such studies lies in the great variation in categories which were used in approaching the problem. In view of the fact that these studies were made for somewhat differing reasons this is not too surprising, but it would be helpful if some agreement could be reached regarding just what are appropriate descriptive categories for the various elements in a program.

Barr and Reppen, as part of a study of teacher attitudes toward supervision, had their respondents rank eight common types of supervisory activities in order of their general value to teachers. The ranking by all teachers sampled was as follows:

1. Classroom visitations and conference
2. Demonstrations
3. Visiting other teachers
4. Teachers meetings
5. Professional reading and discussion
6. Experimental study of teaching problems

7. Participation in curriculum construction
8. Supervisory bulletins.[9]

Apparently, "supervisory activities" were very broadly interpreted. The high rank accorded the supervisory visit is not supported by the present study.

A subcommittee of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools, under the direction of C. A. Weber, carried out a comprehensive study of inservice training activities in selected schools of the Association. In summarizing the findings of the study, Weber made five suggestions for program improvement, as follows:

1. Discarding inspectorial techniques which originate with administrators.
2. Giving teachers a definite part in shaping school policies, planning the school budget, developing the curriculum, selecting materials for instruction, planning faculty meetings, and developing a program of public relations.
3. Devising ways and means for teachers to have a part in selecting their own leaders who will preside over their own meetings.
4. Inviting and encouraging parents and pupils to participate in the deliberations which concern problems affecting the child.
5. Encouraging the workshop idea in teachers.[10]

In the process of arriving at these suggestions teacher opinion was sought by means of an extremely long check list. Unfortunately,

---

[9]A. S. Barr and Nels O. Reppen, "The Attitude of Teachers Toward Supervision," Journal of Experimental Education, III (June, 1935), p. 287.

[10]C. A. Weber, "A Summary of the Findings of the Subcommittee on Inservice Education of Secondary School Teachers," North Central Association Quarterly, XVII (January, 1943), p. 28.

nowhere in the extensive reports of the study does any sort of summary ranking of the items on the checklist appear.

Coon, in a study of the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward high-school curriculum reorganization, asked the question, "Which of the following have stimulated you most in your thinking about school programs and the purposes of education?" The percentage of respondents checking each of eight categories is shown below.

Per cent	Category
14	1. Teachers meetings and conferences
27	2. Courses in colleges or universities
9	3. Workshops in colleges or universities
6	4. Local workshops and study groups
12	5. Visitations to other schools
67	6. Teaching experience
1	7. Uncertain
0	8. No opinion[11]

Evidently most of the teachers in the sample felt that the daily run of activities in the classroom were their chief source of stimulation. The "local study group" and "the campus workshop" fare relatively badly in this study.

Moore, reporting research on the inservice education of school superintendents sponsored by the Southwestern Cooperative program in Educational Administration at the University of Texas, summarized

---

[11]Herbert Coon, A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers and Administrators Toward High School Curriculum Reorganization, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1951, p. 323.

responses from 335 superintendents to a thirty-five item checklist of inservice activities. The most frequently used activity was "reading in professional journals." The most valued activity was "attending summer workshops on a college campus."[12]

Needham, as part of a survey of Oregon teachers' opinions concerning inservice activities, asked respondents to indicate which of "six selected subsidiary techniques" of inservice training was most valuable for furthering competency in terms of thirteen "competencies" regarded as important in teaching. The six techniques and the percentage of all respondents indicating which was deemed most valuable are as follows:

Per cent	Technique
20	1. Courses
19	2. Work-conferences
7	3. Faculty meetings
6	4. Supervision
9	5. Visitations (Visiting other classrooms)
5	6. Travel[13]

From an analysis of his data he draws the following interesting conclusion:

> Although teachers have given considerable evidence of ability to recognize their needs, the study has shown that they place a very low value on many desirable forms of

---

[12]Hollis A. Moore, Jr., "How Superintendents Grow Through In-Service Opportunities," The Nation's Schools, LI (May, 1953), pp. 56-9.

[13]John Needham, "The Type of In-Service Program Which Should be Provided for Oregon Teachers," Master's Field Study, University of Oregon, 1950.

> in-service training. Since it does not follow that a mature person would recognize a need and fail to recognize the values in any means designed to meet this need, it must be assumed that in-service programs of the past have been somewhat lacking in organization and administration.[14]

Wood, in reporting the total survey of Oregon teachers and administrators of which Needham's report is a part, sought value-responses on a scale of four points to eighteen "types of inservice training." The four points of the scale were: high value -3; average value -2; low value -1; no value -0. The average value awarded all eighteen types of training was 1.5, or halfway between low and average value. The types of training activities are listed below, together with their average value score:[15]

Type of In-Service Training	Index of value
1. County institutes	2.2
2. Multi-county work conferences	1.8
3. Local pre-school work conferences	1.4
4. Extension Division workshops	1.1
5. O.E.A. Annual Portland meeting	1.3
6. Other conferences	1.4
7. Classroom visitation of other teachers	.8
8. Staff meetings	2.6
9. O.E.A. committee meetings	.9
10. Other professional committee meetings	1.6
11. Extension or campus courses	1.5
12. Conferences with local administrators	1.7
13. Conferences with outside consultants	1.0
14. Correspondence courses	.8

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 56-7.

[15] Hugh B. Wood, "Inservice Education of Teachers -- An Evaluation," Curriculum Bulletin No. 81, University of Oregon, 1950. p. 10.

15. Professional reading	2.4
16. Cultural activities (music, art, etc.)	2.1
17. Travel for cultural improvement	1.3
18. Summer school	1.5
Average value	1.5

Since certain of these types of training activities are quite closely analogous to types used in the present study, a comparison will be made between the results on comparable items in Chapter Four, following the analysis of the questionnaire data compiled in this study. Portions of two of Wood's conclusions are of interest here.

> Fourth, teachers have not found these activities as helpful as we might have hoped for. In general, they rate the activities between "low" and "average" in value. ...
>
> Fifth, a careful scrutiny of these low ratings leads inevitably to the conclusion that more professional leadership is needed at both the local and top levels. With the exception of institutes (the rating of which is held above average only because of the elementary teachers) all types of conferences, as now conducted, fall below average in rating. With the exception of staff meetings (held above average only because of the administrators' own ratings), small group meetings and individual conferences fall below average. Supervision as understood by most teachers holds little promise. Only those activities largely undirected by school leadership--professional reading and cultural activities--rate above average. ...[16]

Wood's fourth conclusion appears a slight, but reasonable, understatement. His fifth conclusion regarding the need for more leadership hardly seems inevitable. At least equally tenable is

---

[16]Ibid., p. 27.

the proposition that more evidence is needed as to why the ratings are so low, in order that the present program may be carefully examined and reconstructed.

One other generalization from Wood's study should be noted. "In general, the wealthier the area, the more favorable are the responses to inservice training activities."[17] This may help to account for some of the differences in average value that appear between his report and the present study.

In Wood's study, the average value score for all activities was 1.5; in the present study the average value score was 2.20 on Criterion I: Improving Personal Social Relationships, and 2.28 on Criterion II: Improving Classroom Practice. Since DeKalb is relatively wealthy, compared to other Georgia counties, it is possible that some general cultural factor may be operating in the marked difference in average valuation appearing between the responses of Oregon teachers and teachers in DeKalb county. The recognition of this possibility, however, does not affect the generalization that the teachers in the present study indicate considerably more satisfaction with inservice activities than did the Oregon teachers.

In a survey of Alabama teachers, Nelson reports a ranking of inservice training activities as follows:

---

[17] Ibid., p. 24.

> The teachers of ten Alabama counties and eight cities rated inservice education techniques as to effectiveness as follows: (a) regular summer sessions on campus, (b) workshops on campus, (c) regular campus courses, (d) local pre-school conferences, (e) local workshops, (f) self-directed study, (g) on- or off-campus extension courses, (h) countywide study groups, with addresses at institutes being significantly low.[18]

This ranking is roughly similar to the ranking of related items in the present study. In both cases relatively high rank is given to workshops and summer courses while speakers and institutes are ranked low.

In the related studies discussed above, there seems to be little consistency in the categories used to describe activities and little consistency in the appraisal of such categories as were somewhat comparable. There is a suggestion that summer workshops and courses are generally well-regarded and that mass-meetings and speeches are frowned upon, but it is only a suggestion. A likely explanation lies in the difference in the way a given activity is carried on in different programs. Supervisory visits in the system sampled by Barr and Reppen, for instance, may be quite different from supervisory activities in the DeKalb county system. It is quite possible that significant appraisals of inservice activities can only be made in connection with a particular program or area and do

---

[18] C. P. Nelson, A Plan for Cooperation Between the State Department of Education and Local Authorities in Alabama in Organizing and Administering an In-Service Program of Teacher Education, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946. Cited in John Needham, op. cit. p. 25.

not admit of generalization beyond those limits. This would not be true, however, of generalizations regarding the reasons that lie behind appraisals of inservice activities.

The importance of value judgments.

The way people feel about the work they are doing has been recognized as important in a number of studies. As early as 1928, Roethlisberger and Dickinson found that the behavior of workers in a factory cannot be understood apart from their feelings or sentiments.[19] Prescott asked teachers participating in a child study program to write an evaluation of how they felt the program had benefitted them. These evaluations were then used in planning subsequent work.[20] The group dynamics movement has been routinely characterized by efforts to get participants in groups to express their feelings about the success of meetings. The development of the Post-Meeting Reaction Slip symbolizes this concern.[21]

Value judgments of participants in a program can be used in several ways. They can be used for instance, as one indication of the success of a program. We would expect a successful program of inservice training to yield a degree of satisfaction to those engaged

---

[19]F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickinson, Management and the Worker. Summarized in Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, pp. 307-08.

[20]Daniel Prescott and Staff, op. cit., pp. 364 ff.

[21]Two Lessons in Group Dynamics, Educator's Washington Dispatch, p. 9.

in it. It should be recognized, however, that the value judgments of participants provide only one way of appraising a program and should be used to supplement evidence of other sorts, not as the only criterion.

Value-judgments of teachers may also be used to discover points in a program where revision may profitably be started. One of the problems that faces the inservice worker is to know where to begin. One of the cliches of our profession is that we should start where people are. If we find that certain elements in an inservice program are held in low esteem, it is possible that a re-examination of those elements may result in arrangements that are seen as more satisfying to teachers.

And finally, negative value judgments may be utilized as a source of energy. When teachers are encouraged to express dissatisfaction with existing arrangements and then channels are opened for them to assist in "doing something about" the sources of dissatisfaction, the possibilities for productive expenditure of energy become very high.

> Men do not change their social arrangements so long as they are perfectly satisfied with them. Dissatisfaction with existing conditions seems to be a prerequisite for intentional change.[22]

Some administrators and group workers seem to regard the expression of negative value-judgments as tantamount to disloyalty. We need to

---

[22]Alice Miel, Changing the Curriculum, p. 40.

learn to exploit the productive possibilities of dissent.

Purpose of the study.

The present study had its origin in two years of intensive work with teachers on the job in the course of which the writer became increasingly sensitive to peripheral feelings of dissatisfaction on the part of both teachers and inservice workers. An experience with the reconstruction of a summer workshop on the basis of intense staff dissatisfaction suggested that similar feelings might be of use in improving other inservice structures.

The overall purpose of the study is to try out a way of getting at the feelings of teachers regarding elements in a total program of inservice work. Specifically, that purpose may be stated as follows:

1. To make an orderly and detailed study of the value judgments that a large number of teachers have about certain of the inservice activities in which they take part.

2. To identify points of satisfaction (high valuation) and dissatisfaction (low valuation) with a view to providing data useful to the school system involved in improving its inservice program.

3. To appraise certain commonly-used means of inservice education from the teacher's point of view.

4. To experiment with a method of getting at attitudes toward an inservice program.

5. To develop certain hypotheses as to the reasons underlying the attitudes of teachers toward elements of an inservice program.

Need for the study.

It was felt that the inservice programs in the Atlanta Area are at a point where such a study would be distinctly helpful in further planning. The study would also be expected to fill a gap in the research bearing on inservice programs in that it would supplement the few existing studies of teacher attitudes toward such programs.

Limitations of the study.

The study is purely descriptive and analytical. It does not measure changes in behavior. No effort is made to blueprint change, to make recommendations applicable to all inservice training activities or to generalize more than tentatively beyond the group studied.

Definition of terms.

Inservice education is used as a general term denoting all the activities, planned or unplanned, that affect the growth of teachers on the job.

Inservice training activities refers to all those activities which are designed, usually by a person or persons in a status position, to bring about teacher growth.

Inservice study refers to that which a teacher does, whether under pressure or under his own initiative, to improve himself on the job.

Inservice structures refers to those more or less formal arrangements that are made within which teacher growth is expected to occur, such as workshops, courses, supervisory visits, etc.

Inservice processes refers to those learning situations that comprise inservice structures, such as watching a demonstration lesson, listening to a lecture, reading professional literature, etc.

One difficulty that was encountered in reviewing the literature on this subject was a tendency on the part of many recent writers to use the terms "curriculum development" and "inservice education" interchangeably. It appears to this writer that whereas the two things may be involved simultaneously in the same activity, they are not necessarily the same thing. Curriculum development has as its main focus the selection and ordering in time and space of experiences for learners. Inservice education has as its main focus the restructuring of the perceptions of teachers.

Method of approach to the problem.

It was decided to approach the problem by seeking responses from a large number of teachers in one system concerning the value of certain commonly used inservice activities. This would be

followed by more intensive exploration of the reasons given by a small sampling of teachers in the same system as to why such activities were valued or not.

A questionnaire was developed which afforded a way of ranking the various inservice activities commonly used in the area according to their value for (1) improving personal-social relationships, and (2) improving classroom practice.[23] The questionnaire was given to the members of the DeKalb Instructional Committee, all teachers, and they were trained in its use. The members of the committee then administered the questionnaire to the teachers in their schools and returned it to the investigator in a sealed envelope.

After the questionnaire had been administered and the results analyzed, an interview schedule was developed to explore further the attitudes revealed in the questionnaire.[24] The interviews were recorded on tape and transcribed. The resulting material was analyzed by means of a combination of value-analysis and coding techniques.

Development of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was developed from an analysis of the activities most commonly used in the area for inservice training. As the listing of these activities proceeded, it appeared that two levels of activities were involved. One was the structural or organizational.

---

[23]See Appendix I.

[24]See Appendix II.

level and included specific arrangements such as courses, institutes, workshops, etc. The other level included the processes that are involved in these arrangements, such as listening, watching, leading discussion, etc. Consequently, the items were grouped into two lists rather than one. These lists were submitted to four competent judges who were familiar with programs in the area and they suggested changes and additions.[25] The revised list contained 28 items. These lists were then submitted to a group of 35 teachers from the area who suggested further revisions. The final form of the questionnaire contained twelve items dealing with processes and fifteen dealing with structures, plus one unnumbered question dealing with the respondent's feeling about taking the questionnaire.[26]

It was originally planned to make provision for three value-responses to each item on the questionnaire. As will be seen, that plan was later modified. Since a given activity may have different value for different purposes, it was assumed that three general kinds of outcomes are to be expected from inservice work as follows: (1) improved personal-social relationships, (2) improved classroom practice, and (3) personal growth. Hence, each respondent was asked to rate each of twenty-seven items in terms of its value for all three purposes.

---

[25]Sterling Brinkley, John I. Goodlad, Granville B. Johnson, all of Emory University and Sam Wiggins, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee.

[26]See Appendix I.

The scale used in this value rating consisted of four numbers as follows:

3 - high value
2 - some value
1 - little value
0 - no value

A four-point scale was used rather than the customary five-point scale in order to avoid a midpoint response. The same scale was used in a somewhat similar study in Oregon with which it was expected certain comparisons could be made.[27]

Respondents were also asked to check whether or not they had engaged in the activity represented by each item. This was done in order to prevent the venturing of judgments about activities with which the respondent was not familiar as well as to provide an indication of frequency-familiarity regarding each item. The heading for the first form of the questionnaire, then, looked like this:

Participation Column I	Improving Personal-Social Relationships II	Improving Classroom Practice III	Personal Growth and Satisfaction IV
( ) 1. Observing other teachers teaching.	( )	( )	( )
( ) 2. Having a supervisor visit my class.	( )	( )	( )
..... ETC			

The first form of the questionnaire was tried out on a group of forty teachers from the area and discussed thoroughly with them. The

[27]Hugh B. Wood, op. cit.

results were tabulated and the items ranked. Process items were, of course, ranked separately from structure items. The tryout group of teachers had pointed out that the effort to make three value judgments about each item called for finer discriminations than they felt they could make. In order to discover which of the three categories of outcomes represented by Columns II, III, and IV of Form 1 of the questionnaire discriminated least the items were ranked according to their mean value rating. The formula for determining the rank-difference coefficient of correlation (rho) was applied to these ranked mean scores with the results shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Rank-difference Coefficients of Correlation (rho) Between Three Columns of Value-Judgments.

Columns	Coefficient of Correlation (rho)
II and III	.52
II and IV	.28
III and IV	.79

N- 27

The high relationship appearing between Columns III and IV suggests that teachers would tend to rank the items in much the same way in those two categories. Consequently, it was decided to retain Column III (Improving Classroom Practice) and reject Column IV (Personal

Growth and Satisfaction) inasmuch as the bearing of inservice activities on the former category of outcomes was deemed to be of more importance for the purposes of the study than the latter.

When all the data for this phase of the study had been collected, the same statistical operation was performed on the two categories that were retained, Columns II and III. A correlation coefficient of .32 which is taken to indicate a very slight tendency to rank items in the same way on these two criteria was obtained.

The final form of the questionnaire, then, contained two columns for value-responses, Column II (Improving Personal-Social Relationships) and Column III (Improving Classroom Practice).

Plan of the interviews.

Since the purpose of the interviews was to provide value-freighted written material for analysis, it was important to encourage as much free response on the part of the interviewees as could be managed. Consequently, it was decided to use an approach that was as non-directive as possible. In order, however, to maintain a degree of comparability among the interviews and assure some connection between the interviews and the questionnaire, an interview schedule was worked out containing seventeen questions. These questions were not used in the rigorous manner prescribed by current opinion research.[28] In

---

[28]For a more extensive treatment of the problem, see David Krech and Richard S. Krutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, pp. 273-306.

such research each question must be asked in exactly the same words and in the order in which it appears on the schedule. In the present study, the interviews always started with the same question and generally followed a consistent pattern, but the interviewee was encouraged, by responses that reflected his feelings or rephrased what he had been saying, to follow whatever line of thought occurred to him so long as it related to inservice training activities. The justification for this difference in procedure lies in the purposes of the present study in which comparability of response is not considered to be of first importance in the use that is made of interview data.

A series of trial interviews were held and recorded on tape. The material on the tapes was transcribed verbatim, then transferred to 5x8 file cards. Each of these cards encompassed a unit of thought. Value statements on the cards were underlined and the resulting material was manipulated in a fashion that is described in detail in Chapter Five. Since the results of the trial run demonstrated the feasibility of collecting and handling material of this sort, a random selection of thirteen schools was made and two teachers interviewed from each school. Interviewees were selected by having the teachers in each school write the name of the person who would best represent their point of view regarding inservice training activities.[29] The

---

[29]See Appendix III

persons most often named were then asked individually by the investigator if they would care to be interviewed. In no instance was the request denied.

Selection of sample - DeKalb County.

The DeKalb County school system was selected for intensive sampling for two reasons: (1) it is reasonably representative of school systems of the area, including both rural and urban components, and (2) it has a highly developed program of inservice training. It was also readily accessible and the investigator was well-known to teachers and administrative personnel.

Questionnaires were distributed to all of the white teachers in the county, a total of 525 at the time the questionnaire was administered.[30] Of the questionnaires distributed, 379 were returned, or 72 per cent. Of these, eleven had to be discarded as improperly filled out, giving a final sampling of 70 per cent. The sample included returns from all of the twenty-two white elementary schools in the county and all but one of the eight white high schools.

Thirteen schools were selected at random and two teachers from each of these schools were chosen by vote of the teachers on each

---

[30]At the time the data for the present study were collected the DeKalb county school system, like all public school systems in Georgia, was operated on a segregated basis. Only white schools were included in the study because the inservice program for white teachers necessarily operated as a separate unit and the number of Negro teachers in the county was very small.

staff. Twenty-six individual teachers were interviewed altogether, six of whom were high-school teachers.

Summary.

The problem of this study was to explore the attitudes that teachers have regarding the value of the various inservice training activities in which they are asked to engage. The method of approach was through administering a questionnaire which provided a large sample of teachers' judgments about the worth of certain characteristic inservice structures and processes. A series of relatively non-directive interviews was arranged to supplement the results of the questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The Atlanta Area.

Metropolitan Atlanta is one of the large urban communities of the industrial south. It is located at the edge of the rolling Piedmont region of northern Georgia. Portions of two large (800 square miles) counties are included in what is known as Greater Atlanta, as well as one small city, Decatur, and eight incorporated towns and ten unincorporated communities.

The public school systems of the area comprise four separate administrative units. Children who live within the city limits of Atlanta or Decatur are served by the independent school systems of those cities. All other children in the area are served by the county systems of Fulton and DeKalb.

The population of the area has increased rapidly in recent years. In 1940, the total number of people in DeKalb and Fulton counties was 479,800; in 1950, it was 610,000. It is estimated that this rate of growth will continue.

About 550,000 people now live in the 300-square mile "urbanized" core of Fulton and DeKalb counties. By 1980,

> this area will contain perhaps 900,000 people. Most of the additional 350,000 persons will locate in what is now the suburbs.[1]

The rapid population growth has involved a great influx of families from all sections of the country. One important result has been a developing heterogeneity in the pupil and teacher population. It is not at all uncommon to find teachers and children who have recently moved here from the North and Midwest.

The pressure of a rapidly increasing child population is one of the continuing facts of life for school boards in the area, particularly for the county systems that serve the burgeoning suburbs. Consequently, new classrooms must be built and new teachers recruited in large numbers.

There has also been a general educational ferment throughout the past several years as symbolized by the passage, in 1949, of the Minimum Foundation Program for Education and the Georgia State Sales Tax, in 1950, to support that program. One effect of the MFPE has been to bring pressure on school systems in the direction of upgrading teacher qualifications.

In the light of these developments, it is not surprising that there should arise a great deal of interest in inservice training activities. This interest was afforded considerable stimulation by

---

[1] Up Ahead, 1952 Report of the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Atlanta, page 3.

the organization, in March, 1945, of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, a unique cooperative arrangement sponsored jointly by six institutions of higher learning and six school systems.

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service.

This teacher-serving agency, referred to hereafter as the AATES, was organized as a result of recommendations to the Advisory Faculty Council of the University Center in Georgia by its Graduate Committee. At the time of the original agreement setting up the AATES, it was sponsored by Agnes Scott College, Atlanta Art Association, Columbia Theological Seminary, The Georgia Institute of Technology, Emory University, and the University of Georgia. Participating school systems were Atlanta, Decatur, and Marietta city systems, and Fulton, DeKalb, and Cobb county systems. The purpose of the AATES was to coordinate and stimulate inservice training activities in the area.

> The purpose of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service is to combine the resources of the institutions with those of the public school systems in locating and attempting to solve the problems confronted by teachers and administrators of the public school systems of the area. Attempts to realize this purpose have been made through three specific types of activities. First, faculty members from the various institutions conduct classes which are taken by the teachers for credit so that teaching certificates may be strengthened. Second, staff members of the various institutions serve as consultants to groups interested in securing help on a given problem in order that instruction may be improved. Third, specialists are brought in to the Atlanta Area from other institutions to give special assistance in the fields which they represent.[2]

---

[2]The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, Bulletin No. 1, Emory University, 1947. page 2.

The Service is directed by a full-time coordinator with an office at Emory University. He is assisted by an office staff of three full-time consultants who also teach the graduate courses offered for credit in the area as well as giving other consultant services.

The AATES has been important to the present study in many ways. It has played a crucial part in helping all of the school systems of the area develop and organize their inservice programs as well as assisting in staffing many of their inservice activities. Through the work of its advisory council, which is composed of representatives from each of the school systems, and through other coordinating activities, it has built up an atmosphere of cooperation among the systems. It has also developed and maintained the kind of relations with school personnel, administrators and teachers that make such studies as this one possible.

Inservice training activities in the Atlanta area.

A great many different kinds of training activities are carried on in the area, ranging in size from the great state Georgia Education Association meetings to a conference between a teacher and a supervisor, and in duration from an AATES course that lasts throughout the school year to a fifteen-minute conference. These activities may be classified roughly into categories as follows:

Large systemwide institutes in which all the teachers of a school system meet together for a period of time ranging from half a day to two days are fairly common. They are usually characterized by a general theme or topic such as "Education for Responsible Citizenship" or "Child Development Through a Unified Curriculum." There is usually at least one speech to the whole group, preceded or followed by smaller group meetings. Consultants are provided to work with the smaller groups and sometimes a nationally-known educator is imported to make the speech.

Systemwide meetings by subject field or grade level takes place in most of the systems from time to time. These occur most frequently when plans are afoot for working out a new curriculum or revising an old one. Subject field meetings, as might be expected, consist usually of high school teachers. Meetings of all the teachers of a given elementary grade level are very infrequent; but occasionally all the primary or all the elementary teachers are gathered together.

Systemwide meetings of teachers with certain special functions, such as audio-visual coordinators and teacher-librarians, are a part of the programs of all of the systems.

Special interest meetings or clinics for the purpose of brushing up on such things as art, reading, or mental hygiene are held from time to time. Such meetings are of relatively brief duration and are usually led by a consultant or occasionally by a teacher with a special skill.

Systemwide orientation meetings for new teachers often are called in the fall, before school opens, for the purpose of acquainting teachers new to the system with the curricula and requirements of the systems in which they are to teach and to introduce them to the supervisors and administrators. Such meetings usually last a day and consultants from outside the system are infrequently used.

Faculty meetings are the meetings which most teachers attend most frequently. These meetings almost invariably take place in the teachers' own schools and vary from purely administrative information-giving sessions to very informal problem-centered discussions. They vary in frequency from once a month or less to once a week or more.

Study groups within building faculties are ordinarily of two general sorts. They may be quite informal, organized under the leadership of the principal or one of the teachers; or they may be quite formal and organized under the leadership of a supervisor or a professional consultant.

Individual supervisory visits by supervisors of instruction in the systems appear to vary a great deal in frequency from system to system. The unannounced visit of the supervisor to an individual teacher in her classroom is a relatively rare occurrence in any system. In at least one system supervisors will visit teachers only when specifically requested to do so by the teacher.

Demonstration Lessons are used regularly in only one of the systems, and there they are usually designed for training new or "probationary" teachers. They may be conducted by an experienced teacher or by one of the supervisors.

AATES courses are offered in various "centers" at conveniently located schools throughout the area. The courses cover a wide range of titles designed to meet teacher needs in the area as seen by the advisory committee. In the school year 1953-54, for example, 1100 teachers were enrolled in 53 different courses in the following areas:

Administration
Counseling and Guidance
Curriculum
Problems in Teaching
Art
Music
Evaluation
Reading
Audio-visual Instruction
Child Study
Industrial Arts Seminar
Applied Research in Education
Diagnostic and Corrective Techniques in School Subjects

All of these courses carry limited graduate credit at Emory University or the University of Georgia. The AATES also renders many non-credit services to teachers in the area, but these do not constitute a separate category of inservice structures as defined in this study.

Child Study courses offered by the AATES are singled out as a category because of their distinctive organization. The child study

program in the Atlanta area is similar to programs set up elsewhere under the inspiration of H. Gerthon Morgan and Daniel Prescott.[3] The bulk of the work of these courses is done in small study groups under the leadership of working teachers who have been specially trained for the purpose by the AATES staff member who is responsible for the program.

Summer courses are offered by Emory and Oglethorpe Universities. These courses carry full degree credit and are organized along much the same lines as summer courses elsewhere. A distinction was drawn between "content" and "professional" courses in the questionnaire in an effort to shed some light on the controversy concerning the perceived usefulness of professional education courses for teachers.

Workshops are a popular feature of summer inservice work here as well as elsewhere. They vary a great deal in organization and focus, but are usually characterized by relative informality and a problem-centered approach to learning. They last from a week to six weeks and usually take up the greater part of the participant's day.

Internship for supervising teachers of student teachers is a development in inservice training that is relatively new in the area and consequently has affected a relatively few teachers in any given system. While the central purpose of this training activity is to

---

[3]Prescott, Daniel and Staff. op. cit.

provide better conditions for student teaching, its possibilities for bringing about desirable changes in the teaching behavior of the supervising teacher himself would seem to be very great.

Georgia Education Association meetings occur once a year. Children are dismissed early so that teachers may go to these meetings and they are huge affairs. Actually, the chief purpose of these meetings is political, for the selection of officers and the development of policy, but some professional growth is expected to accrue to the teachers who attend them.

High-school evaluations through the use of the Evaluative Criteria of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards have taken place in all of the high schools of the area.[4] The application of these extensive criteria, first by the teachers of the school, then by a visiting committee of experts, is primarily for purposes of accreditation of the school. Improvement in the performance of teachers, however, is usually regarded as a reasonable by-product.

The sixteen categories described above briefly are not intended to include all of the inservice structures of the area. The list could be extended to include such things as consultative services and field trips and excursions, for example. Or it could make use of different categories, such as formal classes, group discussions, etc. The justification for the present listing lies in the fact

---

[4]Evaluative Criteria: 1950 Edition, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Washington, D. C.

that it represents planned arrangements that are relatively frequently used in designing inservice program activities in this particular area.

The DeKalb county school system.

DeKalb county, lying to the east and northeast of Atlanta, includes a portion of the city of Atlanta, the entire small city of Decatur and some fifteen small communities in its 274 square miles. There are twenty-four white elementary schools in the system and eight white high schools. The schools range in type from small, almost rural elementary units like Rock Chapel located several miles from Atlanta, to large (1600 pupils) combination elementary and high-school units like Druid Hills which is located in one of the wealthy suburban areas of greater Atlanta. Some 150,000 people live in the county and it serves a school population of 19,130 children and youth.

The administrative organization of the county consists of a Board of Education whose members are elected from five electoral districts and a Superintendent who is appointed by the Board. In 1950 the creation of a Division of Instruction was authorized by the Board and at the time of the study this division was staffed by three supervisors.

The pattern of school organization is the 7-5 plan, in which children enter high school at the eighth grade. The system changed

over from an eleven-year to a twelve-year program in September of 1951.

The DeKalb inservice program.

The present organized program of inservice training really began in the summer of 1947 when the Board of Education partially financed a workshop for thirty-five teachers at Emory University. Before that, inservice training had been confined to two countywide teachers' meetings a year and various relatively uncoordinated supervisory activities and meetings.

In 1949 the Instruction Committee was formed, consisting of a teacher from each school in the system, the superintendent, the supervisors, and a representative from one of the local universities. Leadership of this committee was placed in the hands of one of the teachers. Since its inception the Instruction Committee has assumed major responsibility for coordinating inservice activities in the county.

Committees of teachers and principals have worked out statements of purposes a number of times. The latest statement of purposes for the inservice program reads as follows:

The purposes of in-service education are:

1. To guide and stimulate personal and professional growth of all school personnel.
2. To provide opportunities for teachers and others on a local and system-wide basis to study and attack problems through group action.

3. To share ideas, materials and common experiences.

4. To provide experiences that will help teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to acquire a better understanding of the basic principles of human growth and development.

5. To study better ways of utilizing all available personnel and resources of the community, to the end that life and education in the community may be improved.[5]

The scope of the program of activities designed to carry out these purposes is reflected in the following list of "work procedures":

1. Workshops (Countywide work study conferences).
2. Curriculum committees (Countywide)
3. Workshops (Summer)
4. Clinics
5. Committees on the production, evaluation and selection of equipment and supplies
6. Preschool and postschool conferences
7. Teacher conferences
8. Summer study
9. Excursions and field trips
10. Consultative services (reading, art, music, science, health, etc.)
11. Exhibits
12. Teacher visitation
13. Interest groups
14. Extension offerings (AATES classes)
15. Small group discussions[6]

The number of organized groups at work on inservice problems in the county has reached a considerable total. An incomplete listing would include the following thirteen distinct kinds of groups:

---

[5]The In-Service Education Program of the DeKalb County Public Schools, Unpublished manuscript, DeKalb County Board of Education, 1953. p. 11.

[6]Ibid., p. 29.

1. The Instruction Committee (Including seven sub-committees)
2. The High School Principals' group
3. The Elementary Principals' club
4. Countywide Workshop groups
5. Individual faculty projects (Including sub-committees of faculties)
6. Audio-visual coordinators' group
7. AATES course groups
8. Field trip and community resources groups
9. Program development groups in subject areas
    - 9.1 General shop
    - 9.2 Homemaking education
    - 9.3 Vocational agriculture
10. Janitors and maids clinics
11. Cafeteria managers' group
12. Bus drivers' training groups
13. Leadership training groups

All of these groups meet in the course of the regular school year.

Certain trends have been noticeable in the inservice program. The number of countywide workshops has been reduced from a high of five to two annually. Greater emphasis is being placed on the individual school faculty as the basic unit of inservice training. The role of the principal is seen as being of increasing importance in improving the instructional program, as is shown by the organization of a four-weeks principals' workshop in the summer of 1953.

Summary.

The DeKalb County program is characterized by a large number of activities designed to promote the growth of teachers and other personnel in service. It has a detailed statement of objectives, is highly organized and is in no sense a static program. Major

responsibility for coordinating the program is in the hands of a central, representative teacher group under teacher leadership. Members of the central office staff are part of this group and a university consultant works with it.

CHAPTER III

POINT OF VIEW

Inservice training, like any other form of educational endeavor, involves some concept of guiding values, some theory as to the way learning takes place, and a notion of the nature of needs of the teacher and his job. Basically, the view taken in the present study is that all teachers are capable of learning and that the way in which they learn is not greatly different from the way in which children and youth learn. It is also felt that all training activities of whatever character should reflect the same democratic values that are expected to prevail in public education generally.

A concept of democratic values.

The basic democratic values that are assumed in the present study can be outlined roughly as follows:

1. Individual human beings are important simply because of their membership in the human family and should be treated with due respect. Teachers as persons are always to be regarded as ends in themselves and not as means. The best kind of development of the individual teacher is the ultimate criterion of inservice educational practices.

2. Cooperation of all concerned toward the solution of common problems is the preferred method of democratic living. The solution

of conflict is best approached through extending the area of common concerns by working together on those problems which are recognized as common.

3. The free play of intelligence as exemplified in the methods of science provides the most effective basis for the solution of problems in all areas of living. This implies the free entertaining of alternative hypotheses in realms of controversy and the holding open of established hypotheses to re-examination in the light of new evidence. It further implies that channels of communication must be kept open and new and possibly competing ideas are to be welcomed and accorded serious consideration on their own merits.

4. Means and ends are closely interrelated. Indeed, it is more accurate to speak of a means-ends continuum of events in which ends-in-view, once achieved, take on the character of means to still further ends. One meaning of this concept is very simple and very important: means can never be justified by the ends they are purported eventually to serve. A democratic inservice program cannot, to use an over-simplified example, be established by administrative fiat.

5. All values arise out of human experience and are susceptible to change and redefinition in the light of their consequences in application to contemporary events. One of the major functions of inservice education is the clarification of values in terms of their application to the educational task.

The essence of these beliefs has been ably and simply stated by Bostwick and Reid as follows:

> A functional program must be related to purpose. The purpose, in turn, must grow out of a system of social beliefs, without which social action toward consistent and related ends is impossible. The assumptions upon which this entire discussion is based are three: (1) that the aim of a democratic society is the optimum development of individual personalities; (2) that its essential faith is in the free play of intelligence, through which all human experience may be criticized and reconstructed; and (3) that its method is participation of all concerned in making decisions which affect them in solving common problems, a process by which there is developed "reciprocal individual and group responsibility for promoting common concerns."[1]

Progress in the field of inservice education is to be accomplished through the continual refinement in operation of the meanings implicit in these values in the light of what we are finding out about the nature of perception and learning, and in terms of our understanding of the needs of the people with whom we are working.

Some assumptions concerning the learning process.

One of the most controversial fields in psychology and certainly one of the most difficult for workers in education to translate into practice, is the field of learning theory. The problem is complicated by the presence of two main theories which start from quite different

---

[1]Prudence Bostwick and Chandos Reid, A Functional High School Program, pp. 1-2.

premises, emphasize different experimental data, and arrive at different conclusions.

According to Hilgard, these two main theories "may be designated association theories on the one hand, and field theories on the other."[2] At the conclusion of his very thorough analysis of major current theories, the same author comes to the conclusion that what is lacking is not accumulated knowledge about learning, but rather an adequate theory. He makes the point in this way:

> The erroneous impression may be left that little is known about learning. The factual knowledge does in reality bulk large.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It is the consistent ordering of this voluminous material into a compact and agreed-upon systematic structure which is lacking.[3]

How far we still are from an "agreed-upon systematic structure" may be seen in the following summary paragraphs from two recent attempts to synthesize and apply the known facts by representatives of the two major points of view. Dollard and Miller summarize the "basic factors in learning" as follows:

> Four factors are exceedingly important in learning. These are: drive, cue, response, and reinforcement. The drive impels responses which are usually channelized by cues from other stimuli not strong enough to act as drives but more specifically distinctive than the drive. If the

---

[2]Ernest Hilgard, Theories of Learning, p. 9.

[3]Ibid., p. 345.

> first response is not rewarded, this creates a dilemma in which the extinction of successive nonreinforced responses leads to so-called random behavior. If some one response is followed by reinforcement, the connection between the stimulus pattern and this response is strengthened, so that the next time the same drive and other cues are present this response is more likely to occur.[4]

The fact that this brief paragraph is not adequately representative of the elaborate and systematic treatment accorded learning in the whole book does not detract from the accurate way in which it reflects an emphasis on the establishment and strengthening of "connections" as the basic act of learning.

Snygg and Combs, in summarizing "how behavior changes," use strikingly different language to describe what is presumably the same process, as follows:

> Summarizing from the phenomenological point of view, all behavior, without exception, is determined by the phenomenal field at the moment of action. To control or change the behavior of any individual it is necessary, therefore, to change his phenomenal field. The process of change in the field is one of differentiation, that is, of the emergence of new entities and characters from the undifferentiated ground. This process of differentiation is an aspect of the efforts of the individual to maintain and increase the organization of his field and, in particular, to maintain and enhance his phenomenal self. In other words, learning and remembering are aspects of an active, purposeful, and continuous process carried on by the individual for the satisfaction of his need. It is impractical to think of the learner except in terms of his own need, his own desires, and his own point of view.[5]

---

[4] John Dollard and Neal E. Miller, Personality and Psychotherapy, p. 47.

[5] Donald Snygg and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior, pp. 50-51.

In the face of such marked differences in approach and terminology it is not surprising that the working educator becomes somewhat confused. Attempts to reconcile field and associationist theories as represented by McConnell's chapter in the Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education are not very clarifying. After reading it, one agrees with him heartily that "learning is an exceedingly complex process."[6] Small wonder that there is a tendency to rely on empirically derived principles supplemented by relatively intelligible formulations of such philosophers as Dewey and Bode. The notion that learning is essentially the reconstruction of experience as a guide to future action and that it goes forward best through action toward the solution of problems that are real to the learner provides a relatively clear directive for organizing the learning process.

There are, however, certain concepts involved in the synthesis of field theory formulated by Snygg and Combs that, from the point of view of the present study, help to illuminate certain problems of inservice training. These concepts will be discussed in some detail.

1. "All behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the phenomenal field of the behaving organism."[7]

---

[6]T. R. McConnell, "Reconciliation of Learning Theories," Chapter VII, The Psychology of Learning, Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II., pp. 243-86.

[7]Snygg and Combs, op. cit., p. 15.

This is the assumption, familiar to educators and agreed to by all psychologists, that behavior is caused. There is some novelty, however, in the idea that the causes are present in the field at the moment of action. Presumably this means that the conditions for the occurrence of a particular form of behavior are to be found in what a person brings to the situation in the form of perceptions, needs, etc., in interaction with those objects and relationships present in the field as he sees it. The phenomenal field is defined as "simply the universe of naive experience in which each individual lives, the everyday situation of self and surroundings which each person takes to be reality." It should be noted that residues of past experiences in the form of memory and perception as well as inferences about the future are included.

In this view, reality for any individual <u>is</u> his phenomenal field. Fields do overlap and consequently communication and agreement about the nature of objects and events are possible, within limits. This seems to make of reality a private, purely individual thing with the objective nature of the world being chiefly a matter of social or cultural agreement. "The only 'objective reality' is that which is agreed upon in a particular culture."[8]

Kelley and Rasey support this view, pointing out that man "lives in a world of his own, unshared in complete detail by his contemporaries. Therefore we come to the inescapable fact that we have no

---

[8] <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 88.

given common world with our fellow men."[9] Later on, though, they grant that we live on the same "earth ball" and can start from there.

> We have innumerable things in common, and our perception can be brought nearer and nearer to correspondence with externality. When we all work to improve our perception of the same object, we come nearer and nearer to commonalty.[10]

Apparently there's something out there, but it isn't real. The individual's perception of it is real. In Kelley's words, "the only reality is a perception, located somewhere behind the eyes."[11] The adequacy of a perception depends upon the degree to which it corresponds to the external environment. The objective nature of this "externality" depends upon what most of the people in your culture think it is. One is reminded of Percy Bridgman's famous question, "Under what conditions could you imagine that everyone else in the world had suddenly gone mad?"

Fortunately, one's private reality is testable through purposeful action. In Ames' words, "In a concrete situation, a perception is a potential prognostic directive for furthering purpose by action."[12] When behavior actually results in the furthering of

---

[9]Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey, Education and the Nature of Man, pp. 38-9.

[10]Ibid., p. 40.

[11]Earl C. Kelley, Education for What is Real, p. 35.

[12]Adelbert Ames, quoted in Hadley Cantril, Understanding Man's Social Behavior, p. 19.

purpose, one can assume that his reality is in touch with externality.

The point to this rather extended discussion is that behavior on the part of an individual has a one-to-one relationship to the perceptions that he makes out of the situation (field) in which he is behaving and that these perceptions cannot possibly be identical with those of any other individual. This gives a new cast to the proposition that behavior is caused and expands the concept of individual differences in a striking way.

2. The phenomenal field is always organized. Though the field of the individual is constantly changing, it remains organized and meaningful. This organization is with reference to the needs of an individual at any given time and has the character of figure and ground. The individual brings elements of the field into figure (more or less acute awareness) as part of his continual search for ways of meeting his need. Presumably the emergence of figure in the phenomenal field, just as in the special case of visual artistic representation, is dependent on the nature of the ground as well as the individual's need. The figure-ground concept provides a way of disposing of the conscious-unconscious dualism. In this view there are simply degrees of consciousness which shade from a high level to a low level as figure shades into ground.

Two points in this discussion are important for our thinking about inservice training: the function of immediately operative

need in determining what it is that a person will attend to; and the significance of ground elements in the emergence of figure. The precise application of the latter concept to the inservice learning situation is not entirely clear at this point. Professor Paul Bogatay and other members of the Fine Arts Department at the Ohio State University are making some interesting experimental applications in the training of beginning students in drawing. One of these experiments involves a cardboard background of a dark material on which students are asked to arrange strips of white paper in such a way that a central figure will emerge. Possibly the corresponding approach in teacher education would involve attention to ground elements in the learning situation out of which pupil learning behavior would be expected to emerge, as well as more direct approaches to such behavior.

3. The individual strives to maintain and defend the organization of his phenomenal field. Snygg and Combs put it this way:

> Like all organized entities, the phenomenal field tends to maintain its organization. ... Items within the field are interacting and interdependent, and any new thing in the field derives its properties from its relationship to the field as a whole.
>
> Material whose inclusion would necessitate a basic reorganization of the field, for instance, is accepted with extreme distortion and modification, or in extreme cases is rejected completely.[13]

---

[13]Snygg and Combs, op. cit., pp. 27-8.

This assumption would appear to have much empirical support in the field of teacher training where the difficulty in bringing about significant change on the part of the classroom teacher is widely recognized. It also receives theoretical support from what is known about the character of fields in biology and physiology. The "wisdom of the body" as revealed in the phenomenon of homeostasis is a case in point.

4. Change in the field occurs through a process of differentiation. The assumption that behavior is determined by the phenomenal field leads to the corollary assumption that change in behavior depends upon change in the field. Snygg and Combs subsume such apparently diverse phenomena as perception, learning, problem-solving, remembering, and forgetting under one process, differentiation. Since this construct is a crucial one, it will be necessary to quote at some length, as follows:

> Since the figure is the only aspect of the field of which we are clearly aware, change in the field means change in the figure. The figure may become smaller and more detailed or it may become larger and more vague and diffuse.
>
> In the same way that the figure is continually shifting in size, it is also changing in character as new characteristics and entities rise and differentiate from ground. Since precision in behavior can only result from precision of figure, it is this emergence into figure which is the phenomenological cause of more effective behavior, that is, of learning. Learning may, therefore, like perception, be considered a process of increasing differentiation

> of the field. In fact, the differentiation of a general solution or procedure, followed by the further differentiation of necessary details, is characteristic of all learning, problem-solving, and remembering.[14]

The same writers go on to point out that "the kind and degree of differentiation in the field are determined by the need of the behaver and by the opportunities for differentiation that are available."[15]

The "opportunities for differentiation" are a function not only of the external physical and social aspects of the field but of the internal residues of previous experiences as well. As Kelley and Rasey put it, "We perceive what we have experience and purpose to perceive and that perception is built into us."[16] It should perhaps be emphasized at this point that the phenomenal field at the moment of action includes all residues of past experiences of the individual as well as inferences he may be making about the future.

The notion that all forms of learning are simply different aspects of the same process is not new, though it would be disputed by many psychologists, including field theorists. Lewin, for example, distinguishes between learning as change in cognitive structure,

---

[14]Snygg and Combs, op. cit., 37-8.

[15]Ibid., p. 45.

[16]Kelley and Rasey, op. cit., p. 36.

learning as change in motivation, learning as change in group belongingness or ideology, and learning in the meaning of voluntary control of the body musculature.[17] The inclusion of perception and memory under the same system principle as learning makes for great economy of theory, though it doubtless makes the proposition even more controversial. The distinctions that are drawn between the different aspects of the process of differentiation are chiefly in terms of time (Perception is almost, but not quite, instantaneous; rote learning and problem solving take longer), complexity (Problem-solving is most complex), and direction of reference (Memory refers to past aspects of the field). The process, though, of differentiating out into figure details that are relevant to purpose remains the same.

One of the functions of any learning situation, then, is to provide the kinds of conditions under which differentiation can take place. These conditions are a function of time, richness of both internal and external aspects of the learner's phenomenal field, and the learner's continuing search for increasingly useful differentiations in terms of his purposes.

5. The basic need of the individual is the enhancement and protection of his phenomenal self. The phenomenal self is regarded as including "all those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual experiences as part or characteristic of himself."[18]

---

[17]Kurt Lewin, "Field Theory and Learning," Psychology of Learning, Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. p. 220.

[18]Snygg and Combs, op. cit., p. 58.

The physical boundaries of the self are usually felt by the individual to be the skin surfaces, though they are capable of extension. The notion of the phenomenal self is admittedly a construct; it is intended to focus attention on those aspects of the phenomenal field that are conceived to be of particular importance in understanding behavior.

Snygg and Combs base the convenient postulate of a single need on a previous assumption that fields tend to operate in such a way that their organization will be maintained. Kelley and Rasey state a somewhat similar conclusion in quite different terminology as follows:

> Because of the uniqueness of individual purpose, the individual views whatever he takes in from the standpoint of his own enhancement or defense. Since perception is highly selective (we perceive only a few of the thousands of coincidences in our environment at any one time) and is controlled largely by purpose, it is likely that most of the things perceived are on the basis of what any particular item means to the perceiver, either to his advantage or his danger. The purpose to enhance is ever present in the individual, and the concomitant of that enhancement is defense or protection.[19]

The search for ways of enhancing or defending the self is, then, the prime mover of human behavior. What are usually regarded as needs are referred to as goals which have been differentiated by the individual as useful in satisfying the basic need for enhancement of self.

---

[19]Kelley and Rasey, op. cit., pp. 73-4.

Two correlates of this assumption are important. The first is that the aspects of the phenomenal field which are most significant in determining behavior are those which are seen by the individual as having reference to the self. The second is that the behavior of the individual at any given moment represents the most effective action he can take in terms of what he regards as self-enhancement. In this view, all behavior is logical from the point of view of the behaver, even though it may appear inappropriate or even irrational to the observer.

In any learning situation, then, the individual's view of himself is exceedingly important. In terms of inservice training, whether he thinks of himself as competent or incompetent, as like or different from the rest of the group, as traditional or progressive, as "knowing all he needs to know" or "needing to learn," etc., has a great deal to do with the way he will behave.

Furthermore, the learner will differentiate goals in the learning situation in terms of what he regards as self-enhancement. Where the aims and activities of the learning group are seen as having a significant self-reference in the direction of enhancement, it may be assumed that modifications in the organization of the phenomenal field will result; where they remain on the level of pleasing the leader in order to get a high grade or its equivalent, little change is likely to occur.

Summary of viewpoint toward learning.

Since the job of the inservice worker is to assist in bringing about changes in the behavior of individual teachers, it is felt that an individual, personal approach to learning theory is more appropriate than an objective, normative one. The important thing about such an approach is the emphasis it places upon the field character of experience and the central importance of purpose as it operates in the perceptions of the experiencing "self." In a sense, the preceding discussion is closely related to the concept of learning as the reconstruction of experience as a guide to future action. Bode once stated the central element in learning in this way:

> All forms of learning, then, have a common element. They all involve a change in the experiential situation which gives greater control in relation to subsequent behavior.[20]

"Experiential situation" is a more comfortable term than "phenomenal field" but it seems reasonable to suppose that the two refer to about the same thing. Change, or reconstruction of behavior is assumed in the current discussion to come about through differentiation which is conceived as an active, purposeful affair initiated by the individual.

---

[20]Boyd Bode, How We Learn, p. 242.

The basic learning situation and inservice training.

In trying to understand the behavior of teachers on the job and their response to efforts at inservice training it is important to analyze the field in which teachers spend most of their time, the classroom. From the teacher's point of view, the classroom, as field, contains the following elements:

1. Self. This includes everything within his skin and all the available residues of all the experiences he has ever had, his perceptions and value judgments, his concept of himself and his notion of what kind of behavior on his part constitutes adequate performance.

2. Learners. A number, usually too many, of younger and presumably less experienced personalities with purposes and perceptions of their own. These learners are there to be helped to make more adequate differentiations within their fields to the end that they may acquire more effective control over subsequent experiences.

3. Materials. Books, film, maps, charts, paper and other items of varying degrees of abstractness are present to extend the range of potential learnings or short-cut the time required for them to occur.

4. A physical place, bounded in some way.

5. Time for learning to take place.

6. A community and culture whose needs and values affect what is to be learned.

Most teachers who have taught for any length of time develop an approach to organizing the classroom field. They have to, or they could not survive. And once a teacher has developed a modus operandi that affords him a sense of adequacy, it would be surprising indeed if he did not tend to develop classroom fields of a consistent organizational pattern. From this point of view every teacher is doing the best job of teaching that he knows how to do. From the observer's standpoint, he may be behaving inadequately, or inappropriately, or even irrationally; but from the behaver's standpoint, what he is doing appears motivated and reasonable.

One of the interview respondents summarized the process with remarkable succinctness in the following excerpt:

Interviewer: What is the best way that a person can learn to develop his best individual method?

Respondent: I don't know. I think it's something like playing golf - the thing that feels natural is the thing to do.

Interviewer: That's an interesting comment. Of course, it's an impossible question to answer.

Respondent: Yeah, but that's just the way I feel. In other words, I've had all the courses, you know, and I've seen this and that and the other thing. But... a person can know when they're getting something across. At least I think I do. And when I feel like I'm getting something across, if it's natural for me to do it that way, why that's the way I'll do it. Next year, and the year after that, and the year after that.

When he had a feeling of adequacy in the teaching role he tended to persist in the modes of behavior that afforded that feeling.

The purpose of inservice training is always, ultimately, to bring about changes in the way the classroom field is organized. The classroom field is always specific and concrete and it always involves action of some sort. Since action is determined by the perceptions of the people engaged in it, it would appear to follow that a fruitful point of attack in inservice training would be the perceptions of teachers. The peculiar problem that faces inservice training, in contradistinction to pre-service training is that teachers-as-learners have already developed some way of organizing the classroom field. Efforts on the part of teacher trainers to bring about change in that field often meet with resistance. In view of the generalization regarding the way in which fields tend to preserve and defend their organization, it would be surprising if such efforts did not meet with resistance.

Ordinarily, we try to bring about changes in the classroom through change agents, usually people of higher status than teachers, though not always. Their entry into the classroom picture may be direct, as in a supervisory visit, or quite indirect, as in a speech by a visiting educator. When such agents carry with them perceived pressure to change from the outside, they introduce an element of threat into the field in which the teacher is operating. It may be safely postulated that the nearer the change-agent gets to

the classroom field, the greater is the element of threat. In this connection, an excerpt from a discussion of psychotherapy is interesting.

> Such feelings of threat have very unfortunate effects on the likelihood of eventual adjustments. Small threats can be tolerated, but when threat becomes great, it may make change in self-concept almost impossible. ... Under threat (the individual) has no choice but to defend his organization and change to some other organization becomes extremely unlikely so long as this feeling of threat remains. He is driven in spite of himself to defend the organization that exists.[21]

The particular organization of the classroom field that a given teacher has worked out represents the best adjustment that he knows how to make in terms of his concept of himself as a teacher and the limitations imposed by anticipated approval or disapproval from many sources, from parents, children, colleagues, the principal, etc. The classroom is a sort of organism-in-balance that is surviving more or less adequately in its environment, the school culture. In connection with this point, the same writers have this to say:

> (The therapist) recognizes that, if therapy is to be effective, it must result in self-enhancement. Without satisfaction of need, therapy is foredoomed to failure. Indeed, the maladjusted state itself is the result of the

---

[21] Snygg and Combs, op. cit., p. 298. (Italics mine.)

> client's striving for need satisfaction. So far as he is concerned, his maladjusted state appears to him as the best possible way he can achieve what he is looking for. Whatever therapeutic experiences are designed for him, then, must provide more opportunity for self-enhancement than he has succeeded in achieving in his former condition. What is more, they must provide opportunity for self-enhancement as the client perceives it; not as the therapist sees the problem. It seems likely that many failures in therapy can be traced directly to failure to consider this important principle.[22]

Two implications of this discussion are quite clear. First, efforts on the part of change-agents that appear as threatening are likely to be met with resistance, and are not likely to bring about lasting changes in the direction desired by the agent. Second, that changes in the classroom field in the direction of adjustment (better teaching) will be of a sort that the teacher perceives as self-enhancing (desirable).

The next question is, of course, a crucial one and very difficult to answer: How can changes in the classroom field be brought about? The answer may lie in the fact that very few classroom fields are in a state of complete equilibrium. Most teachers feel inadequacy in some respects as regards the organization of their classrooms. They may sense more or less acutely, for instance, that they are not reaching the extremes of "slow learners" or "bright" children in their teaching. When tensions of this sort are present

---

[22] Ibid., p. 295. (Italics mine.)

in the field as perceived by the teacher, anything that is seen as being likely to reduce them will be welcomed.

Another way in which it is possible that changes may be brought about is through a change in the concept of the teaching role. This was apparently the case in an incident mentioned in the interviews where a teacher came back from a workshop saying: "I'm going to teach children this year; I taught books last year."

Yet another way is through activities that bring about changes in perception of figure-ground relationships in the classroom field. One teacher, commenting on a child study class, said that the teachers in the group came to feel "that maybe they dwelt too much on things they felt were important that seem just little insignificant things now ... and then it reversed the other way." Awareness of certain elements in the field faded as other elements came into figure.

In summary, it appears that any lasting change in the way in which a classroom field is organized has to stem from inadequacies or tensions within the field as perceived by the teacher. Intense threat reduces the likelihood of change. Changes may be brought about through activities that reduce perceived inadequacies or tensions and through activities that bring about shifts in perception of self in the teaching role or alterations in the perceived character of the field itself.

The foregoing discussion is not intended to provide a revolutionary scheme for reorganizing inservice procedures, but rather to elaborate

certain recognized principles of learning in terms of field theory.

Some variables involved in planning inservice work.

In planning a program of inservice activities, certain variables must be considered. Ten of these variables will be discussed briefly at this point, since they are treated at length in the final chapter of the study.

Variable One: Participation in Planning.

The question of who should share in the planning of inservice activities is one that has to be answered again and again. Errors can be made in two directions: (1) by asking people to share in planning an activity who have no real stake in it; and (2) by failing to involve people who will be significantly affected by the planning.

Variable Two: Problem Selection.

The problems that inservice groups are asked to work on or choose to work on are of many sorts. Ordinarily the selection of a problem implies a reconciliation of felt need on the part of the teachers and some concept of significance of the problem to school and community. Sometimes, also, the feeling of the inservice planner as to what is important enters the picture.

Variable Three: Participation in the Work.

Some inservice planners apparently feel that every teacher in

a system should be actively engaged in some form of inservice work. Occasionally this results in efforts to enlist as many teachers as possible in training groups of various sorts whether they are particularly receptive to the idea or not.

Variable Four: Leadership.

In some programs, leadership functions tend to stay in the hands of principals, supervisors, department heads and other status personnel. In others, a concerted effort is made to encourage the development of skill in leadership on the part of teachers. The selection of a leader for an inservice group is perhaps a more delicate problem than it has sometimes been assumed to be, involving as it does elements of both potential threat and potential growth.

Variable Five: Group Composition.

In the planning of very large meetings or workshops, the question as to who shall be expected to work with whom may be quite controversial. There are those who advocate a "vertical distribution" that cuts across grade and subject interests and there are those who urge a "horizontal distribution" that reflects such interests in common. In smaller and more manageable group situations, the choice is usually between grouping by interest in a problem and some form of sociometric grouping. Sometimes, of course, it depends simply on who is available.

Variable Six: Group Size.

Occasionally the size of a group may be very important, as in the case of a representative planning group in a large system; representation from each of the schools may provide a group so large as to be unwieldy. Two assumptions are frequently made; (1) that for problem-centered group work there is a maximum size (estimates vary from 15 to 30) beyond which sheer size begins to operate restrictively; and (2) that there is a minimum size below which the limited human resources of the group make for less effective work.

Variable Seven: Status Differences.

The presence of status differences in a group are usually regarded as having an inhibiting effect on the functioning of the group. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine a group getting organized effectively without status and its accompanying responsibility being accorded to someone in the group, either openly or implicitly.

Variable Eight: Place of Work.

The question as to where the greater part of inservice work should be done apparently has a very simple answer: wherever it is most convenient for the participants. There are complicating factors, however. Certainly the local school would appear to provide the maximum of convenience and the maximum of security. But sometimes, complete separation, spatially, from the local situation may have

value in terms of freedom and perspective. Church people know the value of the "retreat" and it is possible that inservice planners can learn from them.

Variable Nine: Frequency of Meetings.

Most inservice workers are anxious to keep the frequency of group meetings as low as may be compatible with the purposes to be served. It is possible, though, for meetings to be scheduled too infrequently with resulting loss of continuity and piling up of agenda.

Variable Ten: Expertness.

How much, and what kind, of expert help should be made available to inservice groups, and when it is needed, are questions that have to be decided not only in terms of budget, but in terms of effect on the group. The outside expert, called in to keynote a group meeting, to tell teachers what, in effect, they ought to be concerned with, is not as popular as he once was, and for good reason. His expertness is not available to teacher groups at work on problems, for reasons discussed above that relate to resistance of a field. The best he can hope to do is to tie into the perceptions of some individuals at points where they are ready to understand what he means. There is, however, no real question as to the need for expertness; it is simply a matter of finding out under what conditions it can be made useful to a given group. A reasonable

guess is that such conditions involve a clearly felt and defined inadequacy on the part of the working group and a certain perceptiveness on the part of the expert as to just how much of what sort of help is needed by the group.

In connection with the problem of the use of "outside" experts, Miel has this to say:

> The best strategy in the use of all experts who are outside a given situation would seem to be to find the point at which the group wants help, find the person most likely to be able to furnish that help, find out under what conditions the expert feels he can do his best work, and then clear the way for him to be his most effective self.[23]

It should be pointed out that each of the variables discussed above is treated as if all other things were equal. Such is, of course, never the case. Decisions involved in the planning of in-service programsalways involve questions of purpose, availability of space, people, and resources as well as many other factors.

Criteria for Inservice Programs.

Since one of the outcomes of the present study will be the development of what is in effect a set of criteria for an inservice program from the teacher's point of view, it would be well to consider briefly some of the criteria that have been proposed by workers in the field.

---

[23]Alice Miel, op. cit., p. 131-2.

Beasley, discussing problems of evaluation in the report of the New Hampshire Conference, suggests five criteria for an "ideal" inservice program.

1. An ideal program of inservice education is one in which motivation for participation comes from within the individual.

2. An ideal program of inservice education is cooperatively planned.

3. An ideal program of inservice education is adapted to the needs of the participants.

4. An ideal program of inservice education provides for an interpretation to the public of both purposes and outcomes.

5. An ideal program of inservice education provides a plan for continuous evaluation and improvement of the effectiveness of the program by all concerned.[24]

By way of contrast, Samuel Everett offers four "philosophic" and seven "operational" principles of inservice work.

I. Basic Philosophic Principles

1. There is faith in the competence of teachers to think through, and meet in practical ways, the problems of education.

2. Trust in democratic participation in the educative process is present.

3. Utilization of the problem-solving method moves forward.

4. Responsibility goes with freedom.

---

[24]N. C. Beasley, "Evaluating Inservice Programs," The Teaching Profession Grows in Service, Official Group Reports of the New Hampshire Conference, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA., 1949.

II. Practical Operational Principles

1. Teachers at all educational levels work together.
2. Teachers volunteer to do extra professional work.
3. Extra work is recognized by the payment of an honorarium.
4. Teachers decide for themselves what to do and how to do it.
5. A representative of a central administrative agency participates in group thinking and experimentation.
6. Specialists are provided when needed.
7. Minutes of meetings and progress reports are made available.[25]

These two sets of criteria are presumably derived empirically from experiences in working with teachers on the job. They reflect a common emphasis on voluntary participation, democratic means, and the needs of teachers, but at that point they diverge. From the point of view of the present study, it seems necessary only to ask a few questions of any inservice training program, though these questions would doubtless proliferate in the asking.

1. Are changes in behavior of teachers occurring as a result of the program? (Changes in the organization of individual, concrete, basic learning situations.)
2. Are these changes in the direction of greater perceived adequacy in the teaching role? (Enhancement of self in the teaching role.)

---

[25]Samuel Everett, "Teachers Explore Basic Principles," Educational Leadership, VI (April, 1949).

3. Are the means used to bring about these changes consistent with democratic values?

4. Are the means used to bring about these changes consistent with what we know about learning?

It seems likely that nearly all important criteria can be subsumed under questions like these.

Summary:

The point of view toward inservice education reflected in the present study is rooted in a democratic framework of values that emphasizes the optimum development of personalities, the free play of intelligence, and cooperative decision-making on problems of common concern. Learning is regarded as taking place through the reconstruction of experience and consequent modification of perceptions in the individual. Any given learning situation is regarded as having certain field properties which are significant in any effort to bring about change in behavior, particularly the concept which an individual teacher has of his "self" in the teaching role.

Certain major variables that have to be taken into account in planning inservice activities were discussed briefly, as were certain proposed criteria for an inservice training program.

CHAPTER IV

THE ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS AS REFLECTED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

The Teachers who took part in the study.

The 368 persons who filled out questionnaires for this study represent a variety of levels of teaching, years in the profession and other variables. Data from the cover sheet on the questionnaire provided a way of classifying responses into eight categories which are shown in Table 2. High-school teachers are slightly under-represented, since they make up about 35 per cent of the actual teacher population. Only one in ten of the respondents was a man. Most of the teachers are married and nearly half of them have children of their own. Twin peaks are reflected in the age distribution with fewer teachers in their thirties than might be expected. Nearly forty per cent of the respondents have less than six years' teaching experience. Most of the teachers hold the baccalaureate degree and have done some graduate study. Only nine per cent are teaching on provisional certificates.

Extent of participation in inservice activities.

The extent to which the teachers indicated that they had engaged in the different activities listed in the questionnaire is shown on Table 3 and Table 4.

TABLE 2

The Teachers Who Filled Out The Questionnaires

Category		Number (N-368)	Percent (100.0)
1.	Elementary	259	70.3
	High School	99	26.9
	Others	10	2.8
2.	Men	40	10.8
	Women	328	89.2
3.	Married	253	68.7
	Single	92	25.0
	Divorced or widowed	18	4.9
	No data	5	1.5
4.	Married with children	161	43.8
	Married with no children	105	28.5
	No data	10	2.7
5.	Age: Under 20	1	.5
	21-30	131	35.6
	31-40	75	20.4
	41-50	105	28.5
	Over 50	46	12.5
	No data	10	2.7
6.	Years in teaching:		
	1-5	147	39.9
	6-10	60	16.3
	11-20	97	26.4
	21-30	41	11.1
	Over 30	18	4.8
	No data	5	1.5
7.	Training:		
	Less than AB degree	54	14.7
	AB degree	46	12.5
	AB plus some grad. work	197	53.5
	MA	29	7.9
	MA plus some grad. work	29	7.9
	PhD	1	.3
	No data	12	3.2
8.	Provisional certificate	33	9.0
	Less than 4-year professional	19	5.2
	4-year professional and higher	297	80.6
	No data	19	5.2

Apparently the inservice processes most familiar to these teachers are reading, listening to lectures, and meeting with other teachers of the same grade level, in that order.

In Table 3 it is shown that 92 per cent of these teachers have at one time or another read professional books and pamphlets. Eighty-nine per cent have had the opportunity of listening to a "distinguished educator" and 84 per cent have worked with other teachers in grade-level groups. It is not until the bottom three items are reached that we find less than half the teachers indicating participation. Forty-five per cent have been visited by a supervisor; 43 per cent have been called upon to lead discussion; and only 23 per cent have worked with student teachers.

In terms of structures, nearly everyone goes to faculty meetings and the sessions of the GEA. A rather surprising third in rank is the special-purpose group meeting. Over 77 per cent of the teachers have evidently been to health clinics, reading clinics, audio-visual meetings, and so on.

At the bottom of the participation picture, AATES courses have been taken by about 28 per cent of the respondents, high-school evaluations are familiar to about 18.2 per cent of the total sample (Of the high-school teachers tabulated separately, 48.5 per cent had taken part in such evaluations). Only 15.9 per cent say they have had a visit by a supervisor.

TABLE 3

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Extent of Participation: Process Items

Rank	%		Item
1.	92.0	10.	Reading professional books and pamphlets.
2.	89.0	7.	Hearing a distinguished educator talk on a subject of interest to me.
3.	84.0	3.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same grade as I do.
4.	81.0	8.	Taking part in a discussion led by another teacher.
5.	80.0	6.	Working with a group of teachers from several schools in the system under the leadership of an outside consultant.
6.	76.0	5.	Working with a group of teachers in my own school under the leadership of my own principal.
7.	67.0	1.	Observing other teachers teaching.
8.	62.0	11.	Traveling during vacation.
9.	56.0	4.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same subject as I.
10.	45.0	2.	Having a supervisor visit my class and discuss it with me.
11.	43.0	9.	Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers.
12.	23.0	12.	Having a student teacher working under my direction in my class.

TABLE 4

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Extent of Participation: Structure Items

Rank	%		Item
1	95.5	17.	Faculty Meetings.
2	83.8	27.	Georgia Education Association meetings.
3	77.6	15.	Special interest group meetings (audio-visual or reading clinics, etc.)
4	77.1	13.	Large institutes or workshops for all teachers within an area or system.
5	66.0	18.	Summer professional courses at a college or university. (Materials and methods, etc.)
6	64.0	14.	Systemwide meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field
7	60.0	16.	Meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field within a school
8	45.8	20.	Summer workshops at a college or university.
9	43.9	22.	Child study
10	38.5	19.	Summer content courses at a college or university.
11	34.6	26.	Formal demonstration lessons
12	29.1	24.	Study group led by a supervisor
13	27.7	21.	AATES courses taken during the school year.
14	18.2	25.	High school evaluations (Use of the Evaluative Criteria).
15	15.9	23.	Individual visits by a supervisor.

It should be pointed out that certain differences in responses to related items are pretty baffling. For instance, in Table 3, 45 per cent of the respondents indicated familiarity with the process involved in the supervisory visit; (Item 2, Rank 10) yet, in Table 4, only 15.9 per cent checked the corresponding structure (Item 23, rank 15). Apparently teachers perceive the two as being different. Similarly, the sixth-ranking item on Table 3., "working with a group of teachers in my own school under the leadership of my own principal," has a percentage index of 76.0 while the first-ranking item on Table 4., "Faculty meetings," has an index of 95.5. This divergence, however, has an explanation in the distinction that many teachers draw between faculty meetings and working with one's principal on inservice problems; some even put the distinction into effect by defining faculty meetings versus staff meetings.

The ranking of the items as a whole, however, is not seriously affected for the purposes of this study, inasmuch as the position of supervisory activity remains low in terms of participation on both tables; and certainly not all faculty meetings may be reasonably regarded as "working with" a group of one's fellow teachers.

Treatment of the value data.

The first step in the manipulation of the value responses to the questionnaire was to work out a mean value score (MVS) for each item on both criteria. This score was derived by multiplying the

number of responses in each category by the value number (3,2,1, or 0) of that category, summating the results and dividing by the total number of responses to that item. Thus, each MVS represents a theoretical point on a scale of value from three to zero, where three represents "high value," two represents "some value," one represents "low" value, and zero represents "no value." An MVS of 2.50, then, represents a point halfway between "some value" and "high value."

The second step was to rank each item according to the size of its MVS. This was done for each item - classification separately and for each criterion, giving four sets of rankings in all.

Since it was desired to discover which inservice activities were most highly regarded and which were least valued, certain arbitrary limits were set. All items with an MVS of 2.50 or above were classified as of "high value;" all items with an MVS of 2.00 or below were classified as of "low value."

Since for certain purposes it was necessary to have some way of symbolizing relationships between rankings, the rank-difference coefficient of correlation (rho) was used to provide a rough indication of the extent to which there was agreement between two sets of rankings. A rho of 1.00 indicates a one-to-one relationship or complete agreement; 0.00 indicates no relationship; -1.00 indicates a complete reversal in ranks.

TABLE 5

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Value for Improving Personal-Social Relationships: Process Items

Rank	Mean Value Score		Item
1	2.63	5.	Working with a group of teachers in my own school under the leadership of my own principal.
2	2.62	3.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same grade I do.
3	2.61	4.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same subject I do.
4	2.57	11.	Traveling during vacation.
5	2.38	6.	Working with a group of teachers from several schools in the system under leadership of an outside consultant.
6	2.20	9.	Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers.
7	2.08	8.	Taking part in a discussion group led by another teacher.
8	1.99	1.	Observing other teachers teaching.
9	1.94	2.	Having a supervisor visit my class and discuss it with me afterwards.
10	1.91	12.	Having a student teacher working under my direction in my class.
11	1.87	10.	Reading professional books and pamphlets.
12	1.79	7.	Hearing a distinguished educator talk on a subject of interest to me.

Average value score (Sum MVS/12) - 2.22

TABLE 6

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Value for Improving Personal-Social Relationships: Structure Items

Rank	Mean Value Score		Item
1	2.66	20.	Summer workshops at a college or university.
2	2.50	16.	Meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field within a school.
3	2.36	18.	Summer professional courses at a college or a university.
4	2.35	21.	AATES courses taken during the school year.
5	2.33	17.	Faculty meetings.
6	2.32	22.	Child study.
7	2.29	14.	Systemwide meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field.
8	2.28	13.	Large institutes or workshops for all teachers within an area or system.
9	2.17	15.	Special interest group meetings. (Audio-visual or reading clinics, etc.)
10	2.15	19.	Summer content courses at a college or a university.
11	2.07	27.	Georgia Education Association Meetings.
12	2.03	24.	Study group led by a supervisor.
13	1.84	23.	Individual visits by a supervisor.
14	1.80	25.	High school evaluations.
15	1.68	26.	Formal demonstration lessons.

Average value score (Sum MVS/15) - 2.19

Criterion I: The value of inservice activities for improving personal-social relationships: Process items.

The four top-ranking items in Table 5 are accorded a scale position more than half-way between 3 - "of great value" and 2 - "of some value." The differences between the MVS of these four items are so light as to make their position in relation to one another rather arbitrary. But the endorsement of the processes involved seems clear. These teachers feel that, of the processes listed, those which involve meeting together over common problems represented by same grade, same subject, or same school are of greatest value in improving personal-social relationships. Summer travel is a close competitor.

Of least value under this criterion are activities dealing with observing, reading, and listening. Since these involve little human interaction, this is not surprising. But two other items are given a mean value of less than "2," one dealing with having a student teacher and the other dealing with visits by supervisors. Both of these are face-to-face situations where the teachers' performance in the classroom may come under close scrutiny and both involve relationships with status persons, college or system supervisors.

Criterion I: The value of inservice activities for improving personal-social relations: Structure items.

In Table 6 the second-ranking item is the structure that includes the top three items of process shown in Table 5. The high rank

accorded summer workshops and professional courses (AATES courses are analogous to professional courses) cannot be explained through any such direct relationship. It is possible that the value connected with getting away and meeting new people that is reflected in summer travel may have a bearing here. The MVS given the summer workshop is unmistakeably high.

At the very bottom of the list on this table we find formal demonstration lessons, high school evaluations and the individual supervisory visit, all accorded a relatively low MVS.

Criterion II: The value of inservice activities for improving classroom practice: Process items.

Topping the list here, with the highest MVS (2.73) accorded any item on any criterion, is No. 4, "Working with a group of teachers who teach the same subject as I." This is followed closely by the "same-grade" item, and third rank is given to the process of observing. Apparently these teachers see group work with other teachers who have the same grade or content in common with them as affording much the highest returns for inservice work, in terms of both relationship value and instructional improvement.

Those are, however, the only two items that maintain the favored top-ranking position. Observing other teachers has shifted from third-from-bottom to third-from-top position with the application of a different criterion.

TABLE 7

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Value for Improving Classroom Practice: Process Items

Rank	Mean Value Score	Item	
1	2.73	4.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same subject as I do.
2	2.68	3.	Working with a group of teachers who teach the same grade as I do.
3	2.59	1.	Observing other teachers teaching.
4	2.49	10.	Reading professional books and pamphlets.
5	2.46	11.	Traveling during vacation.
6	2.38	5.	Working with a group of teachers in my own school under leadership of my own principal.
7	2.29	6.	Working with a group of teachers from several schools in the system under the leadership of an outside consultant.
$8\frac{1}{2}$	2.26	2.	Having a supervisor visit my class and discuss it with me afterward.
$8\frac{1}{2}$	2.26	7.	Hearing a distinguished educator talk on a subject of interest to me.
10	2.01	8.	Taking part in a discussion led by another teacher.
11	1.96	12.	Having a student teacher working under my direction in my class.
12	1.95	9.	Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers.

Average value score (Sum MVS/12) - 2.34

TABLE 8

Inservice Activities Ranked According to Value for Improving Classroom Practice: Structure Items

Rank	Mean Value Score	Item	
1	2.58	22.	Child study.
2½	2.57	20.	Summer workshops at a college or university.
2½	2.57	16.	Meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field within a school.
4	2.50	18.	Summer professional courses at a college or university.
5	2.46	21.	AATES courses taken during the school year.
6	2.45	15.	Special interest group meetings. (Audio-visual or reading clinics, etc.)
7	2.35	19.	Summer content courses at a college or university.
8	2.25	14.	Systemwide meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field.
9	2.21	26.	Formal demonstration lessons.
10½	2.08	24.	Study groups led by a supervisor.
10½	2.08	13.	Large institutes or workshops for all teachers within an area or system.
12	1.99	17.	Faculty meetings.
13	1.95	25.	High school evaluations.
14	1.88	23.	Individual visits by a supervisor.
15	1.56	27.	Georgia Education Association meetings.

Average value score (Sum MVS/15) - 2.23

The lowest three items on Table 7 deal with leading a discussion, having a student teacher, and taking part in a discussion group led by another teacher. Teachers see little value in these activities as far as improving classroom practice is concerned.

Criterion II: The value of inservice activities for improving classroom practice: Structure items.

The top four items on Table 8 all have an MVS of 2.50 or over and the differences among the top three are negligible. One of these items (No. 16) deals with the familiar grade-subject-school arrangement. The other three are related to institution-sponsored programs. Except for the emergence of Child Study in first place, the same items top the list of structures on Criterion II as on Criterion I (Table 6).

The bottom four items have an MVS of less than 2.00 and now include faculty meetings and GEA meetings as well as high-school evaluations and the individual supervisory visit. Of all the structures listed, GEA meetings are clearly considered least helpful for this purpose.

It should be noted that many teachers checked "Child Study" who had not participated in the organized AATES program which the investigator had in mind. From the interviews it became clear that many respondents took it to mean the study of children in any form whatever.

TABLE 9

Top-ranking and "High Value" Inservice Activities: All Teachers

Item	Criterion I: Rank	Criterion I: MVS	Criterion II: Rank	Criterion II: MVS
Process items:				
5. Working with a group of teachers in my own school under leadership of my principal	1	2.63		
°3. Working with a group of teachers - same grade	2	2.62	2	2.68
°4. Working with a group of teachers - same subject	3	2.61	1	2.73
11. Traveling	4	2.57		
1. Observing			3	2.59
10. Reading			4	2.49
Structure items:				
22. Child study			1	2.58
°20. Summer workshop	1	2.66	2½	2.57
°16. Grade or subject meetings within a school	2	2.50	2½	2.57
°18. Summer professional courses	3	2.36	4	2.50

° - Items rated high on both criteria

(Criterion I - Improving personal-social relationships)
(Criterion II - Improving classroom practice)

TABLE 10

Bottom-ranking and "Low Value" Inservice Activities:
All Teachers

Item	Criterion I: Rank	Criterion I: MVS	Criterion II: Rank	Criterion II: MVS
Process items:				
1. Observing	8	1.99		
2. Being visited by supervisor	9	1.94		
°12. Having student teacher	10	1.91	11	1.96°
10. Reading	11	1.87		
7. Listening to speaker	12	1.79		
9. Leading a discussion			12	1.95
Structure items:				
°23. Individual visit by supervisor	13	1.84	14	1.88°
°25. High school evaluations	14	1.80	13	1.95°
26. Demonstration lessons	15	1.68		
27. GEA meetings			15	1.56
17. Faculty meeting:			12	1.99

° - Items rated low on both criteria

(Criterion I - Improving personal-social relationships)
(Criterion II - Improving classroom practice)

Summary of high- and low- valued inservice activities.

The rankings and relationships briefly analyzed above are summarized in Tables 9 and 10. Concerning the high-ranking items, certain generalizations appear to be justified.

1. These teachers see high value in those inservice activities which honor grade level and subject area concerns. This is true on both criteria and in both classifications. It is supported by three items (No. 3, 4, and 16.)

2. These teachers see high value in those system activities that take place within a school. This is true for both criteria in the case of Item 16 and for Criterion I in the case of Item 5.

3. These teachers see high value in certain summer study activities. This is true on both criteria for the informal, problem-centered study represented by the workshop, Item 20, and on Criterion II for courses in materials and methods. (Professional courses rank third on Criterion I, also, though they are not in the "high value" MVS category.)

4. These teachers see high value in child study for improving classroom practice. Cooperation between institution and school system in the organized study of individual children is given top rank under this criterion.

5. These teachers see high relationship value in the relatively independent activity of summer travel.

6. These teachers see high instructional value in watching other teachers teaching. This activity, represented by Item 1, is the only activity that is valued high on one criterion and low on the other. However, the independent activity of reading, Item 10, is rated low on Criterion I and almost reaches the "high" classification on Criterion II.

Low-valued activities.

1. These teachers see little value in the activities involved in supervising a student teacher. This is true on both criteria. The presence of a student in the classroom and the relationship with a college supervisor of student teachers apparently do not make for inservice growth in the view of these teachers.

2. These teachers see little value in supervision as represented by the individual classroom visit. This is true on both criteria for the unqualified visit represented by Item 23. For the visit followed by a conference, Item 2, it is true on Criterion I.

3. These teachers see little value for improving relationships in the relatively passive activities of observing, reading, and listening to a speaker.

4. These teachers see little instructional value in large professional meetings. As represented by the Georgia Education Association meetings, Item 27, almost no value is seen in terms of Criterion II, only slight value on Criterion I.

5. These teachers see little instructional value in faculty meetings. Though the relationship value of such meetings is fairly high, they are perceived as making little contribution to the improvement of instruction.

6. The teachers see little instructional value in leading discussion. This activity, as represented by Item 9, is at the bottom of the list on this criterion.

Analysis of Sub-group responses to the questionnaire.

For all of the sub-groups analysed, an average MVS or average value score was figured for process and structure items on both criteria. The difference in such scores from group to group is assumed to indicate greater or less satisfaction with training activities as a whole.

Likewise, rank-difference correlation coefficients (rho) were determined for paired divisions within the subgroups to provide a way of symbolizing the extent to which groups tended to rank the items on the questionnaire in the same way.

As a rule of thumb, where the differences between all four average value scores are in the same direction, a presumption of an actual difference in attitude is assumed to be indicated. Where these differences all exceed .10, the presumption is assumed to be fairly strong.

As a second rule of thumb, where the rank-difference coefficient of correlation exceeds .90, it is assumed that rankings are for all

TABLE 11

Differences in Ranking of Process Items:

High School vs. Elementary

Item	Criterion I: Relationships		Criterion II: Practice	
	High	Elem.	High	Elem.
1. Observing	9	8	3	3
2. Being visited	10	9	6	9
3. Same grade	4	3	2	2
4. Same subject	2	1½	1	1
5. Same school	3	1½	7	5½
6. Consultant	5	5	8	7
7. Listening to speaker	12	12	9	8
8. Teacher leader	7	7	11	10
9. Leading discussion	6	6	12	11
10. Reading	11	10	5	5
11. Traveling	1	4	4	5½
12. Student teacher	8	11	10	12
Average value score	2.09	2.27	2.17	2.40
Difference		+.18		+.23
Rank relationship		+.92		+.92

N (High School) - 99: N (Elementary) - 259

TABLE 12

Difference in Ranking of Structure Items:
High School vs. Elementary

Item	Criterion I: Relationship		Criterion II: Practice	
	High	Elem.	High	Elem.
13. Large institutes	8	6	12	10½
14. Systemwide grade subject meetings	4	8	6½	7
15. Within school grade subject	2	2	2	2½
16. Special interest meetings	10	9	8	8
17. Faculty meetings	5	5	11	12
18. Summer courses (professional)	6	3	4	5
19. Summer courses (content)	7	11	1	8
20. Summer workshops	1	1	5	1
21. AATES courses	9	4	10	4
22. Child study	3	7	3	2½
23. Supervisory visit	12	13	14	13
24. Study group led by supervisor	14	12	13	10.5
25. High-school Evaluations	11	15	9	14
26. Demonstration lessons	15	14	6½	9
27. GEA meetings	13	10	15	15
Average value score	2.04	2.23	1.95	2.31
Difference		+.19		+.36
Rank relationship		+.79		+.73

practical purposes the same. Furthermore, in cases of lower coefficients, only those items which reflect a difference of four or more place-positions will be discussed.

Finally, any differences in the three highest-ranking items that are indicated by any sub-group will be noted; e.g., high-school teachers rank summer content courses among the first three items in instructional value. This is not true of the whole group.

Differences in ranking by sub-groups.

Category 1: High School vs. Elementary (Tables 11 and 12)

Mean value differences

Average value scores were higher for elementary teachers than for high-school teachers. The differences are represented by .18, .23, .19, .36. There is a strong presumption that elementary teachers see more value in inservice activities than do high-school teachers.

Rank differences

For process items there was little difference between the two groups, the relationship being represented by coefficients of .92 on both criteria.

For structure items there was greater divergence in rankings, as is shown by the two coefficients .79 on Criterion I, and .73 on

Criterion II. High-school teachers ranked systemwide (grade or subject) meetings and child study higher for improving personal-social relationships, workshops lower for improving instruction. They marked summer content courses and high-school evaluations higher than did elementary teachers on both criteria, AATES courses lower.

Differences in highest-valued items

1. For improving personal-social relationships.

   Process Items:

   Rank 1 - 11. Traveling during vacation

   Structure Items:

   Rank 3 - 22. Child Study

2. For improving classroom practice.

   Process Items:

   No difference

   Structure Items:

   Rank 1 - 19. Summer content courses.

Generalizations

1. High-school teachers see less value in inservice training activities than do elementary teachers.

2. High-school teachers find systemwide meetings and child study relatively more congenial than do elementary teachers.

3. High-school teachers see less instructional value in workshops.

4. High-school teachers see more value in summer content courses and in high-school evaluations than do elementary teachers, on both criteria.

5. High-school teachers see less value in AATES courses than do elementary teachers, on both criteria.

6. High-school teadhers see high value in travel as a means of improving personal social relationships.

7. High-school teachers rank summer content courses first for improving instruction.

Category 2: Men vs. Women. (Tables 13 and 14)

Mean value differences

Average value scores were higher for women than for men for both classifications of items on both criteria. The differences are represented by .10, .11, .05, and .14. There is a presumption that the women in the sample see more value in inservice training activities than do the men.

Rank differences

For process items there was little difference between the two groups, the relationship being represented by coefficients of .87 and .82 for Criterion I and Criterion II respectively. Men ranked

TABLE 13

Differences in Ranking of Process Items:

Men vs. Women

Item	Content	Criterion I: Relationships		Criterion II: Practice	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
1.	Observing	9	8	4	3
2.	Being visited	8	9	6	9
3.	Same grade	5	1	2	2
4.	Same subject	3	2.5	1	1
5.	Same school	1	2.5	3	6
6.	Consultant	2	5	8	7
7.	Listening to speaker	12	12	10.5	8
8.	Teacher leader	7	7	10.5	10
9.	Leading discussion	6	6	9	12
10.	Reading	10	11	5	4.5
11.	Traveling	4	4	7	4.5
12.	Student teacher	11	10	12	11
Average value score		2.13	2.28	2.23	2.34
Difference			+.15		+.11
Rank relationship		+.87		+.82	

N (Men) - 40: N (Women) - 326

TABLE 14

Differences in Ranking of Structure Items:

Men vs. Women

	Item	Criterion I: Relationships		Criterion II: Practice	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
13.	Large Institutes	5	7	12	11
14.	Systemwide grade subject meetings	2	8	6	8
15.	Special Interest meetings	11	9.5	2	6
16.	Within school meetings	4	2	4.5	1.5
17.	Faculty meetings	3	6	10.5	14
18.	Summer courses (professional)	6	3	4.5	4
19.	Summer courses (content)	10	9.5	1	7
20.	Summer workshops	1	1	3	3
21.	AATES courses	7	4	8.5	5
22.	Child study	9	5	8.5	1.5
23.	Supervisory visit	12	13	15	12
24.	Discussion led by supervisor	15	11	13	10
25.	High-school evaluations	8	14	10.5	13
26.	Demonstration lessons	14	15	7	9
27.	GEA meetings	13	12	14	15
Average value score		2.14	2.19	2.07	2.21
Difference			+.05		+.14
Rank relationship			+.71		+.65

working in grade-level groups lower for improving relationships, working with teachers from several schools under consultant leadership higher. For improving practice men see more value in working within a school under leadership of the principal and do not rate leading a discussion group as low as do women.

For structure items there is greater difference between the two groups, the relationship being represented by .71 and .65. For improving relationships men rank systemwide grade-subject meetings much higher than do women, and they do not rank high-school evaluations as low. Men rank child study and study groups led by a supervisor much lower than do women.

For improving practice men rank summer content courses and special interest groups higher than do women. They rank child study and AATES courses lower. Women rank faculty meetings lower than men do on both criteria.

Marked differences in highest and lowest ranking items.

Since the rankings by women did not differ very much from the entire sample, only rankings by men are shown.

1. For improving personal-social relationships.

Process Items:

Rank 2 - 6. Working with a group of teachers from several schools in the system under leadership of an outside consultant.

Structure Items:

Rank 2 - 14. Systemwide meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field

Rank 3 - 17. Faculty meetings

2. For improving classroom practice.

Process Items:

Rank 3 - 5. Working with a group of teachers in my own school under the leadership of my own principal.

Structure Items:

Rank 1 - 19. Summer content courses.

Rank 2 - 15. Special interest group meetings.

Generalizations

1. Men see somewhat less value in inservice training activities than do women.

2. Men see less relationship value in grade-level meetings than do women.

3. Men see more relationship value in working with teachers from several schools under consultant leadership and in systemwide grade or subject meetings.

4. Men see more instructional value in working within a school under leadership of the principal, in leading a discussion group, in summer content courses and special interest group meetings.

5. Women see less value in faculty meetings than do men. Men apparently see high relationship value in systemwide meetings,

preferably in their own subject field and with an outside consultant. They also rank faculty meetings high for this purpose.

For improving classroom practice men choose the summer content course first, special interest meetings second. Apparently these men are more content-centered than the women. But they see working in their own schools as having high instructional value.

Category 3: Married vs. Single (Tables 15 and 16)

Mean value differences

Average value scores were slightly higher for married teachers than for single teachers for process items on both criteria; slightly lower for structure items. The differences are represented by -.06, -.03, +.10, +.02.

Rank differences

For process items there was practically no difference between the two groups, the relationship being represented by coefficients of +.93 and +.90.

For structure items the same generalization holds. Coefficients were +.91 and +.93.

Single teachers do rank summer professional courses markedly lower than do married teachers for improving relationships and they rank workshops lower for improving instruction.

Differences in Highest-valued items

1. For improving personal-social relationships.

Process items:

Rank 1 - (Single) 11. Traveling during vacation

TABLE 15

Differences in Ranking of Process Items:

Married vs. Single

Item	Criterion I: Relationships		Criterion II: Practice	
	Mar.	Single	Mar.	Single
1. Observing	8.5	8	3	3
2. Being visited	10	9	9	6
3. Same grade	2	2.5	2	2
4. Same subject	3	4	1	1
5. Same school	1	2.5	5	7.5
6. Consultant	5	5	7	7.5
7. Listening to speaker	12	12	8	9
8. Teacher leader	7	7	10	11.5
9. Leading discussion	6	6	11	10
10. Reading	11	11	4	5
11. Traveling	4	1	6	4
12. Student teacher	8.5	10	12	11.5
Average value score	2.24	2.18	2.36	2.33
Difference		-.06		-.03
Rank relationship	+.93		+.90	

N (Married) - 253: N (Single) - 92

TABLE 16

Differences in Ranking of Structure Items:

Married vs. Single

	Item	Criterion I: Relationships Mar.	Single	Criterion II: Practice Mar.	Single
13.	Large Institutes	7	7.5	10	11.5
14.	Systemwide grade subject meetings	8	4.5	8	8
15.	Special interest meetings	10	10	5	6
16.	Within-school meetings	2	2	3	1
17.	Faculty meetings	5	4.5	12	13
18.	Summer courses (professional)	3	7.5	4	2
19.	Summer courses (content)	9	9	7	7
20.	Summer Workshops	1	1	1	5
21.	AATES courses	4	6	6	4
22.	Child study	6	3	2	3
23.	Supervisory visit	13	13	14	11.5
24.	Study group led by supervisor	11.5	12	11	10
25.	High school Evaluations	14	14	13	14
26.	Demonstration lessons	15	15	9	9
27.	GEA meetings	11.5	11	15	15
Average value score		2.19	2.29	2.24	2.26
Difference			+.10		+.02
Rank relationship		+.91		+.93	

Structure items:

Rank 3 - (Single) 22. Child study

2. For improving classroom practice.

Process items

No difference

Structure items

Rank 2 - (Single) 18. Summer professional courses.

Single teachers put travel in first rank of process items for improving relationships; child study into third rank on the same criterion. The summer professional course comes up into second place for improving practice, replacing the workshop.

Generalizations

1. Single and married teachers do not differ significantly in their general attitudes toward inservice training.

2. Single teachers see less value in summer professional courses on Criterion I, and in workshops on Criterion II. They give summer professional courses second rank, however, on Criterion II.

Summary and tentative conclusions:

The inservice activities with which the greatest number of these teachers are familiar are faculty meetings, professional reading, hearing a distinguished speaker, working with teachers at same-grade level and Georgia Education Association Meetings.

Activities least commonly experienced are supervisory visits, high-school evaluations and having a student teacher. A rather curious point is that these activities are also among the least valued.

The system activities to which greatest value is attached are those that honor grade level and subject area concerns, that take place within a school, and that involve the study of children or watching other teachers teach. Summer workshops and methods courses are also highly regarded and vacation travel is considered a worthwhile means of professional growth.

Classroom supervisory activities are held in low esteem and having a student teacher is felt to make little contribution to inservice growth. Meetings of the Georgia Education Association and faculty meetings are believed to have little to offer for instructional improvement. Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers is thought to have little relationship to growth in teaching skill.

<u>High-school teachers</u> differ from elementary teachers in the high value they see in summer content courses for improving instruction. They see correspondingly less value in summer workshops and AATES courses. High-school evaluations (with which they are naturally more familiar than are elementary teachers) they rate somewhat higher, but not much. Systemwide (departmental) meetings they also rate higher.

High-school teachers see less value in inservice activities as a whole.

Men also put summer content courses in first position for improving instruction. They rank special interest meetings second on the same criterion. They rank systemwide meetings with consultant leadership and departmental meetings in second place for improving relationships. They also rate staff study groups under principal leadership high for instructional purposes. Women rate faculty meetings lower than do men; they rate child study higher and see more value in inservice activities as a whole.

Single teachers do not differ significantly from married teachers in their attitudes toward inservice training activities as a whole. They do, however, put travel in first place position for improving relationships, see less value in summer professional courses for the same purpose. They see definitely less value in summer workshops than do married teachers, as a means of improving classroom practice.

Tentative conclusions:

1. Teachers prefer to do inservice work at the grade level or in the subject field where they teach.

2. Teachers prefer to work in their own schools, but high-school teachers and men value systemwide departmental meetings.

3. Teachers value inservice study on a college or university campus in the summer. In such work, elementary teachers prefer workshops for improving classroom practice. High-school teachers and men prefer content courses. Workshops are preferred by all groups for improving personal-social relationships.

4. Teachers see child study and observing other teachers as effective means of improving classroom practice.

5. Teachers favor vacation travel as a way of improving personal-social relationships.

6. Supervisory activities are regarded as having limited value for meeting the needs of these teachers.

7. Experiences with student teachers have not been professionally rewarding.

8. Teachers see little instructional value in attending large association meetings.

9. Faculty meetings do not yield rewards in terms of instructional improvement.

10. Assumption of the leadership role by teachers is not regarded by them as contributing to instructional improvement.

11. As at present constituted, inservice training activities appear to be yielding greater satisfaction to elementary teachers than to high-school teachers, to women than to men.

CHAPTER V

THE ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS AS REFLECTED IN THE INTERVIEWS

In order to understand the treatment of the interview data on the following pages, certain procedures need to be described in some detail. Two relatively novel concepts are employed here and they are used in a special way. The first of these concepts is the response unit. This unit is defined simply as all of the relevant material that appears in the transcripts in response to one of the standard questions. Such a unit may include several probing or summarizing remarks by the interviewer. The unit may be very short and succinct, as in the following illustration:

I: How do teachers feel about GEA meetings?

R: They think they are pretty much a waste of time.[1]

D 1.1

On the other hand, it may ramble over a page or two.

The second concept is the basic value unit. This unit is defined as that portion of the relevant response material which is stated, or which can be clearly re-stated, as a minimum thought unit. It is usually the equivalent of a simple sentence or independent clause, though sometimes dependent clauses are included in

---

[1] In excerpts from interview transcripts I stands for interviewer, R for respondent. Numbers following each excerpt identify the interview from which it is taken.

it. An illustration may help to clarify the way this is done.

I: How do teachers feel about the GEA meetings?

R: You see an awful lot of them there. Well, there again, I think there are always certain things ... I think most of the teachers I know like to be free to go to the meetings they want to go to. But they enjoy those.
D 7.3

The response of the interviewee is composed of the following communication units:

1. You see an awful lot of them (teachers) there.

2. There are always certain things ...

3. Teachers like to be free to go to the meetings they want to go to.

4. They enjoy those (meetings).

All four of these units reveal an evaluation, either stated or implied. Since No. 2 cannot be interpreted with any degree of accuracy, it would not be included in analysis. Since all three of the other elements are statements to which positive (plus) valuation is attached, the response unit which the above excerpt represents is classified as positive.

In the first illustration, the response unit consisted of a single value unit, "They (teachers) think they (GEA meetings) are pretty much a waste of time," which clearly has a minus value

and is classified as a negative response to the question.

A great many response units contain both positive and negative value units, as well as much "filler" material and explanatory or causal units as well as occasional value units that do not bear directly on the question under consideration.

> I: How do the teachers on your staff feel about going to GEA meetings? Do they feel that's a valuable kind of activity?
>
> R: I don't think they feel like that is as valuable as some of our other meetings. It may be that ... Some of them say that they didn't know they had small meetings, just general meetings. But I go to the small meetings, too. And I have gained something there.
>
> D 10.1

Organized as communications units, the response reads as follows:

1. They (don't) feel like that is as valuable as some of our other meetings.

2. Some say they didn't know they had small meetings, just general meetings.

3. I go to the small meetings, too.

4. I have gained something there.

Units 1 and 4 are value units; one negative, the other positive. Hence, the total response unit is classified as mixed or bi-valued.

Unit 2 is explanatory as to why teachers may feel that way. Unit 3 is also explanatory, of the respondent's behavior. What the respondent is saying in effect is, "Most teachers don't value GEA meetings very highly, but I find small meetings of some value."

A rough formula for classifying all response units to a given question into three categories was worked out. Whenever 75% or more of the basic value units making up a response unit were positive, the response was classified as positive. Whenever 75% or more of the basic value units making up a response unit were negative, the response was classified as negative (minus). Everything in between those limits was classified as mixed (plus-and-minus). So, in effect, when a response is classified as positive it represents relatively unqualified approval or endorsement of an activity, only one in four value units having a negative valence at worst.

Like any formula, this one does some violence to the analysis of human communication, especially since it makes no allowance for the intensity with which valuations are expressed. Conceivably, several mild positive statements may be completely overbalanced by one vitriolic expression of distaste. In actual application to the material of the interviews, however, this problem did not appear significant. When people discuss something of which they approve, and know that other teachers approve, they tend to make positive statements about it. The same generalization applies to clearly

negative reactions. And when they have reservations about the value of an activity, the formula shows that up, too.

Appraisal of the various activities mentioned in the interviews was not, of course, the main function of the analysis of the interview data. The basic communications units also served as a basis for developing generalizations bearing on the question of why the teachers feel as they do about inservice activities and the dynamics that underly feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. For instance, one of the generalizations that developed had to do with time. From putting together such units as the following, the way in which teachers' perceptions of the usages of their time function in their attitudes toward inservice training activities begins to emerge.

"Sometimes our Saturday meetings may come at an inopportune time." D 14.1

"I do not like to throw away my time." D 4.12A

"There's too much time wasted in getting down to the gist (sic) of the problem." D 28.2

"The hardship that we all labor under is the pressure of time." D 28.5

"We think we've got a better use for that time." D 28.1

"A lot of teachers feel like that they put in a lot of time and don't get much out of it." D 28.2

"Some older teachers may have had some (inservice training) that they felt was a waste of time." D 7.1

"No, it wasn't a waste of time at all." D 7.2

By breaking down and classifying the basic communications units in this way, the categories were derived that provided a basis for an interpretative analysis of the data in context. The main point here is that such a procedure provides a way of developing categories that does not depend on an a priori framework and is consequently more likely to correspond to the actual perceptions of teachers. It also provides an indication of the importance of a particular perception to the extent that frequency of mention is related to intensity of concern. If concern over time is mentioned more often than some other category, presumably time is more important in the thinking of these teachers than the other category.

Appraisal of Inservice Activities in the Interviews

Most of the teachers interviewed in DeKalb county said they felt teachers saw the need for inservice training and had a generally favorable attitude toward the program. The most common explanation given was that teachers feel a professional obligation to keep in touch with newer methods and practices.

> I know that most people wouldn't want to go to a doctor who was still going by 1850 methods and I'm sure that most people wouldn't want their children taught by a person using 1850 methods.
>
> ... D 28.3

It was felt by some that younger teachers were more favorably inclined toward inservice work than older teachers. Several respondents indicated that any good, professional person will

welcome the opportunity to do inservice work, implying, presumably, that there are some bad, unprofessional teachers who do not share this attitude. A number were critical of the demands that some activities "of dubious value" made upon their time. Others disliked the element of "requiredness" that they felt characterized some of the activities. Still others felt that many activities had little relation to the "down-to-earth" problems of their classrooms. In no instance, however, did a respondent question the need for inservice training, and many of them were emphatic in their appreciation of the opportunities provided for them in the DeKalb program.

When the formula for classification of response units was applied to material relating to this question, the following distribution appeared:

TABLE 17

Distribution of Responses to the Question: How Do You Think Teachers, in General, Feel About Inservice Training Activities?

Positive (plus)	45%
Mixed (plus and minus)	35%
Negative	20%
(N-26)	

It should be emphasized that the 20% classified as negative did not say that teachers disliked inservice training activities. It simply means that 75% or more of the value units in those responses

were classified as negative. An example of a response unit classified as negative will illustrate the point.

> Well, I believe most of them are in favor of them and like them. But the thing is they aren't sure just how much they're going to get out of them. In other words, a lot of them feel like they put in a lot of time and don't get much out of it. Now when I say much, I consider the money, salary, and upgrading along with certificates and other things. That seems to be the opinion of a lot of them. And that they don't mind them particularly ... But they're just not sure. I think that's the thing, they're just not sure.
> ... D 28.2

Broken down into units, that response reads as follows:

_/_ 1. Most of them are in favor of them and like them.

_-_ 2. They aren't sure how much they're going to get out of them.

_-_ 3. A lot of them feel like they put in a lot of time.

_-_ 4. (They) don't get much out of it.

_X_ 5. When I say much, I consider money, etc.

_X_ 6. That seems to be the opinion of a lot of them I talk with.

_-_ 7. They're not sure.

_-_ 8. They're just not sure.[2]

Even though this respondent's first sentence is a positive one, the whole value-tone of the rest of his words reflects uncertainty as to the value of inservice activities, even, as he points out, when such incentives as salary and upgrading are taken into account.

---

[2] In this instance, the symbol X is used to indicate statements not clearly indicating valuation.

As regards the program as a whole, then, it would appear that about half of the respondents made relatively unqualified responses of approval while an important minority reflected uncertainty as to the value of the program.

Appraisal of Particular Inservice Structures.

Since not all respondents had had experience with all of the structures under consideration, the statistical treatment of responses to questions dealing with such arrangements as demonstration lessons and supervisory visits is at best suggestive. Table 18 shows the relative position of nine inservice structures in terms of response units to specific questions. In each case the question was: "How do you think teachers feel about (the particular activity)?"

TABLE 18

Distribution of Responses to Questions Dealing With Particular Inservice Activities

Rank	Structure	Plus %	Mixed %	Minus %
1	Faculty meetings	81	5.5	12.5
2	Summer workshop	77	11.5	11.5
3	°Demonstration lessons	75	12.5	12.5
4	AATES courses	71	21	8
5	°Having student teacher	67	16	16
6	Summer study	63	21	16
7	°Supervisory visits	44	33	23
8	Countywide meetings	24	59	17
9	GEA meetings	25	50	25

° - N less than 10

Faculty meetings.

The emergence of faculty meetings into first rank position is in marked contrast to the rating of the same item in the questionnaire results. It is supported, however, by the high rank given process item No. 5, "Working with a group of teachers in my own school under the leadership of my own principal," on Criterion I. Most of the interview respondents felt that teachers recognized the need for faculty meetings and went out of their way to express satisfaction with the way in which the meetings in their schools were conducted.

Teachers like faculty meetings:

1. When they recognize a reason for having them.
2. When they feel they accomplish something.
3. When they provide an opportunity for "closer contact with other teachers."
4. When teachers feel they have a share in what goes on.
5. When they deal with problems of interest to teachers.
6. When they know about them in advance.
7. When the discussion is focussed on individual children.
8. When immediate, specific problems of concern to all, like "noise in the halls" are taken up.
9. When teachers have a share in planning not only the agenda, but when and how often they will meet.

Teachers dislike faculty meetings.

1. When they are "principal-run".
2. When they are called routinely, whether needed or not.
3. When the problems they deal with are seen as vague or abstract.
4. When they last too long or occur too frequently.
5. When they are devoted exclusively to administrative pronouncements.

Faculty meetings are the most commonly experienced inservice gathering for most teachers. The way in which the staff of a school is organized to go about its business appears to be very important to these teachers. Teachers tend to draw a distinction between faculty meetings and meetings of the staff or subgroups of the staff for purposes of inservice study. Several respondents expressed satisfaction with arrangements that permitted teachers of the same grade level, or who taught the same children, to meet together. However, they feel a need for at least an occasional meeting of the total staff group. This drive toward getting together with the rest of the faculty is reflected in two quite different interviews.

> Last year we were told that we would be called on faculty meeting only if something very important must be told us, and that we were going to have our small meetings. Well, for a while we liked it. It gave us a little more time. We were having our small (primary, elementary, and upper elementary) meetings and thought we were progressing. But you know, before ... I bet you before Christmas, we were asking to get together, again. We'd missed each other. We really did.
>
> D 7.1

> In our school we have just seven teachers and all seven of us are on something. And if it's junior Red Cross, or if it's the inservice program, or whatever it is, we make announcements, at faculty meetings and talk to each other and iron it out then. Because that's about the only time we can ever get together. The two of us teachers up here can hardly ever meet with those down there (in the new wing of the building) unless it is at our weekly faculty meetings.
>
> D 5.1

It should be noted that these responses seem to involve as much a wish for social contact as a concern over schoolwide problems. Apparently teachers feel isolated from one another to some extent, even in a relatively small school. The distance from one classroom to another or from one wing of a building to another may be considerable. One important function of a faculty meeting may be to reduce this perceived distance.

Demonstration lessons.

Few of the teachers interviewed had had much experience with formal demonstration lessons, though a number of them had visited in other teachers' classrooms. Several expressed a wish that they could see someone demonstrate newer or different practices.

Formal lessons are criticized on the ground that the situation is artificial, the children behave too well, the whole thing goes too smoothly. However, it is possible to get something out of such lessons, even if it is only to learn what not to do. Situations that are seen as "natural", that deal with children of a comparable age-level, and with common teaching problems are looked upon with great favor. Two excerpts clearly illustrate these feelings.

> I think it's because demonstration lessons often go so smoothly that they (teachers) feel that there is not a natural situation. It's an artificial, streamlined, cut-and-dried deal where somebody's showing off.
>
> D 1.1

> Well, I always love to watch another teacher teach because I get so much from them. At the first of the year, we went down to visit this Negro school in (a neighboring) county - the new Negro school. And I would have just stayed in one of the classes if we'd just had time. I love to see how they would go about teaching different subjects the same that I would be teaching. Things that would help me. I wouldn't be especially interested in watching them teach something that I wouldn't have any interest in teaching or probably never would be teaching. But anything, especially on my level, that I'm teaching or ever hope to teach, I would certainly like to know more about it.
>
> D 5.1

One teacher, in discussing plans for intervisitation of teachers in her school pointed out that whenever anyone, even a child, visited her classroom there was a change in the atmosphere of her class. She didn't feel, as she put it, that she had her children "at her finger-tips" as she did when there was no visitor present.

Teachers see value in demonstration lessons:

1. When the situation is felt to be "natural"; i.e., when conditions under which the demonstration takes place are analogous to the situations in which they themselves operate daily.

2. When age and grade-level of the children involved are about the same as their own pupils.

3. When the teaching problems are seen as corresponding to ones they face on the job.

Teachers see little value in demonstration lessons:

1. When the setting is "artificial".
2. When "things go too smoothly" and characteristic behavior problems do not appear among the children.

One rather odd aspect of teachers' attitudes toward demonstration activities is the feeling they expressed rather often that these activities have much potential value. Teachers who had not witnessed such activities said that they would like to. Teachers who had experienced them felt that they could be exceedingly worthwhile if properly carried on.

AATES Courses.

Endorsement of the value of these courses was widespread among the persons interviewed. Where this favorable feeling was explained, it was usually in terms of appreciation for the chance to do work-for-credit to meet increment and degree requirements during the school year. Some respondents spoke of the variety of "good, practical" courses that were offered and felt that they really helped to "meet their needs". Apparently, in the minds of these teachers, requirements for certification and degree programs are postulates of almost the same order as needs for help in the solution of classroom problems. When they speak of a course as "meeting their needs" they are as likely to be speaking of certification needs as of their own instructional or growth needs.

Negative statements about the courses usually had little to do

with the nature of the course experience but dealt rather with difficulties of finding time to attend them, to do "research" in connection with them, or of finding a needed course at a convenient location. The 3:30 p.m. meeting time was mentioned as "a difficult time to meet" by one respondent, dismissed as no problem by another. Two excerpts reflecting extremes of positive and negative generalizations about these courses are given below.

> I think AATES has given me more help for my own work than anything else that we have had in the area. They offer so many good, practical courses. I feel like we are very fortunate right here where we are located.
>
> D 4.12

> Well, most of them that I have talked to feel pretty general about them as they do any education courses. I'm pretty sure it is pretty well agreed among teachers and people in the education field that a lot of education courses are boring because it is a lot of repeat in them.
>
> D 28.2

The second of these two selections (D 28.2) states rather well, albeit with more candor than grammar, a point of view which is probably more widespread than the material gathered in the present study would suggest. The complaint of "repetitiveness" is found in several places in the interview material in connection with, usually, more formal arrangements which teachers have a limited share in planning.

Teachers see value in AATES courses:

1. Because they provide a convenient way of meeting certification

needs and accumulating graduate credit.

2. Because they are practical.

3. Because they are varied, provide a "wide range".

Teachers criticize AATES courses:

1. When they are too much like "other education courses".

2. When too much outside "research" is required in connection with them.

A considerable number of the DeKalb respondents had not taken AATES courses, though most of them said they were planning to do so.

Having a student teacher.

About 20 per cent of the teachers interviewed had had student teachers working under their direction, a figure which corresponds closely to the proportion in the county as a whole (23 per cent). But all of these respondents agreed emphatically that the experience had a strong positive effect on their own teaching, a marked contrast to the low rating accorded this item on Criterion II in the questionnaire responses. They also pointed out that it was a lot more work, but said that it kept them on their toes and caused them to re-evaluate their own procedures. One extensive selection from an interview with an experienced supervising teacher is illuminating.

I: And you always felt that it was a pretty stimulating thing to have a student teacher working with you.

R: I look forward to it so, that I wish I could have one every quarter. I told Dr. Z., (a visiting consultant from NYU), ... I know Dr. Z. thinks one or two student teachers a year is enough, but I'd like to have one every quarter. I really would.

. . . . . .

I think it helps me. It stimulates me to better efforts because I want to make a good teacher out of the individual. It makes me far more aware of the problems that I, from my years of experience, would probably just slide over.

. . . . . .

I think in many instances, the people who take student teachers have the wrong idea of what they are to accomplish. I think they take them primarily sometimes to think of the help they can get. And then, when they realize that the work balances the help, and in many instances overbalances, they are not willing to go on with it. Now most of the teachers who have taken the workshop (for training supervising teachers) know exactly what is to be expected.

. . . . . .

And also, many teachers who refuse to take student teachers after having had one or two, ... I think they feel that they themselves as individuals are being held up and criticized. I have heard the remark, "I don't want my classes discussed in a college seminar." I don't believe they realize that you are not discussed as Mrs. Smith or Mrs. Jones. That your class is discussed as a history class or a geology class rather than you as an individual. And many teachers don't realize that. They're afraid of criticism.

. . . . . .

I think college professors who correlate the program can do a great deal to help the teachers. Dr. W. helped me so much in seeing just what was to be accomplished and the rewards of it, and the work that was connected with it. So that I didn't go into it after that first time completely blind.

D 28.5

Perhaps the most interesting thing about this excerpt is the degree to which it reflects a successful relationship between university personnel and classroom teachers in the development of

a cooperative program whose primary purpose is the improvement of pre-service activity. The elements involved in the program are these:

1. Choice by teachers as to whether or not they will take part in the supervising teacher program.

2. Scholarship and academic credit for participation.

3. A summer workshop group made up of supervising teachers to provide preliminary training for the work.

4. Regular seminars for the participating teachers throughout a subsequent period of "internship."

5. Close working relationships between university supervisor, supervising teacher, and student teacher during the period that the student teacher is at work.

Apparently, such an organized approach to this particular in-service job makes a considerable difference in the attitude of the teachers involved. Two other respondents had been in the same program and their comments reflect a similar degree of enthusiasm.

Another important element is the recognition of teachers' sensitivity to criticism, an appraisal that is given support elsewhere in the interviews.

Summer study.

This broad heading covers a number of activities and problems. The respondents in general felt that one of the rewards for being in

the teaching profession was the opportunity for summer study and travel that a teacher has. Opinion was divided as to whether most teachers would engage in summer study if it were not required for certification and increment purposes. Respondents also disagreed as to whether methods courses or content courses were more valuable, though most of them said they would pick methods courses if they had a choice. Workshops were regarded as highly valuable by all but one of the respondents who had participated in them.

Reasons as to why summer study is of value, aside from its function in meeting increment requirements, were infrequently offered. It was said that summer study is a source of "refreshment", that it provides you with new ideas and keeps you from getting "stale". One respondent mentioned the opportunity to meet people and another one thought it was healthy to be put in the position of being a pupil again.

Explanations as to why teachers didn't do more summer study were more frequently given. The most common explanation is weariness.

> Well, the majority of them (teachers) out here really and truly think that they are so tired when the time comes to decide to go to summer school that they think they just can't make it. And I was one this summer that felt the same way. I knew that I should go. And I get something out of going. When I do go, I'm glad that I did. But it's just getting into it. Every summer that I've gone, I've thoroughly enjoyed it and got something from it.
>
> D 9.1

The next most common explanation is that most teachers nowadays have family obligations and have difficulty getting away. Another one is that it costs money.

> The health workshop, I did go to that with no pressure. I was given a scholarship to pay my tuition, but when you consider that I had to hire a baby-sitter eight hours a day and drive back and forth, I did not save any money. It cost me much more than the tuition. Of course, that <u>was</u> an incentive.
>
> D 10.1

One interesting aspect of the material relating to summer study was the role of state and system requirements in the perceptions of the teachers. These requirements are set up by administrators, often in cooperation with training institutions, but rarely with the advice and counsel of teachers. Yet these requirements are never questioned, even when they cause considerable inconvenience, as witness the following rather puzzling excerpt.

> R: Well I, as an old teacher, think that it (summer study) certainly should be required. I would not have had to have gone to school this summer if it had been required many years ago. I did like teachers then; I got my two-year normal (certificate). Then I went where I pleased. When I went back and had my work evaluated, I had to take much and throw away much that I had taken. Although it was valuable to me, it was not counted as ... I just had too much in one area.
>
> I: But you feel that it should be required.
>
> R: I do. I've always gone, every so often, through the years. But I took more psychology and things like that that I enjoyed. And when I had my work evaluated, I had too much in the same area.
>
> D 14.2

What this conscientious teacher means, of course, is that teachers should be required to plan their work in terms of the criteria on which it is to be evaluated by the agencies involved. Incidentally, the outcome of the application of such criteria in this case was that she, a fourth-grade teacher, signed up for a content course in political science in which she was competing with advanced liberal arts graduate students. As might be expected, the result was a most disturbing experience.

Supervisory visits.

Not many of the respondents had been visited by supervisors in any formal way, but nearly all of them expressed attitudes toward such activity. The general tenor of the responses is that they would not mind and would even welcome supervisory visits, provided they did not anticipate their teaching activities would be put under critical analysis. Younger teachers were felt to be more anxious in this respect than older teachers. The response of one of the younger teachers who has been in the county for about two years provides a colorful illustration of her own early anxiety and the security she feels she has since developed.

> R: Mrs. X. (the principal) has been in a number of times. Mrs. Y. (county supervisor) has been down. It doesn't bother me now for anybody to come in. I don't mind at all. They can just come in and sit down, it's all right with me.

R: But the first year I was down here, Mrs. Y. and this teacher that's head of student teaching and all at Blank College came down. And honestly, we were just scared out of our wits. Mary Sue (another young teacher) and me both, it was our first year and they came down. And I said then, I'd never let myself get so upset. I didn't know what I was saying or anything. But since then, it's been all right.

I: So whereas it scared you at first, you got used to it and now you don't mind.

R: And now .. it doesn't bother me now. I think that was more or less just first-year teaching.

D 5.1

Aside from such first-year panic, however, most teachers felt that they could use individual help in their classrooms. In fact, one teacher criticized the inservice program because supervisory help was not more readily available. One anecdote describing an effective classroom visit reveals an interesting attitude toward the use of resource personnel:

R: The only time I have had anyone to watch me teach was on something that I had tried out new. I was trying the teaching of music through the use of song-flutes and I asked our principal and our music teacher to get their candid, honest opinion on what I was doing.

I: That's interesting. A specific technique and you wanted . .

R: I wanted it appraised by somebody who knew more about what was going on that I did.

D 10.1

Teachers welcome supervisory visits:

1. When they feel the visitor does not come to criticize.

2. When they feel the visitor can help them with a fairly clearcut teaching problem.

3. When they can request the visit.

4. When the visit results in "immediate action".

5. When they (the teachers) feel reasonably secure in their teaching competencé.

6. When they feel the visitor "knows more about what's going on" than they do.

Teachers dread supervisory visits:

1. When they are new to their jobs and relatively insecure.

2. When they anticipate that the visitor will sit in judgment on their teaching behavior.

3. When it brings about a disturbing change in the "feel" of their classrooms.

Countywide meetings.

These meetings are appraised in a generally lukewarm fashion by the respondents, compared to the other activities discussed thus far.

> I can remember three or four years ago when our Saturday meetings, for instance, that I felt it was just a waste of time. But I find now that I look forward to them, which is certainly a change, and I think that's a general thing.
> D 7.3

The feeling that the meetings were getting better, and that teachers were developing more favorable attitudes toward them was expressed several times. An exception was the reaction to the most recent of these meetings where it was felt that "the four areas" (categories of educational objectives) had been "handed down from above". This, said one of the teachers, made for less "spontaneity" than had previously characterized their group. Another felt that it led to circular discussion and ended in"a kind of confused state".

Most respondents felt, however, that teachers see a real need for this kind of gathering, provided it does not happen too often. They mention being refreshed, or inspired, and having had a real interesting time in the art group, the reading group, or the mental hygiene group. They speak favorably of occasions when the discussion "came right down to them" and helped them in their own classroom activities. They speak unfavorably of discussions that are vague, general, and up in the air. They feel that consultants at these meetings have made a real contribution. They evidently like to get together with the other teachers in the county once in a while. But they wish they could meet more often in grade-level or subject area groups.

Teachers are divided as to whether or not the feeling that they are expected to go or required to go to these meetings is important. Two excerpts will illustrate the point.

I: Do they feel they have to go to the meetings? Does that bother them at all?

R: Well, I do not think so. We feel that we have to, not because someone says so, but because we should. And I don't believe anyone fails to go unless there is a real reason.

D 14.2

Look, why do they have to browbeat teachers into going to these things? You either have to have a pretty good excuse or (your principal gets a phone call) ... "Why wasn't Mrs. So-and-so at the meeting on Saturday?"

D 16.12A

The idea that the element of "requiredness" has a strong effect on the attitude with which a person approaches such a meeting was expressed several times, once in an engagingly colloquial way:

That's why we enjoy going to them (special interest groups) because we feel that they are meaningful. At times I've been made to go, and I didn't like it worth a doodle and I wasn't going to learn a thing when I got there. (Laughter)

D 1.1

The most common source of dissatisfaction, however, was the fact that these meetings are held on Saturdays. Even though teachers recognized that this was part of the contractual agreement with the county, they felt that many of their colleagues hated to "give up their Saturdays" for this purpose.

Teacher reaction to being asked to assume leadership at these meetings is divided. Those who have had successful experiences as

leader of a countywide workshop group express great satisfaction with the arrangement as a learning experience. Those who have not had a successful experience express intense resistance to the idea.

> I wouldn't dare lead a discussion. I just couldn't! I just can't!
>
> D 1.1

> I've said it before, I think it would be wise for all of the teachers to be a leader at one time or another. They'd certainly learn a lot about that one thing, if not about any other thing. I worked pretty hard on (my) group. But I enjoyed it, I really did, after I got into it.
>
> D 5.1

Countywide meetings are valued:

1. When they provide opportunity for teachers to discuss practical, down-to-earth problems.

2. When they provide opportunity for social contact, getting together with other teachers in the county.

3. When the problems under discussion are seen as arising from the concerns of the group and not handed down from above.

4. When visiting consultants perform effectively.

5. When teachers can choose the group and leader they wish to be with.

6. When they don't come too often.

7. When groups get right to work with little delay.

8. When the purpose of the meeting is clear.

Countywide meetings are valued negatively:

1. When they are felt to be "required."
2. When they meet at "an inopportune time."
3. When group meetings are "dry or repetitious."
4. When discussions are felt to be general, vague, or "up in the air."
5. When one anticipates having to act as leader of a group.
6. When the purpose of the meeting is not clear.
7. When one had hoped to do something else that Saturday.

GEA meetings.

Since the systems involved have little control over what goes on at these meetings, the discussion of them will be brief. The main point to discussing them at all is that they are very large meetings and considerably distant, both psychologically and physically from a teacher's home base. The respondents saw little value in the large groups where speeches and exhortation are the order of the day, unless the speaker happened to be one that the teachers especially wanted to hear. Those of the respondents who knew in advance about smaller meetings, felt that it was possible to choose among these according to one's interests and thereby "gain something" from them. One respondent spoke enthusiastically of a "well-planned" audio-visual meeting that was so interesting that she hated to leave. The displays of publishers' materials also were commented on favorably.

One respondent pointed out that if you were a delegate to the convention, you would probably find attendance worthwhile because you had a reason for being there; but that most of the teachers were in a kind of peripheral role.

Responses to other questions on the interview schedule.

Several questions on the schedule did not call for appraisal of particular inservice structures as such, but rather sought explanations of certain valuations and conflicts found in the questionnaire responses. In addition to these, the last question on the form asked for suggestions for improvement of the program, and the second question on the first page called for a description of any experience of unusual value.

Question Two: Can you describe an experience that you felt was unusually helpful in your teaching?

This question was inserted in the hope of drawing out unstructured material before more specific questions were asked. Some of the respondents could not think of anything and others gave responses that were quite unrelated to the question. Of the teachers who gave useable answers, six mentioned experiences connected with summer activities, six mentioned experiences connected with system activities, one mentioned an AATES course and the others were unrelated to planned inservice structures. The breakdown is shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

Experiences Mentioned by Teachers as Being Unusually Valuable

Experience		Inservice Structure
1. Changing from high school to elementary teaching	...	Summer workshop
2. Changing from high school to elementary teaching	...	AATES course
3. Returning to teaching after period of years	...	Summer workshop (2)
4. Training to be supervising teacher	...	Summer workshop
5. Insight into pupils' viewpoint	...	Summer content course
6. Insight into pupils' viewpoint	...	Summer work experience
7. Helping initiate inservice program	...	Instruction committee
8. Acting as leader	...	Countywide meeting
9. Taking part in study group	...	Countywide meeting
10. Discussion led by expert	...	Countywide meeting
11. Leading study group	...	Faculty meeting
12. Worthwhile discussions	...	Faculty meetings
13. Contact with outstanding person	...	Uncertain
14. Independent activities	...	None

Summer Workshop	4
Other summer activities	2
AATES course	1
Countywide meetings	3
Faculty meetings	2
Instruction committee	1
Other	2
Total	15

The actual interview transcripts reflected experiences far more diverse than could be shown in the above table. This simply gives a rough classification. Careful inspection of the material suggests two elements that characterize the majority of these experiences. They involve situations that called for marked changes in perceived role, either anticipated or current; and they involve some sort of activity that was seen as making a positive difference in the direction of adequacy in the new role. The teachers were changing from high-school to elementary positions, returning to teaching after some years of absence, being called upon to assume an unfamiliar kind of leadership, or they were placed in a position where they understood "how their children felt." An excerpt will serve to illustrate the point.

R: Well, you know, I was a high-school teacher. And when I started teaching elementary school I felt so incompetent. I felt like I needed so many things and that's why I went ahead to get my degree. Because I thought there was so much I needed to do. So I started working on that phase of it, too.

I: You had a real feeling of need.

R: That's right. Because ... and now, in my classroom, I enjoy it so much more than I did the first year. Because I can see now that I was under tremendous pressure - from the children not understanding ... from me not understanding them as well as not knowing how to cope with what I had to put across.

I: What do you think helped you to get in command of that situation?

R: Well, I think ... broadening my own abilities.

I: Did you take any particular course that you can remember? Did you hear a particular talk or did you have a particular conference ... ?

R: Well, I think my (AATES) course with Professor Z. was of tremendous help. And the course in reading with Mrs. Q. was of tremendous help. And then there's this course we took on Diagnostic and Corrective. We turned that more or less ... Is this heresy? ... into a child study group. And I learned a lot then from other people in the class.

D 10.1

These remembered learning situations contain the following elements:

1. Something that calls for a change in accustomed modes of behavior.

2. Feelings of inadequacy in the new role. These feelings may be anticipatory, or they may arise in the course of an experience as in the example quoted above.

3. Perception of need for learning new and more adequate behavior.

4. Usually, help from a person or organized experience in learning new behavior.

5. Incorporation of what has been learned into successful performance or greater understanding, or both.

There is, of course, variation in the intensity of these experiences and not all of them specify, for instance, a particular source of help. It is tempting to postulate, too, a minimum security base or framework within which inadequacy is felt, for presumably if such

feelings are too intense, they would lead to withdrawal from the situation in some way.

Certain other elements characterize these remembered situations, though not as generally and strikingly as the cluster described above.

1. Freedom. Freedom to choose a course, a leader, a subgroup, a problem to work on.

> "She allowed us to do what we wanted to do and read what we wanted to read."

2. Opportunity to build relationships with others.

> "I could understand other people's problems and they could understand mine."

3. Adequacy of resource person or leader.

> "Dr. Z. was an expert in the area."
> "I got a lot of information and help from Miss X."

4. Discovery of a satisfactory problem or interest. Sometimes this was in the form of a common problem identified by a group; sometimes it was an individual matter.

> "We found a common problem that we all needed to work on."

> "The work that we accomplish there (in faculty meetings) in many areas, for instance on grading, the field of grading and discipline problems and the actual organization of the school .. has meant a great deal to me."

> "I read everything I could find on problem children. .. I became quite absorbed in it. That's how I got off on this mental health."

The very diversity of the experiences that were described is a matter of interest. It might have been anticipated that the fondly-recollected professor would have played a more important role, for

instance, or the stimulating course. But in all of these excerpts, the self-concept and stimulation in the form of either threat or support to that concept seems to play the central role.

Question Four: Explanation of values seen in workshops.

Since summer workshops represent one of the inservice structures accorded high value on the questionnaires, an effort was made in the interviews to seek explanations for such valuation.

The reasons given for the value of workshops fall pretty much into the same categories described in the analysis of responses to Question 2., except that the self-concept dynamic was somewhat less clear. Satisfying human relations played an important role. The opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in deciding what would be studied was frequently mentioned as was the discovery of common concerns in small-group activity. One interesting reason was given for choosing a workshop over a course: You can be more certain what you will get out of a workshop. An excerpt will illustrate this:

> Well, I think that's one time when they (teachers) find an opportunity to do what they want to. An experienced teacher knows her weaknesses. And she can concentrate on them to a large measure.
> . . . . . .
> But the thing about summer courses is that you're not quite as sure of being able to follow the things you're really interested in as you would be in a summer workshop.
> D 10.1

There is another side to the coin. One experienced teacher who had

had a workshop experience which she regarded as valuable, explained why she wouldn't want to take another one in these terms:

> First place, I think the hours are so long. I get awfully tired of being with that same group and always doing something. And it seems like you're straining so hard to get something done ... and maybe not always achieving. To turn something in, perhaps, that's not what you want at all ... The one I did have answered a lot of questions for me. But now, it would be just kind of an exchange of a lot of the ideas we've gone over and over, I'm afraid.
>
> D 7.1

Apparently this workshop group did not develop common concerns which it looked upon as its own, nor did it develop satisfying human relations. There was pressure to meet expectations from outside the group.

Question Five: Explanation as to why teachers prefer to work in subject- or grade-level groups.

One of the more familiar phenomena in inservice work is the drive of teachers to meet with other teachers who teach the same grade or subject that they do. An equally familiar phenomenon, not so often remarked, is the resistance of many inservice workers to this drive. All but one of the respondents expressed some degree of agreement with this drive. The reasons they gave were quite interesting.

1. Security. One feels more competent to discuss problems and children with which one is familiar. One can anticipate that one will "know what one is talking about" in a grade-level or subject-level meeting.

2. Commonness of interest is more likely to be found in such meetings. This has its source in two facts of educational life: (1) when children are under discussion, they will be at approximately the same developmental level; and (2) when teaching problems are under discussion they will probably be much like the ones teachers face.

3. Discussions in this kind of group are more likely to be concrete, specific, and practical.

4. One is more likely to get help from other teachers through sharing ideas, tips on practices, etc.

Illustrative excerpts:

1. R: I've heard considerable dissatisfaction on our Saturday workshops because we've got a vertical distribution there. And we feel frequently that the problems are rather different. I know there are other motives in that vertical distribution, but that's responsible for the dissatisfaction.

   I: You think that if they had their choice they'd pick groups in their own grade and own field?

   R: Yes. And I would largely say that the gains are less than the losses when they take that ... more concrete results might be secured if you had a more homogeneous group.

   D 2.81

2. Of course, when we were working with the instructional committee, I was quite sold on the idea at that time of getting the whole picture at one time. But I do know that now, in our own school, we're working more or less at our own level. And I think there's a feeling of security in that you know what you are talking about

and that what you say is going to really mean ... well, it's <u>your</u> subject.

D 7.1

3. We'd certainly be interested in meeting with someone who'd had a successful reading course somewhere in our grade, you see. Or if mathematics is a problem in a certain grade, we'd like to have success in that grade. I think it's a subject <u>and</u> grade, or subject and general grade level.

D 14.2

4. R: That's a bad question to ask me.

I: You probably have an emotional reaction to it.

R: I guess we've heard it so much that I've just kind of gone on the other side. Maybe I haven't even thought through why I don't feel that way.

I: But you don't agree with that feeling.

R: No, I don't. I think you can learn a lot from working across subject and grade lines.

D 10.1

Selection No. 4 is taken from an interview with a teacher who is often chosen for leadership responsibilities by the central office, which may explain her different attitude. It is possible that some of the attitudes of teachers may be conditioned by the extent to which they feel identification, or lack of it, with the administrative hierarchy of the system.

<u>Question Six: Explanation of conflict regarding demonstration lessons.</u>

Data bearing on this question was analyzed fully under "Demonstration lessons" on page 117.

Questions Seven and Eight: Explanation of teachers attitudes regarding teacher leadership.

By and large, teachers would prefer to have status leadership for their discussions. They would like to have someone who knows more than they do. And they would much rather not be asked to assume leadership. Particularly when the meeting is a fairly large one and of a relatively formal sort. The anxiety of teachers who are called upon to lead groups at the countywide meetings has been noted earlier in the chapter. This anxiety is not reduced by having principals and members of the central office staff in these groups. It does seem to be reduced by having consultants from outside the system share responsibility for the meetings.

Illustrative Excerpts:

1. R: I'm afraid that unless the leader knows what he is doing, they get too much down to the specifics. And too much time is consumed by "my little Johnny does thus and so." And that irritates you. You feel your time is wasted. And then I guess you feel like you know about as much as the teacher who is leading the discussion.

   I: Teachers would rather be led, let's say, by somebody of a little different status, like a supervisor or a college professor?

   R: Very decidedly. And personally, I like having as outside consultants somebody entirely outside the system, as these consultants we have for the Saturday workshops. I mean like Dr. B. from Georgia College, for instance, and others, because you're freer then.

   I: That's interesting. You're freer when the leadership is from outside?

   R: You're freer to say what you think.

D 1.1

2. R: There are many, many teachers as leaders that I do value. Again, just discussions between us, - fine. At our own levels, that's fine. But I'm not too sold that teachers are leaders, yet. And I don't think we've been trained in leading.

I: So offhand, if you had a choice between sitting in on a discussion led by just any teacher and a discussion led by just any consultant, you'd probably pick the one ...

R: I'd pick the consultant.

D 7.1

Incidentally, the teacher in the first episode is the only one in the entire group who feared lest a discussion become too much concerned with "the specifics."

The second excerpt is interesting in that it suggests that the situation in which the leadership role is exercised may be of very great importance. In discussions "just between us, at our own levels" it may be that the leader role is perfectly acceptable. This view is lent support by the following description by the leader of a successful staff study group in an elementary school:

R: Well, last year, we had the primary and the elementary, (groups) and then often we met with the high school. But we enjoyed working out our portion with just elementary. I think we got a great deal out of it. At least I did. I happened to be the leader of my group and I thought a great many ideas were brought forth that helped.

I: Tell me about that a little bit.

R: Well, I enjoyed it because my teachers responded.

I: Then for you, it was a pretty good experience.

R: I thought it was very good. We had a good recorder. And we thoroughly enjoyed our discussions. And I think our discussions ... possibly we didn't take them out like we planned, but at least we were conscious of an effort of all of the things we mentioned.

I: You feel that you were really working on things that made sense to you.

R: Yes! We certainly did!

I: How did you decide what to work on?

R: At first we thought of noise in our halls. And we planned things that we could do ... (Portion accidentally erased. Describes how they worked successfully on this problem and how it led to other things.) South Carolima, I think it was South Carolina, their plans in the language arts. That helped a great deal to see what other teachers were doing.

I: Sometimes in the county, we call in consultants to work with staff groups. How do teachers feel about that? Do they like it better than working on their own or do they get more satisfaction ...?

R: No, I don't think we felt the need of a consultant every time. I think we would've enjoyed it. We didn't get started until in the middle of the year. And we would have enjoyed consultants occasionally, but not every meeting. Because we worked out things that were real to us and were not real to anyone else.

D 14.1

The group described in this excerpt deserves further analysis. It was a relatively small group. It was composed of teachers from the same school who taught grades four through seven. It met regularly. It first tackled an immediate problem, "noise in the halls", successfully and then went on to discuss better ways to teach language arts. Members of the group didn't particularly feel the need for consultants

or other expert help because they were dealing with "things that were real to us and were not real to anyone else." The leader had no special training, was an older, rather traditional teacher, and was selected by the group for the leadership role.

Question Nine: Suggestions offered by teachers for improving the inservice program.

Many of the teachers interviewed were unable to respond to this question at all. The ones who could answer it did so unhesitatingly. Seven types of suggestions were offered.

1. Give teachers greater share in planning activities.
2. Help teachers see purpose in what they are asked to do.
3. Eliminate requiredness.
4. Make it possible for teachers to have more free time.
5. Make services of supervisors more readily available.
6. Encourage teachers to experiment more.
7. Have more and different people leading.

Three excerpts are quoted here because they are considered as reflecting three very important elements in the feelings of DeKalb teachers about their inservice program.

1. It seems to me like we have so many different meetings, that we feel like we ought to go to. If we could somehow organize the program where that ... where the teachers could feel like they were really doing what they felt like they ought to do. Now that's a difficult thing, I know, because it seems that everybody has a different idea about what the thing ought to include. But if there were some

way set up that people could do what they wanted to do ... with the groups that they wanted to do them with.

D 30.1

2. Well, I feel sometimes that we're in such a hurry, there's so much to be done that things are handed down to us and given to us as "You do this!" Whereas we would want to do it if it were brought up in a faculty meeting or even in a county meeting. And it's the right thing to do; but just to say "Here this is. Do it." There isn't enough planning, you might say teacher-administrative planning, to give you the feeling that "I have helped ...had a part in planning this." I feel we could have more planning among the teachers and the superiors or the administrators.

I understand why a lot of it is. It's because of the time element that it takes. There's just so much to be done that we don't get around to that. And then so often it's given to us and when we look it over and begin to evaluate, why sure, that's what we wanted to do. But wouldn't it have been nice if we'd been consulted first.

D 4.1

3. R: The best suggestion I've got is a financial, administrative one. Give the teachers some more time. I know they're caught there; that it's hard to do. But we teach a heavy load because we can't help it.

I: So as far as you're concerned, this time element is crucial?

R: More than anything else. I think we have an exceedingly interested group of people. They would do a great deal more if they had the opportunity.

D 28.1

Throughout the interviews the feeling of pressure was revealed. "Pressure to attend meetings." "Pressure of limited time to spend on things that are regarded as of importance." "Too many things that you would like to do."

The feeling of not having a share in planning many of the activities in the program is not as frequently expressed, but it nevertheless

is clearly evident. The cause of this feeling is not clear to the investigator inasmuch as a representative teacher body, the Instruction Committee, is theoretically responsible for coordinating the whole inservice program for teachers. The implication of the responses to this question seem to be plain, however; teachers feel there should be fewer meetings and they would like to have a greater voice in planning both policy and activities in the inservice program.

Summary generalizations concerning the "why" of teachers' attitudes.

In the preceding analysis of the interview data, certain recurring themes can be identified. These themes represent simply the perceptions regarding certain activities that teachers express in discussing the value of such activities. It is not intended as a deep-level interpretation of motivation.

I. Inservice activities are seen as valuable:

1. When teachers see a reason for having a given meeting or engaging in a given activity. This is a distinct perception and has two references, (1) the reason for an individual to be present, and (2) the reason for having the meeting at all, its function in problem-solving. One practical reason for involving teachers in the planning of activities is that it helps them to see purpose in what they plan to do. That the sense of purpose is not a purely intellectual thing is reflected in the following rather awkward protocol:

R: Any time, I think, that what they're working for is ... maybe not stated in so many words, but made clear enough, then I think they feel good in it.

I: That when it's quite clear and they know what they're working for, that they feel good about it. But when they're uncertain ... Don't know why or what ...

R: That's right. When it seems to be a pointless thing, then I think that resentment builds up.

D 7.3

The recognition that simply stating objectives "in so many words" will not turn the trick is interesting.

2. When they feel that meetings "accomplish something." Such accomplishment may be in terms of resulting action, or agreements about policy in respect to discipline, or simply social intercourse. The feeling may be individual, "I learned a lot about that one thing, if not about any other thing," or it may be group-centered, "... we get things that we need to straighten out, straightened out."

3. When the activity is characterized by a feeling of emotional support by fellow participants. When the activity is carried on in such a way that it encourages the development of friendly, accepting relationships among group members, when problems and anxieties are shared, teachers come to feel that they are not alone in their struggles toward adequacy.

4. When the content of a discussion is clear, practical, and specific. The words "practical," "specific," "concrete," "down-to-earth," appear again and again in interview material that has a

favorable valuation. Usually, these words seem to refer to matters that teachers see as being directly related to classroom problems of method, or to understanding and dealing more effectively with the behavior of individual children with whom they are concerned.

5. When the content of a discussion is focussed. Teachers prefer to participate in an activity where the range of topics or problems is limited in such a way that they feel competent to participate effectively in discussion. One of the reasons given for preferring grade-level groups is that "there is a feeling of security in that you know what you are talking about."

6. When leadership is seen as competent. A leader who is seen as competent may be "that teacher from Blank school who is so good in art," or it may be a highly trained visiting specialist from a university. Leaders are valued when they are good at leading and when they have special knowledge.

7. When there is opportunity to exercise choice. This takes several forms in the perceptions of teachers. They would like to have some choice as to what groups they meet with and when, what leader or consultant they will work with, what course they will register for. They would also like to exercise some choice through sharing in planning what is to be studied or discussed.

8. When an activity results in a change in point of view. Teachers speak favorably of experiences that have enabled them to

see their children, their objectives, and themselves with new and more adequate perspective.

9. When an activity results in a change in behavior. Teachers like to be able to "bring back" from an activity something that has immediate application in their classrooms. It may be as simple as an anecdote or story to tell the children, or as complex as a new approach to teaching reading. Teachers appear to be constantly in search of something they can "use" to make life a little more interesting for themselves and their children.

II. Inservice activities are valued negatively:

1. When individual life-schedules are felt to be overloaded. The most common negative comments are those that mention time in some way. Most teachers feel that they have many claims on their time over and above their regular teaching load. Some mention extra-curricular and community activities; others mention family responsibilities. When inservice activities are added to what is felt to be already a crowded schedule, choices have to be made. When such choices mean cancelling another commitment which is regarded as of equal or even greater importance, negative feelings tend to arise.

2. When there is the likelihood of exposure to possible criticism. Teachers appear to be very sensitive to criticism of their performance in the teaching role. Some of them are reluctant to take student teachers because they don't want their classes discussed in a college seminar. Others are apprehensive about visits from supervisors, professors, or parents for similar reasons.

3. When they feel pressure to engage in a training activity. There seems to be considerable variation in the teachers' feelings about this, but for some teachers, the idea that attendance is "expected" or required at a meeting in itself reduces the value of such a meeting. This seems to be particularly true when the pressure is seen as originating in the central office of the system. Pressures toward certification by the State Department of Education seem to be accepted without comparable resistance.

4. When activities are seen as vague, overly general, or repetitive. When the purpose or content of a meeting is not clear, or when it is viewed as being so general that little connection can be made with real problems, or when the same old problems and cliches are rehashed, little value is recognized.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, conclusions drawn from the analysis of the questionnaire responses are put together with explanatory material from the interviews and certain implications are drawn. The ten variables of inservice planning identified in Chapter Three are then discussed in the light of the interview material and certain hypotheses concerning these variables are developed.

I. Conclusions, interpretations, and implications.

1. Teachers prefer to do inservice work at the grade level or in the subject field they teach.

This preference is strongly supported in the interviews, though there is an indication that teachers feel there is a place for meetings that cut across grade and subject lines.

The reasons given for this preference are that teachers feel more competent to engage in discussions, they have teaching problems and children in common, such work is likely to be specific and practical, and fellow teachers can serve as resource persons in providing ideas, tips on practice, etc.

Interpretation:

One of the teachers interviewed said, in connection with a discussion of these valuations, "After all, that's where you teach."

Two major considerations appear to be involved. One is a matter of personal security in that the teacher is familiar with the problems under discussion and can both make a contribution to such discussion and profit from it. Personal security is further supported in that the teacher either knows the other teachers with whom he is working or can assume that they are "like him" in terms of status. The second consideration is that work with teachers of one's own grade or subject interest is likely to be "close", psychologically, to one's own basic learning situation or classroom field. In other words, the perceptual fields of teachers under these conditions are likely to be analogous. Consequently, differences in the way in which other teachers approach the organization of their classroom fields are likely to be viewed as "practical" or realistic.

The wish of teachers for "practical" inservice situations, then, appears to be met most directly under conditions where other participants in an activity are felt to have familiarity with analogous fields. The field with which teachers are most concerned is represented by the classroom situation in which they teach. Put more simply, from the point of view of the fifth-grade teacher the people who understand the "real" problems of fifth-grade teachers best are other fifth-grade teachers.

This does not mean that consultants and supervisors cannot assist in the solution of problems. Neither does it mean that there

is no place for groups organized on some other basis. It does mean that initial security is likely to be fostered in such groups and that the possibility of realistic problem-solving is felt by teachers to be high.

Implications:

It has been pointed out earlier that many inservice workers resist grouping by grade level and subject field. Their resistance is based on a wish to foster understanding between different levels and areas and to provide for a grasp of the "total picture" of the work of the school or school system. Occasionally this aim, which certainly makes sense in many situations, is translated into resistance to any grade level or subject field group meetings. Where such an attitude prevails it seems likely that the chief outcome will be a feeling on the part of the teachers that their needs are not being considered in a realistic way.

A sounder approach might be to recognize that honest and earnest efforts to solve problems at grade level or in subject areas will probably lead to the consideration of related problems in other levels and areas. The task of the inservice worker then becomes one of improving the quality of problem-solving and extending its scope. It is possible that the "total picture" can emerge through such problem-solving activities. Indeed, it may be questioned whether a concept of the over-all job of the school would have much

validity unless it was seen as being closely related to the particulars of the daily teaching job.

A major implication, then, is that wherever the chief purpose of an inservice activity is to engage teachers in a process of problem-solving, an organization which reflects grade and subject interests is likely to provide optimal conditions for the immediate enlistment of teacher interest. Another implication is that whenever it is considered important to provide for initial security in an inservice group, one source of such security is to be found in putting like teachers with like. A third implication is that members of such groups are in a strategic position to offer and accept ideas about better ways of handling teaching problems. The utilization of teachers as resource persons might well be promoted successfully in groups organized in this way. A fourth implication is that the high level of security to be found in such groups provides a good setting for the development of teacher leadership from the point of view of both leader and led. A final possible implication is that in program planning teacher satisfaction is most likely to be fostered where the greater number of inservice meetings take this strong drive of teachers into account.

2. Teachers prefer to work in their own schools.

This preference is given support in the interviews somewhat indirectly in discussion of faculty meetings and staff study

groups. Since many of these meetings provide for grade and subject interests, the same reasons given in Conclusion 1 apply here.

Other reasons deal with the support that comes from working with people one knows; with an expressed need for communication with other members of the staff in terms of interpersonal relations as well as problem-solving; and with the feeling that discussions in faculty meetings can be "practical" in that they may center either on certain problems of associated living or on individual children who are known to other teachers.

Interpretation:

The perceptual field that is represented by "my school" is probably next in importance for the behavior of the individual teacher to the field represented by "my classroom." Viewed objectively, this field has quite different characteristics from the classroom field. To start with, the teachers on a staff usually know each other, at least by name, so that meetings within a school staff do not have a "getting acquainted" problem to the extent that many other kinds of meetings do.

In the second place, the common areas of the school field usually have to do with problems that are not considered as instructional. Teachers rarely share the same classroom or teaching situation

directly, even in the same school. Their fields do overlap in the halls, the lunchroom, the playground, the auditorium, and in the planning of all-school activities, policies, and procedures. It might be expected, then, that the kinds of problems a school staff would define as realistic, practical, and of greatest common concern would be those which have to do with behavior of children in halls, lunchrooms, etc. In this view, the selection by a staff of such a problem as "How can we provide for individual differences?" or even "How can we do a better job of teaching reading?" would be unlikely under conditions of free choice. "What can we do about noise in the halls?" or "How can we improve the school grounds?" would seem more likely to be chosen as a starting point.

A third characteristic of the school field is that individual students are known by more than one faculty member. The opportunity for sharing information and misinformation about the same child is at hand. This has great potential advantages as well as disadvantages. Children can be studied intelligently as well as gossiped about.

A fourth characteristic of the school field is that knowledge about its community is shared by the staff members to some extent. While it is true that many of our teachers do not live in the community where they teach, they have much indirect knowledge of it through their children. This fact provides a potential basis for communication.

Perhaps the most important characteristic of the school field lies in its nature as a field. From the point of view of each teacher, this field is an entity, with somewhat flexible boundaries, organized in terms of expectancies and relationships with principal, other staff members, parents, children, etc. (Perhaps it should be emphasized again at the risk of laboring the point, that the field is not the same for each teacher. The staff, for instance, includes oneself and seven other teachers. For each teacher the seven others include one different person.) The nature of the field as a whole may be assumed to affect the behavior of any of its parts. Consequently, changes in the character of a school may be expected to affect the behavior of each teacher in some way. Conversely, efforts of an individual teacher to institute marked changes in his behavior may be expected to have an effect on the whole school. Theoretically, it may be postulated that the effect in the latter case will take the form of resistance, at least to the extent that the change in behavior of the individual is viewed as leading to a considerable alteration of the existing organization of the school field.

Curriculum workers are coming increasingly to recognize, on an empirical basis, that changes in a school are not brought about by re-training individuals. College professors of education are well aware of how difficult it is for a young graduate to put newer ideas and methods into effect once he is on the job. Field theory suggests an interesting explanation of these and related phenomena in terms of

part-whole relationships and resistance.

Implications:

If the above theoretical analysis of the school as field is correct, it is clear that inservice activities which involve the local school faculty deserve high priority. Ways of bringing about changes in the total psychological field or atmosphere of the school need to be explored in order to clear the way for changes in individual classrooms. Conditions under which new differentiations can arise and be accepted without accompanying threat need to be established.

As a practical matter this usually means change in the behavior of the principal as the status leader of the school group. His activities in fostering personal security and good human relations on the one hand and setting up the arrangements for problem-solving on the other, are crucial.

Certain interesting alternatives arise at this point. One possible approach would involve intensive leadership training for principals through courses, workshops, clinics, etc. that bring together principals in a situation outside of the local school. Another approach might be to carry on similar training within the school with faculty meetings as practice sessions. Still a third approach might be to withdraw the whole faculty from the school for several days, as is sometimes done, for a workshop or planning

and evaluating session.

A second implication is that when a school staff selects a common problem it may be expected to be one which lies in that portion of the school field which is currently perceived by the teachers as common. Valid problem-solving should be expected to start with such problems and to proceed by a process of extending the area of common concerns to broader and more fundamental considerations. It should be recognized that sub-groups within the staff such as the "primary" teachers are more likely to find common instructional problems, though even these groups often start with such items as "discipline" or "politeness."

A third implication is that the study of individual children by small groups of teachers may have possibilities as a local activity. There is ample evidence in this study that organized child study activities are seen as a highly valued form of inservice training. Efforts to engage a whole faculty in such organized study, however, have not always been successful. Whether an interested team of teachers could carry on such study effectively without the discipline of an organized course is problematical.

A final implication is based on putting Conclusions 1 and 2 together. So many of the conditions of security and practical problem-solving are present in the grade level or subject field group within a school that it might almost be regarded as the optimal inservice arrangement from the teacher's point of view.

In a school of moderate size this usually means groups composed of primary, middle, or upper elementary grades and from each of the five levels in high school. Perhaps the bulk of the effort devoted to inservice training during the school year should be spent in helping groups of this sort learn to work effectively, to make use of consultant help, and extend their concerns to other like groups where common problems arise and thence to the whole school and community.

By way of summary, the most important professional self-definition that a teacher makes appears to be that he is a fifth-grade teacher in Blank school. By virtue of this definition and the common perceptual fields that it represents, he tends to value those inservice activities that take grade-subject interests and school staff membership into account.

3. Teachers value inservice study on a college or university campus. Elementary teachers prefer workshops for improving classroom practice; high-school teachers and men prefer content courses. All teachers prefer workshops for improving personal-social relationships.

The preference for workshops is supported by all but one of the interview respondents. The preference of high-school teachers for summer courses is not supported statistically by the interview data.

The reasons given for valuing summer study in general were that it provides a source of stimulation and new ideas and that it provides a convenient way of meeting certification and increment requirements.

The reasons for valuing workshops had to do with freedom of choice in deciding what shall be studied and how it will be studied, opportunities for building close human relations, opportunity to work on problems that are of real concern to the teacher, and the likelihood of developing new insights or a different point of view.

Interpretation:

The informal group problem-solving activities that characterize most workshops apparently pay off in resulting teacher attitudes. Several elements are involved. One is an implicit respect for the capacity of the teacher to identify and work successfully on problems that are of concern to him. Another is an emphasis on freedom.

Yet another is a concern for the importance of human relations, of developing a feeling of belongingness within the group. A minor, but important, element is that time is provided for continuous study in such a way that it is not seen as conflicting with other responsibilities and no "home work" is required. Furthermore, status relationships in a workshop have a different quality from such relationships in system work or in a summer course. Efforts are usually made to reduce the anxiety-producing effects of status differences.

In some workshops, the framework is deliberately planned to reflect what is regarded as desirable methodology, to provide, in other words, a learning situation or field that is directly analogous to what is thought to be a "good" classroom and school environment. Here the assumption is that participation as a learner in a learning field

that is organized in a significantly different way will help bring about change in the organization of the teachers' own classroom fields. To the extent that the workshop field yields satisfaction to the individual and to the extent that awareness of difference from "traditional" fields is fostered and clarified, this assumption would appear to be reasonable.

The preference of high-school teachers for content courses for improving instruction seems to reflect a marked difference in the perceptual fields of such teachers. Presumably those elements in the field that are represented by subject-matter considerations are more sharply in awareness than is the case with elementary teachers. Since the job of the high-school teacher is defined, operationally, in terms of content areas, this concern with subject matter is not surprising. Whether it represents the most adequate or desirable field perception is another matter. It is possible that workshops set up on a subject area basis would be more acceptable to high school teachers seeking instructional improvement than are the present "general" workshops.

Implications:

The high value accorded workshops suggests that other inservice arrangements could profit from an application of the principles that they represent. Ways of working that respect teachers' ability, that emphasize human relations, and that provide for choice in the selection of problems and activities should not be too difficult to work out.

The learning field that any inservice activity represents should be organized in accord with what are considered to be "good" practices in promoting learning. Experiences in an analogous situation should have long-term effects on the performance of teachers in their own classrooms. Put more simply, since we tend to teach as we are taught, we should be taught properly.

Difference in the high-school teacher's perception of his job raises some knotty problems. If this perception is accepted as reasonable, appropriate, and realistic, then significant differences in the pattern of training activities for high-school teachers as a group is indicated. On the other hand, if principles of learning as reflected in the basic classroom learning field are regarded as applicable at all levels, then efforts at modifying the perceptions of high-school teachers in the direction of "problem-centeredness" are in order.

4. Teachers see child study and observing other teachers as effective means of improving classroom practice.

In the interviews, it developed that many teachers responded to Item 22. Child study, as meaning simply the study or discussion of children. Of the importance of such study, however, all respondents are convinced. It may be safely assumed that many of the respondents understood the item as it was intended, that is, as representing the organized course program operated under the aegis of the AATES.

The reasons given for valuing child study courses related mainly

to the changes in perspective toward children and the whole teaching job that resulted from such study. Since these courses do not deal with what are regarded as problems of method or content, but rather focus upon theoretical and practical means of understanding the behavior of children, it is interesting that they come across as "practical" and helpful in improving instruction.

In the interviews, the process of watching another teacher teaching was widely endorsed, even by respondents who had not done it. The distinction between "observing" and "formal demonstration lessons" is very clear in the minds of these teachers.

The reasons given for valuing observational activities are not clearly stated by interviewees. It seems that they just feel that great benefit is to be derived from watching how someone else performs in a situation like the one one is working in. And the implication is clear that the closer the situation corresponds to one's own, the more valuable the observation is likely to be. Demonstration lessons are criticized on grounds that the situation is "artificial," which is taken to indicate that they are not viewed as corresponding to actual working situations.

The importance of the notion of the perceived analogous field is, then, suggested in connection with observational experiences. In a sense, watching another teacher teach could be like watching another self at work in the process of organizing a classroom field.

From the same point of view, the important element in child study activities is that they focus, not directly on what the teacher does but on the learner. Hence, threat to the self is reduced and reorganization of the classroom field is brought about indirectly.

Implications:

To the extent that observational activities can be arranged in a way that is perceived as closely approximating the conditions under which the observers themselves work, it is likely that they have promise for inservice work. It also seems probable that those arrangements which make it possible for the observers to empathize with the teacher under observation would be important. Friendly relationships and mutual respect would seem to be essential if resistance on the part of the observer and anxiety on the part of the observed are to be avoided.

The possibility of other means of reproducing valid classroom situations through film, recordings, or television would appear to hold promise. The difficulty with most such efforts to date have been that few of them meet the requirement of "naturalness" that is so strongly stressed by the teachers in the interviews.

It is possible that the indirect approach represented by child study may have value when applied to other elements in the basic learning situation, such as study by teachers of community problems and expectations, or efforts to develop learning materials with children.

5. Teachers favor vacation travel as a way of improving personal-social relationships.

The interview materials support the value of travel, but unfortunately do not supply any explanatory material for this value judgment.

6. Supervisory activities are regarded as having limited value for meeting the needs of these teachers.

This generalization is not clearly supported by the interview materials, most of the respondents indicating that they felt most teachers would welcome supervisory visits.

The responses did, however, include explanations as to why such visits might not be highly regarded. These explanations were in terms of the insecurity attributed to young or new teachers and to teachers who felt they were not doing a good job. It was also pointed out that no teacher likes to feel that her behavior is under critical inspection. It was felt, too, that part of the problem involved is in helping teachers to learn how to make use of supervisory help and in letting people know that such help is available.

Interpretation:

Even though current supervisory practices are carried on in a way that minimizes the critical function, it seems likely that the entry into a classroom field of any person of higher attributed status whose job it is to bring about desirable changes in the organization

of that field will represent a degree of threat and give rise to some anxiety. That the degree of tension depends upon the stability of the learning field would seem to be axiomatic. The effectiveness of supervisory activities in the eyes of these teachers if related to two elements, (1) the extent to which the perception of potential threat can be reduced and, (2) the extent to which the supervisor is viewed as an effective resource in problem-solving.

Implications:

Supervisory activities should be taken as far as possible out of the realm of sitting in judgment. It is not enough for this to be done by verbal disclaimer. Some kind of cooperative planning by teachers and supervisors over the problem of how to give and receive supervisory help is indicated. The entry of the supervisor into the classroom field should be only under conditions of "readiness."

Supervisory help should be readily available and it should be regarded as effective by the teachers. It is possible that teachers might be asked to help define the kind of help they need most and the conditions under which it is most useful.

7. Experiences with student teachers have not been professionally rewarding.

This negative valuation is not supported by the interview data. All of the respondents who had worked with student teachers reported the experience as very valuable.

Only one of the respondents offered an explanation as to why this activity is low-valued. Her explanation was in terms of sensitivity to criticism and added work load. Many teachers, she felt, take on student teachers in the expectation that they will be relieved of some work; when it turns out that this is not the case, their disappointment is reflected in negative attitudes.

Interpretation:

The situation involved in having a student teacher seems to contain certain elements like those discussed under supervision. The possibility is high that the teacher's behavior will come under critical examination in some way, and the entry of two persons of different status into the classroom field is involved. The college supervisor has relatively high attributed status and in this situation is related to the system administration in such a way that his opinion of the teacher's work may have consequences within the system. The student teacher, while lower in status on the job, may be regarded as "different" simply because he is a college student. Both of these people bring to the classroom situation perceptions of value which may be quite different from those of the teacher, perceptions which are usually thought of as being more "progressive" or "theoretical" than those of the practicing classroom teacher. In this case, the perceptual fields of the three parties involved are definitely not analogous, at least to begin with. The professor customarily works

with a relatively small group of young adults with virtually no problems of control; the student teacher is accustomed to the role of passive learner wherein verbal generalizations are at a premium rather than action.

The extent to which the potential tensions involved in this situation have been resolved through the supervising teacher internship program in the area is a tribute to the way in which careful planning can affect the quality of an activity. The status of participating teachers is raised through this program. Selection as a "supervising teacher" is regarded as something of an honor. Through the preparatory summer workshop a feeling of being engaged in a worthy common enterprise with other teachers is fostered. This quite clearly results in changes in perception of what is to be expected and in improved communication.

Implications:

It seems clear from the above analysis, that if working with student teachers is ever to develop into an effective means of in-service training, much will depend on the way it is handled. For one thing, the job should have recognition as important by other teachers as well as administrators. Possibly the tiny additional stipend given to supervising teachers should be supplemented by reduction in load, thus recognizing that additional work is entailed.

A second consideration is that the college professor-supervisor needs to learn a role opposite the teacher-supervisor and student-teacher that reduces the element of threat in their three-way

relationship. A real humility on his part concerning the "best" approach to method, for instance, would seem to be indicated. Elimination of the academic grade for student teachers would also be helpful in creating the kind of permissive conditions under which learning can take place.

A third implication is that teachers need to be helped to see that having a student teacher is an opportunity for growth inservice. Tying such activity in with course and increment credit is a step in the right direction. It is possible, also, that supervising teachers might be given greater recognition and encouragement by the central office administration. Neither of these activities, however, would necessarily result in more positive attitudes on the part of teachers. There is some evidence that supervising teachers are regarded as "different" and even a little snobbish by their colleagues. Ways need to be found to reduce this perceived difference. It does not seem inconceivable that someday having a student teacher might come to be recognized as a normal stage in the professional growth of all teachers. As a beginning, all teachers on the staff of some school might be encouraged to undertake such activities in the course of, say, a three-year period. Such a plan has immediate practical limitations, but perhaps it deserves attention.

8. Teachers see little instructional value in attending large association meetings.

The interview responses do not justify such a sweeping statement. They do support the idea, however, that large professional meetings are perhaps the least valuable activity that teachers engage in.

The main reason for this attitude is the peripheral role that teachers play in such meetings. They usually sit and listen to speakers or wander about among the displays. They rarely feel that they have any very important contribution to make to the meetings. Sometimes there is a very stimulating speaker, and sometimes small interest groups are found to be rewarding, but in general it's "just one of those duty things."

Interpretation:

The relatively neutral feelings of teachers about the GEA meetings can be understood simply in terms of sheer group size and psychological distance from the classroom. Teachers do not seem to feel that this association belongs to them in any consequential sense. They recognize the importance of the GEA in influencing legislation, but as far as the meetings are concerned, the teachers in the present study expressed little enthusiasm for them.

9. Faculty meetings are not yielding rewards in terms of instructional improvement.

This generalization is a little misleading, since faculty meetings are ranked in fourth place on the relationship criterion. Moreover, it is not supported fully by the interview data. Most interview respondents rated faculty meetings as among the more valuable kinds of activities. It is possible, of course, that the value attached to such meetings had nothing to do with instructional improvement. This

did not appear to be the case, however, particularly in those meetings which were based on smaller grade-level meetings and the common problems that grew out of them.

The reasons that some kinds of faculty meetings are not regarded as valuable were stated quite clearly. When such meetings are "principal-run," when they are called routinely, when the problems they deal with are abstract, when they are devoted to administrative pronouncements, and when they last too long, teachers see little value in them.

Interpretation:

As noted in Conclusion 2., the inservice meetings that occur within a school appear to hold the greatest promise of all system activities from the teacher's point of view.

The peculiar characteristics of the school-as-field have been discussed at some length. It is possible that the objections to faculty meetings can be viewed in part, at least, as stemming from various ways of failing to take the nature of the school field into account. Meetings that are "principal-run" fall short because they at best reflect only the problems and concerns that appear in his perceptual field. Discussions are regarded as abstract when they are not seen as having a direct bearing on those aspects of the field which are defined as "reality" by the participating group.

The perception of a meeting as "lasting too long" is a function of the degree to which an individual is involved or "interested" on the one hand and the extent to which the meeting interferes with commitments to other fields such as "getting supper ready for the family" on the other.

The areas of common concern, or overlap in the perceptual fields of different individuals can be expected to become fewer as the group grows larger. This is especially true of those concerns which are labelled "instructional." Whether or not the whole-faculty meeting can be used successfully for work on instructional problems may be a real question.

Implications:

The place of the whole-faculty meeting in the inservice program needs careful consideration. From the teacher's standpoint such meetings are needed to maintain human relations contacts with the rest of the school staff. Arrangements that promote "socializing" among the staff members contribute to meeting this need. Teachers also recognize the place of administrative information-giving at such meetings when it cannot be economically arranged otherwise.

For whole-staff meetings to be regarded as practical and interesting, some way of assuring that the content of such meetings is of truly common concern is needed. Agenda-planning by the staff would appear to be one such way. Various forms of problem-census activities may be used, also, such as question boxes and questionnaires. Such

devices are not always very satisfactory, partly because truly common concerns have to be developed, but they do provide material for a starting point.

For the purpose of considering instructional problems, the usefulness of the small study group within the staff has been urged earlier. It is possible that such small groups should constitute the basic work-unit in efforts at instructional improvement. Teachers themselves, however, recognize that such meetings lead eventually to a sense of isolation.

A general framework for the organization of staff meetings, then, would include the opportunity for a great deal of small-group work under teacher leadership, supplemented by occasional whole-staff meetings the agenda for which is planned by representative staff members and which includes some opportunity for informal socializing.

10. Assumption of the leadership role by teachers is not regarded by them as contributing to instructional improvement.

The interview responses are somewhat conflicting in regard to this conclusion. One instance is reported wherein a teacher undertook to act as a leader of a rather large group even though she felt quite intense anxiety about the prospect. When she was able, through her own industrious planning and the support of her consultant, to carry out the leadership role successfully, she gained greatly in self-confidence and in her knowledge of the area under discussion. Most of the

respondents affirmed, however, that teachers are usually reluctant to assume leadership of inservice groups and see little relationship between such leadership and teaching competency.

The reasons why teachers dislike leading a group of fellow teachers have to do with perceptions of inadequacy in the leader role and with exposure of the self, of being put on the spot. This is particularly true when groups are large. When the topic of discussion is at a fairly high level of abstraction, perceptions of content inadequacy also come into the picture.

Interpretation:

It might be expected that people who regularly organize such a complex field as a classroom would feel perfectly comfortable in the relatively simple responsibility involved in organizing a discussion, but such is apparently not the case. It seems clear that the professional self-concept of many otherwise competent teachers does not include a picture of self as adequate in the role of leading other teachers. Anxiety concerning the leadership role appears to be related to experience in such a role, to size of the group to be led, to the kind of problem under discussion, and perhaps especially to perceived status differences operative in the group. Exposure of self to possible criticism by a fairly large number of teachers of differing levels and subject interests is evidently very threatening to many individuals.

When anticipated inadequacy is resolved through successful behavior in the leader role, however, great satisfaction results. The presence of a certain degree of anxiety (threat) followed by its reduction through successful performance appears to characterize one very rewarding kind of learning experience.

To most teachers, the behavior that is called for in organizing the kind of field that is represented by a discussion group composed of other teachers is seen as having little or no relation to the behavior that is required in organizing the classroom field. Competency in the one situation is seen as having little relation to competency in the other. Since both situations involve essentially the same task (i.e., helping a group to identify and go to work on problems), a greater sense of relationship might have been anticipated. It is possible, of course, that teachers do not really see their daily work as a form of leadership in group problem-solving. In any event, it is quite clear that they do not feel leading a discussion helps them improve their own classroom instruction.

Implications:

The assumption that teacher-leadership should be provided for as widely as possible in an inservice training program may need to be re-examined. The conditions under which an individual teacher is asked to assume leadership should be very carefully considered in terms of the degree of threat perceived by the individual and the

actual objective demands of the situation. Some teachers become almost panicky at the thought of having to act as leader; others simply are not sufficiently skilled in a technical sense to carry on a meeting of any size.

The optimal security conditions for teacher leadership seem to be present in small groups of about the same grade level or subject area within a school staff. Such groups would seem to offer an admirable opportunity for training in the elementary dynamics of group activity for both leader and led. Too often such groups operate in leaderless informality or under the routine chairmanship of the department head. One group that is described in the interview material was set up in the way suggested here. It was a group composed of teachers in the upper elementary grades in a school of moderate size. They chose their own leader and recorder, planned their own agenda and worked together with great satisfaction throughout the year. The question as to what are the conditions under which teachers derive great satisfaction from leadership activities deserves further exploration. The present study simply serves to raise a serious question as to the satisfaction derived from such activities as at present carried on.

There is some evidence that teachers can be aided through leadership training, even of a rather superficial sort. Role-playing sessions in advance of meetings are often helpful in giving teachers an operational "feel" of how a group can be carried forward. An advance

planning session or two with an experienced consultant can also reduce the apprehension of the teacher leader. In several instances the interview respondents pay tribute to the usefulness of the consultant in helping prepare for a meeting and in lending emotional support to the teacher leader while the meeting is in progress. This role is in marked contrast to that of the consultant who does not appear until the morning of the meeting and then "takes over" and dominates the session.

A final implication of the above discussion of leadership is that it is quite possible that for many types of large meetings, trained group leaders of supervisory or consultant status may well be more appropriate than teacher leaders. Such leaders might meet beforehand with an advisory group of teachers to discuss the needs of the particular group with which they would be meeting and to plan the meeting accordingly. It is possible that other ways can be discovered to involve teachers in the learning process than by putting some of them rather reluctantly into positions of leadership.

III. The Application of the Interview Data to Certain Variables Involved in Inservice Planning.

Responses from the interviews were analyzed in terms of the variables in inservice planning identified in Chapter Three. The results are shown below and are summarized in terms of hypotheses concerning the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in inservice work.

Variable One: Planning.

Who should share in planning the inservice program?

The question as to who should be asked to share in the planning of a program is not as easy to answer as it may first seem to be. There are two polar answers: (1) the person or persons charged directly with responsibility for the program; and (2) the people who are expected to take part in the activity. Teachers taking part in the present study feel that it should be a cooperative matter. They speak several times of teacher-administrator planning. But they would like to feel that they had a greater voice in deciding what activities should be carried on.

Hypothesis: The more teachers feel that they have a real share in program planning, the more favorable will be their response to elements of that program.

Variable Two: Problem Selection.

What problems should teachers work on?

From the teachers' point of view, two kinds of problems provide the most satisfying focus for inservice work:

1. Concrete, down-to-earth, practical problems that are like those that teachers face in their classrooms.

2. Common problems of school-community living like noise in the halls, tardiness, discipline, grades, etc.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with work varies directly with perceived practicality of problems worked on; the more practical the problem, the greater the satisfaction.

Variable Three: Participation.

Who should be expected to do inservice work?

The teachers' answer would be, "Those who are interested in doing it." The "mature, professional person", they feel, will seek opportunities for growth. People who are not interested will gain little from inservice work. Inservice activities should be made "so attractive that we will want to go to them."

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work varies directly with perceived freedom of choice concerning participation in those activities.

Variable Four: Leadership.

Who should lead inservice group work?

In the teachers' eyes, the leader of an inservice group should be someone who knows more about content or group dynamics than the members of the group. Other things being equal, a principal, a supervisor, or an outside consultant is preferred over another teacher. Exception: "discussions just between us - on our own level." Also, teachers resist being cast in the leader role.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work varies directly with perceived competency of leader. (Competency is assumed by most teachers to be related to status.)

Variable Five: Group Composition.

Who should make up the inservice work group?

Teachers feel that the most profitable inservice groups are those that are composed of people who teach pupils of approximately the same developmental age or who have content responsibilities of the same kind.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work varies directly with homogeneity of group in terms of grade-level or subject area.

Variable Six: Group Size.

How large should the inservice work group be?

There is a suggestion in the data that very large groups are of little value. There is also the suggestion that a group of two or three is of little value under certain conditions. A better way of putting it is that satisfaction in very large groups and in very small groups is more difficult to manage than in medium-sized groups. In very small groups, self exposure is great and potential threat consequently high; in very large groups self-exposure is at a minimum, but commonness of concern or problem is difficult to establish.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction varies inversely with group size within limits.

Variable Seven: Status Differences.

What is the effect of status differences on inservice groups?

The presence of perceived status differences in a group always provides a potential source of threat. The greater the difference, the greater

the potential threat. However, the presence of high-status consultants from outside the school system in an inservice group apparently is regarded as less threatening, potentially, than the presence of central office personnel from within a system.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work varies inversely with the amount of within-the-system status difference operative in a given work group.

Variable Eight: Place of work.

Where should inservice work be carried on?

There is a suggestion in the questionnaire data that the most valued inservice work goes on in two places, the local school and the university campus. For work within the system the following generalization is suggested.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work varies inversely with the distance from the local school.

Variable Nine: Frequency of meetings.

How often should inservice groups meet?

The teachers in the study would answer, "No more often than is absolutely necessary." However, there is more than a suggestion in the data that a series of meetings is more satisfactory than a single session. The workshop, the summer course, the staff study group provide meetings that permit continuity of problem-solving.

Countywide meetings and GEA meetings represent widely separated sessions. The most important factor affecting frequency of meetings during the school year appears to be schedule conflicts between different kinds of meetings. Frequency of meetings is so intimately related to purpose, however, that fruitful generalization regarding this variable is difficult. Few would wish for more than one GEA meeting each year; whole-staff faculty meetings are regarded as being most likely to succeed when they meet about once a month; workshop study groups meet daily for a six-weeks period.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work appears to be related to frequency of meetings in terms of continuity and purpose. Where purpose involves the solution of specific problems, frequency may be high; where purpose is more diffuse, frequency should be relatively low. The lower the involvement of the individual in problem-solving activity, the less frequent should be the meetings.

Variable Ten: Expertness.

At what point is expert help useful in inservice groups? Respondents in the interviews recognized two kinds of expertness: (1) expertness in leadership techniques, and (2) expertness in "content" problem-solving. Expertness of the first sort appears as a desirable attribute of status leaders in all meetings other than at the local level and in whole-staff faculty meetings. Expertness of the second sort is seen as being useful to teacher-leaders in preparing

for their meetings and at points where a group has developed a need for certain kinds of information and resources.

Hypothesis: Satisfaction with inservice work appears to be related to the availability of expert help at points of felt need.

It should hardly be necessary to point out that none of these variables operates independently. Nor can the propositions advanced be added up to ensure satisfying inservice work. In planning inservice work, however, decisions involving these variables are constantly being made and it is possible that more satisfaction will result when the above inferences from teacher opinion are taken into account.

Summary:

The ten hypotheses developed above grew out of an analysis of teachers' expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with existing inservice training arrangements. They are thus inferences from value statements and have bearing only on certain kinds of experiences as perceived in retrospect by this group of teachers. With these limitations in mind, however, the hypotheses that appear to be warranted by this study can be summarized as follows:

I. Satisfaction of teachers with their inservice training activities varies directly with:

1. Extent to which they feel they have a share in planning the activities they take part in;

2. Perceived practicality of the problems they are asked to work on;

3. Perceived freedom of choice concerning whether or not they will participate in activities;

4. Perceived competency of leadership in inservice groups;

5. Perceived homogeneity of interests in the inservice group;

6. Availability of expert help at points of felt need.

II. Satisfaction of teachers with their inservice training activities varies inversely with:

1. Group size within limits;

2. Weight of perceived local status differences operative in the group;

3. Distance from the local school.

III. Satisfaction of teachers with their inservice training activities is related to frequency of meetings in terms of perceived purpose or need.

CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS TO DEKALB COUNTY

The conclusions discussed in Chapter Six suggest certain lines of consideration for DeKalb county. They certainly do not point to exact courses of action, but rather to areas that might repay discussion and re-thinking on the part of the central office staff and the Instruction Committee.

Recommendation One:

In view of the persistently high valuation accorded grade and subject groupings, it is suggested that inservice meetings be organized in a way that takes this value into account. There are several ways in which this might be done.

1. By encouraging the formation of basic study groups within building faculties. These groups could be kept small in size, ranging from six to ten in membership. They might select their own teacher leadership, keep their own records, choose their own problems. They would be composed of teachers from two or more grades depending on the size of the school and the number of teachers at each grade level. Liaison between such groups could be maintained either by reporting sessions at whole-faculty meetings or by a representative steering committee in which each group is represented.

2. By providing for area meetings within a high-school attendance area or on some other geographical basis. Primary teachers in

the Southwest DeKalb attendance area, for instance, or even first and second grade teachers from such an area would form a group of manageable size and intense common concerns, particularly if such meetings supplemented staff arrangements of the sort described above. Supervisors should find it easy to work in constructive ways within such area groups.

3. By arranging for sub-group meetings within high-school faculties, where the school is small, such sub-groups might be formed on the basis of related areas such as a combination of English and social studies, science and mathematics, or some other pairing. It is possible that ultimately study groups in the high school should be formed on the basis of grade-levels as part of a direction of development away from a concern with subject matter. A study group of ninth-grade teachers, for instance, is more likely to become concerned with the problems of individual children than is a department meeting of English teachers. In any event, groups of this sort should be approached from the point of view of fostering good group dynamics rather than in a traditional departmental way.

There is some evidence that child study groups at the high-school level hold considerable promise. Perhaps it is not too unorthodox to propose that a departmental group of English teachers might undertake to study a cross-section of the adolescents with whom they are working using child study techniques to gain an understanding of the relationship of language development to personality growth.

The main point of this whole discussion is that it may be possible to capitalize upon what appear to be optimal initial security conditions for teachers in such a way as to serve ends other than restricted subject-matter concerns.

Recommendation Two:

In view of the consistently high value seen in working in one's own school, it is suggested that the greater portion of in-service activities during the school year should take place in this setting. A number of possible developments might be considered.

1. Leadership and human relations training for principals and supervisors might be arranged. At the present time, a principal's workshop is held each summer in DeKalb county. A good deal of the time at this workshop is spent in briefing principals in certain technical details of their jobs such as bookkeeping, personnel accounting, maintenance, etc. Another significant emphasis of this workshop is on instructional improvement. It is possible that the latter purpose might be most usefully served by an indirect attack through an intensive two-week session devoted exclusively to human relations and leadership training along the lines laid out by the regional office of the U. S. Department of Health under the direction of William Hollister, a patron of one of the DeKalb schools. Such a workshop could then be followed up by training sessions throughout the school year in which each principal would be encouraged to use

his school staff and community as a laboratory for experimentation with techniques learned under the summer training conditions. The inclusion of the central office personnel in these activities as participants rather than status persons is urged advisedly to the end of breaking down barriers of communication between the central office and local administrative staff.

2. Training for study group "teams" from building faculties through enrollment in the Emory Summer Workshop, through countywide meetings, or through attendance area workshops during the year might be offered. The alternatives for the DeKalb group in the summer workshop will be discussed later, as will the composition of groups in the countywide meetings. The kind of teams envisioned here would vary with the size of the school staff. In the smaller schools, training of the whole school staff in group development techniques would present no serious problem. In larger schools it is possible that a representative group could be selected by the staff in order to provide a training group of manageable size. The training of such groups would be of a sort to promote understanding of interpersonal relations within the staff group and the development of skill in the process of problem solving. The probability of such building faculty teams successfully identifying and solving problems in their school communities would seem to be considerably higher than alternatives that are designed to foster individual development outside of the working staff group.

Still another possibility for the development of effective local staff study groups would be to provide such training through AATES or other consultant sources working throughout the school year on a "for credit" basis. Arrangements of this sort have been tried in the Atlanta area with somewhat disappointing results. One reason for the limited success of such arrangements has been that the requirements of enrollment in a course have obscured the conditions of voluntary enlistment in such an enterprise that would appear to be a necessary condition of its success. It is conceivable, however, that a school staff of moderate size might seek to undertake a year's work as a whole staff under the aegis of the AATES in such a way as to meet the necessary conditions for effective study. It is possible that such a course arrangement might follow a brief pre-school or summer intensive training session in human relations and leadership. The course could then focus on some such objective problem as building resource files or making a community survey or some other whole-group project that the staff considered to be important.

3. Administrative recognition should be given to staff study activities in a concrete way. Some effective inservice work goes forward under almost any conditions simply for the sake of the satisfactions that it affords. It is possible that attention to the other conditions which make for satisfactory working conditions such as

voluntary enlistment and the promition of good human relations may be enough for the development of a superior inservice program. It can be safely postulated, however, that where it is possible to release teachers from even a little of their other obligations in order to do inservice work an increase in morale may be expected to result. This idea is supported by the widespread feeling of the pressure of time reflected by the teachers in the study.

If it were also possible to tie increment credit into inservice work other than formal course work, it could be anticipated that teachers would come to feel that such informal activities were valued by the administration on a par with course work.

4. Provision for whole staff recreational activities and self study in a setting removed from the school should be considered. The values that accrue from a retreat, preferably overnight and for more than a day's duration, are widely recognized by religious groups. Precedent has also been established by school systems such as the Parker District where a camping area has long been available for staff use. DeKalb county is admirably endowed with woods and lakes. It does not seem visionary to suggest that long-term plans for the county might include the acquisition of a multi-purpose camping and recreational area that would serve not only as a staff retreat but as a setting for a future school camping program. Meanwhile the possibilities for the temporary use of some such site might well be explored.

5. Extension of small staff study groups to include parents and lay members of the community might be encouraged. If the assumptions of the present study are correct, such groups should be built around grade or subject interests in the local school setting. Keeping in mind criteria of group size and keeping like people with like, it is possible that small study groups of parents could be developed under parent leadership. Selected representatives from the parent groups could then meet with teachers of the appropriate grade level, thus keeping channels of communication open and affording a way of keeping teachers in touch with the realities of the community as well as giving parents a real stake in curriculum planning.

Recommendation Three.

In view of the high value seen in workshops, the DeKalb group in the Emory workshop should be continued. It is possible, however, that the function of this group needs re-thinking in the light of Recommendation Two, above. Perhaps the function of this group might become that of providing leadership training for teachers or teacher-teams from a few schools each summer. Or perhaps it might simply provide an opportunity for such teachers or teams to work on problems suggested by their own school staffs rather than attempting to meet countywide needs.

There are, of course, serious practical difficulties in either arrangement. The teachers who need the workshop for certification

and increment purposes are not the ones who would probably be selected on a representative team from a building faculty. The possibility of getting a whole school faculty to spend five weeks in a workshop would appear to be slim. Perhaps a briefer workshop held separately from the general teachers workshop would be both more realistic and more appropriate.

In view of the continuing rapid growth of DeKalb county, it seems likely that there will continue to be a sizeable group of teachers with certification needs. For a number of reasons it would seem desirable if the purpose of the DeKalb group in the Emory workshop were to be modified in the direction of serving individual needs rather than countywide concerns. To the extent that the individual school faculty becomes increasingly recognized as the basic inservice training unit, the purposes of the county program would be served with greater effectiveness by the provision of separate study facilities for such faculty groups. If the theoretical analysis of inservice learning in the present study has validity, efforts that are directed to improving the quality of the school-community field can be expected to have a high probability of lasting effectiveness.

Recommendation Four.

In view of the high value accorded child study as a means of instructional improvement, consideration should be given to ways of encouraging the extension of the child study activities in the county.

There are several ways in which this might be done.

1. Continue the present arrangement under which several teachers from different schools form the child study group, sometimes including teachers from other systems. This has a number of drawbacks in view of the preceding discussion.

2. Enlist whole school faculties in child study activities. This arrangement might prove feasible in small schools. In larger schools, basic study groups of the sort described under Recommendations One and Two might provide desirable child study units. Enlistment of the entire primary staff in an elementary school or of the eighth grade staff in a high school would provide a working group of reasonable size and conditions of security. The point here is to provide an arrangement by which child study activities can be carried on in a way which honors the criterion of the local school as the basic inservice unit.

3. If enlistment of a local school study group does not turn out to be practical, local attendance area child study groups might be developed.

4. The development of a "DeKalb team" of child study leaders might be fostered. Such a team might be selected by the teachers in the schools of the eight high-school attendance areas and trained through the facilities of the AATES. One outcome might be the development of relatively permanent child study centers with collections of materials, etc. The county psychologist could work closely with such a program.

Recommendation Five.

In view of the high value seen in observations for improving instruction, consideration should be given to ways of including such activities in the inservice program. It should be noted that teachers reject formal demonstration lessons in both the questionnaire and the interviews. Some form of informal teacher intervisitation either within a school staff or between schools seems a promising form of experimentation for this purpose.

Observational activities should probably be planned in connection with staff study activities as a natural accompaniment to the study of instructional problems rather than as a distinct program. Teachers could be freed from classroom duties for this purpose either by a deliberate policy of hiring supply teachers as a supporting measure by the administration or, for elementary teachers, by training student members of the F.T.A. Under certain conditions, the planning of self-directing class periods is a practical way of freeing teachers for inter-observational purposes.

Recommendation Six.

Supervisory activities are rated low, but interview respondents attribute this to anxiety on the part of new teachers and failure of other teachers to know how to use supervisory services. The need for face-to-face help with specific teaching problems is frequently mentioned by interviewees.

The role of the supervisor seems to need clarification. If a major function is to give direct help to individual teachers from time to time, then certainly more supervisors are needed and activities designed to help teachers learn to use their services should be arranged.

Conceivably the effectiveness of the supervisory role might be increased indirectly through the development of basic staff study groups as suggested earlier. One function of the leaders of such groups might well be to plan with supervisors for the effective use of their services. Such use might take the form not only of quite specific help on instructional problems, but of assistance in problems of group development in the study groups as well. Where requests for help grow out of group study, the reluctance of teachers to seek supervisory help might well be reduced.

Under such an arrangement, the role of the supervisor as service person rather than threatening critic would be established by the structure of the situation instead of depending on a personal selling job by the supervisor to the extent that it does at present.

As far as new teachers are concerned, the selection of an experienced teacher on the same staff to act as professional "big brother or sister" might provide a kind of introductory supervision that would have positive effects on teacher-teacher relations as well as reducing the load of the supervisor.

Recommendation Seven.

Since teacher leadership activities are rated low, careful consideration needs to be given this problem. The evidence is clear that such activities can result in very rapid growth on the part of teachers. Attention should be given to the degree of threat involved and the effects of leadership training on this threat as well as on successful performance. It is possible that teacher leadership should be encouraged most extensively at the local school and community level, in small groups, and on problems that are not perceived as requiring "expertness" for effective solution.

Training in leadership afforded by experience in basic staff study groups should provide a sound base for the development of leadership skills adequate to more complex tasks. Meanwhile it would appear that leadership of large inservice groups should be made the responsibility of either status personnel such as supervisors and consultants, or teachers who are sufficiently comfortable in the leader role to volunteer readily for such tasks.

Recommendation Eight.

Countywide meetings are rated neither at the top nor the bottom on either criterion, but evidence from the interviews indicates that they are central in the thinking of all DeKalb teachers and that they are controversial. The chief sources of low valuation have to do with a perception of requiredness and the fact that they meet on

Saturday. Other comments relate to purpose and the level (vague or abstract) of the problems that tend to be discussed, and to teacher leadership. The main useful purpose that is served by these meetings, as the teachers see it, is to provide an opportunity to "get together once in a while." Other values are those that sometimes accrue to teachers who assume the leadership role and the help that is provided by consultants.

It is possible that certain changes in scheduling and organization of these meetings might pay off in the way teachers feel about them. They might, for instance, be scheduled at some other time; during pre- and post-planning weeks or on a half-day during the year. Attendance at these meetings might be regarded more casually, relying on teachers' involvement in their planning and the obligation to report back to the school faculty for incentives. The selection of topics for discussion might "start where the teachers are" more closely through using grade and subject interests as organizing centers. Or the meetings might be used as a kind of clearing house for discussion of plans of individual building faculty projects, at the beginning of the year, and terminal progress reports at the end.

Yet another possible change in the countywide meetings might be to use such occasions for meetings of school faculties. Reporting of basic study groups within the faculties might be done at this time, or faculties of two or more smaller schools in an attendance

area might meet together. Use of consultants for specific and planned-for contributions to problems currently under consideration by the various faculties would be possible under this arrangement.

Still another possible organization might be in terms of the basic study groups themselves with primary, upper elementary, and the various high-school groups meeting with similar groups from other schools. In this way, the identity of faculty teams would be maintained and grade level and subject area concerns would be respected. Under such an organization it seems likely that feelings of security and belongingness would be high. It is possible, of course, that such groups might remain content-centered in a narrow sense, though such an outcome is by no means inevitable.

In any event, efforts should continue to be made to clarify the purpose of these meetings and to focus discussion on problems which teachers see as real and "practical." It is the opinion of the investigator that what some of the respondents describe as "imposition of the four areas from above" represents a tactical error. The organizing framework within which problems are discussed and projects planned should be one which the teachers readily recognize as growing out of their own concerns and suggestions.

Recommendation Nine.

In view of the interview respondents' concern with the pressure of time in their professional lives, it is urgently suggested that

the entire inservice program be examined with a view to reducing this perceived pressure. It is possible that some slight reduction in the total number of meetings that teachers are expected to attend, in the local school as well as systemwide, would result in higher quality work and improved teacher morale. There is convincing evidence in the interviews that the drive to involve every teacher in some sort of inservice work may boomerang in terms of teacher attitudes.

Recommendation Ten.

In view of the interview respondents' concern with freedom of choice and sharing in planning, it is suggested that ways continue to be explored to help teachers feel that this is their inservice program and that their contribution to its planning is a real and vital one. DeKalb County has made great strides toward this objective, but a number of teachers still feel that they must do many things about which they have no choice; that many of their inservice activities are planned for them, and do not relate directly to problems which they regard as being of first importance.

It is possible that certain changes in the organization and function of the Instruction Committee might be considered. At present the role of the Instruction Committee is regarded as that of coordinating the inservice program; it is composed of a representative from each school, over thirty teachers in all. A conceivable

alternative would be the creation of a committee composed of two representatives, one high-school teacher and one elementary teacher, from each of the eight high school attendance areas, thus forming a central group of sixteen teachers. This group could be given increasing responsibility for planning as well as coordinating the program. It might be strictly a teacher's group, electing its own leadership and inviting central office personnel or consultant services from outside as needed. Eventually, membership on such a committee might be recognized through released time for attendance at meetings, increment credit or some other means.

It should be pointed out that the above paragraph is merely illustrative of one conceivable alternative. The point here is that whereas teachers clearly have a voice in planning the DeKalb program already, ways and means need to be devised to help teachers feel that that representation is increasingly effective.

The recommendation concerning the extension of freedom of choice and increased share in planning applies at the local level as well as countywide. That great progress has been made in the planning of faculty meetings is reflected in the interviews. It appears that teachers quite often have an opportunity to decide "when they will meet, how often they will meet, and what shall be discussed." The question as to how often teachers preside at faculty meetings is not answered in the data. Agenda are most often planned by the

principal with the advice of the teachers; there is evidence of what some respondents refer to as teacher-principal planning. Ingenious solutions that respect teacher time and reduce the number of whole-group meetings have been worked out in some schools. A promising practice appears to be the formation of small subgroups, in large faculties, of teachers from proximate grade levels, with whole-faculty meetings being called only on teacher demand or for the consideration of matters of urgent concern to everyone on the staff. In planning faculty meetings. however, the need for social contact among members of the staff needs to be recognized. In one school, afternoon faculty meetings are started with a brief coffee-break, a practice much appreciated by the teachers.

Ways and means of developing increasingly effective organizational patterns for staff study activities should be considered along the lines suggested in Recommendations One and Two. Such patterns will, of course, vary from school to school in terms of size, and the peculiar requirements of the staff and community.

The strong points of the present inservice program in DeKalb county have been taken for granted in the preceding analysis and have consequently not received a proportionate emphasis. The strengths of the present program stem from the encouragement of the superintendent and board of education who have vigorously supported the program since its inception. A rich variety of

material and human resources have been made available to DeKalb teachers and principals both independently through the initiative of the county office and cooperatively through the AATES. Cooperative planning has characterized the work of the Instruction Committee as well as many other less formal arrangements. Teacher and principal leadership has been encouraged and nearly all of the school system personnel, including non-teaching individuals, has been enlisted in some form of inservice training activities. These values are recognized and appreciated by the teachers in this study. They are important and should be maintained in any future development of the program.

The recommendations in this chapter simply represent an effort to take into account certain criteria based on expressions of degrees of satisfaction with existing arrangements as revealed by in the present study. This does not rule out other criteria or the possibility that teachers may come to value novel arrangements which they have not had a chance to experience. These recommendations should be regarded simply as possible alternative courses of action in planning next steps for the development of a program that is already functioning well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Cecil H. "In-Service Education of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XIII (June, 1943), 262-70.

Anderson, Robert H. "The Influence of an In-Service Improvement Program upon Teacher Test Behavior and Classroom Practices," Journal of Educational Research, XLIV (November, 1950), 205-15.

Bode, Boyd Henry. How We Learn. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1940.

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, Bulletin Number 1, Emory University, Emory University, Ga., 1947.

Barr, A. S., and Reppen, Nels O. "The Attitude of Teachers Toward Supervision," Journal of Experimental Education, III (June, 1935), 237-301.

Bostwick, Prudence, and Reid, Chandos. A Functional High-School Program. New York: Hinds, Hayden and Eldredge, 1947.

Cantrill, Hadley. Understanding Man's Social Behavior. Princeton: Office of Public Opinion Research, 1947.

Charters, W. W., and Waples, Douglas. The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Coon, Herbert. A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers and Administrators Toward High-School Curriculum Reorganization. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1951.

Cremin, Lawrence A. "The Heritage of American Teacher Education, Part II.," Journal of Teacher Education, IV (September, 1952), 246-50.

Dollard, John, and Miller, Neal E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950.

Evaluative Criteria, 1950 Edition. Washington, D. C., The Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, 1950.

Everett, Samuel, "Teachers Explore Basic Principles," Educational Leadership, VI (April, 1949)

Hilgard, Ernest R. Theories of Learning. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1948.

The Inservice Program of DeKalb County Public Schools. Unpublished Manuscript, DeKalb County Board of Education, Decatur, Georgia, 1953.

Kelley, Earl C., and Rasey, Marie I. Education and the Nature of Man. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

Kelly, Earl C. Education for What is Real. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.

Krech, David, and Crutchfield, Richard S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948.

Lingren, Vernon C. "Criteria for the Evaluation of In-Service Activities in Teacher Education," Journal of Educational Research, XLII (September, 1948), 62-8.

Lins, Joseph. "Origins of Teacher Improvement Services in the United States," Journal of Educational Research, XXXVIII (May, 1945), 697-707.

Miel, Alice. Changing the Curriculum; A Social Process. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1946.

Monroe, Walter S. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1950.

Moore, Hollis A., Jr. "How Superintendents Grow Through In-Service Opportunities," The Nation's Schools, LI (May, 1953), 56-9.

Muriel, Sister M. "Teacher Appraisal of In-Service Education in Catholic Secondary Schools of Pennsylvania," Educational Administration and Supervision (January, 1945)

Needham, John. "The Type of In-Service Program which Should be Provided for Oregon Teachers," Master's Field Study, Mimeographed, University of Oregon, 1950.

Nelson, C. P. A Plan for Cooperation Between the State Department of Education and Local Authorities in Alabama in Organizing and Administering an In-Service Program of Teacher Education. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946.

Osborne, Robert Travis. "The Preferential Training Needs Record: A Study of In-Service Educational Needs of Teachers of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service," Journal of Experimental Education, XIX (June, 1951), 271-303.

Prall, Charles E., and Cushman, C. Leslie. Teacher Education in Service. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

Prescott, Daniel, and Staff. Helping Teachers Understand Children. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945.

Rehage, Kenneth J., and Heywood, S. J. "Some Crucial Problems of In-Service Education," Elementary School Journal, LIII (March, 1953), 369-73.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickinson, W. J. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Snygg, Donald and Combs, Arthur W. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Stinnett, T. M. (Ed.). The Teaching Profession Grows in Service, 1949. Official Group Reports of the New Hampshire Conference. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, 6, D. C. 1949.

The Psychology of Learning. The Forty-First Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1942.

Troyer, Maurice, Young, William E., and Allen, James. "In-Service Education of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XVI (June, 1946), 240-54.

"Two Lessons in Group Dynamics," Reprint of two articles from Educational Trend (January 22, 1948 and February 19, 1948), Washington 1, D. C.: Educator's Washington Dispatch, 1948.

Up Ahead: A Regional Land Use Plan for Metropolitan Atlanta. Report of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, 502 Title Building, Atlanta 3, Georgia, February, 1952.

Weber, C. A. "A Summary of the Findings of the Sub-Committee on In-Service Education of Secondary School Teachers," North Central Association Quarterly, XVII (January, 1943), 281-87.

Weber, C. A., and Garfield, S. L. "Teachers' Reactions to Certain Aspects of In-Service Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXVIII (September, 1942), 463-78.

Wood, Hugh B. Inservice Education of Teachers --- An Evaluation. Curriculum Bulletin No. 81, School of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, July 1, 1950. Mimeographed.

OPINION SURVEY: IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Please do not sign your name.

I am a (1) (Circle one) High School Teacher, Elementary Teacher, Principal, Supervisor, Other _____.

(2) (Circle one) Man, Woman.

(3) (Circle one) Married, Single, Widowed, Divorced.

(4) I have _____ children.

(5) (Circle one) My age is under 20, 20-30, 31-40, 41-50, over 50.

(6) (Circle one) I have taught for less than a year, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years, over 30 years

(7) Check one) My training:
1. Less than AB (or BS) degree
2. AB or BS
3. AB plus some graduate work
4. MA degree
5. MA plus some graduate work
6. Ph.D. degree

(8) If high-school teacher: At present, the subject I teach most frequently is _____

(9) If elementary teacher: At present, the grade level I teach most frequently is _____

(10) At present, I hold this level of certificate (check one)
__Provisional
__4-year Professional
__5-year Professional
__P 4
__P 5
__Other.

(11) I have taught in this school system _____ years.

(12) I have been in my present school _____ years.

OPINION SURVEY: IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Teachers are asked to take part in many activities that are expected to contribute to their professional growth and development on the job. This survey is designed to find out what you think about the value of such activities. Your response to this questionnaire will be taken very seriously. The results will be used to help in planning the program of the system in which you work.

On the next two pages you will find a list of items numbered from 1 through 27.

First, read the list rapidly and check every item you have participated in. Put a check mark (✓) in Column 1 to indicate "I have done this".

Second, go over the list again and put a number opposite every item you have checked in each of the two columns on the right-hand side of the page. (Columns II and III)

If you regard the activity as having high value for the purpose indicated at the top of the column .... put a "3"

If you regard the activity as having average value .... put a "2"

If you regard the activity as having low value .... put a "1"

If you regard it as of no value ..... put a "0".

Example:

I		II	III
" (✓)	31. Serving as a member of a PTA committee	(3)	(0)

The way the sample is checked shows that the person answering has taken part in the activity, thinks it of high value for improving personal-social relations, of no value for classroom practice.

Definitions:

Column II - IMPROVING PERSONAL*SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS - How valuable is the activity in helping you learn to get along better with people in your school and community.

Column III - IMPROVING CLASSROOM PRACTICE - How valuable is the activity in helping you improve your ways of working with youngsters in your classroom.

This page deals with general processes. You will probably have many doubts and reservations as you try to appraise these items. You will think of many specific instances. But please try to react in general. Don't spend too much time, just give your quick, over-all reaction to each item.

Scale of values: 3 - high value
2 - some value
1 - low value
0 - no value.

Participation	Improving Personal-Social Relationships	Improving Classroom Practice
Column I.	II.	III.
(_) 1. Observing other teachers teaching.	(_)	(_)
(_) 2. Having a supervisor visit my class and discuss it with me afterwards.	(_)	(_)
(_) 3. Working with a group of teachers who teach the same grade as I do.	(_)	(_)
(_) 4. Working with a group of teachers who teach the same subject as I.	(_)	(_)
(_) 5. Working with a group of teachers in my own school under leadership of my principal.	(_)	(_)
(_) 6. Working with a group of teachers from several schools in the system under leadership of an outside consultant.	(_)	(_)
(_) 7. Hearing a distinguished educaton talk on a subject of interest to me.	(_)	(_)
(_) 8. Taking part in a discussion led by another teacher.	(_)	(_)
(_) 9. Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers.	(_)	(_)
(_)10. Reading professional books and pamphlets.	(_)	(_)
(_)11. Traveling during vacation.	(_)	(_)
(_)12. Having a student teacher working under my direction in my class.	(_)	(_)

This page lists more specific arrangements. Please keep in mind the particular arrangements of your school system when filling this out.

Participation	Improving Personal-Social Relationships	Improving Classroom Practice
Column I.	II.	III.
(_) 13. Large institutes or workshops for all teachers within an area or system.	(_)	(_)
(_) 14. Systemwide meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field.	(_)	(_)
(_) 15. Special interest group meetings (audio-visual or reading clinics, etc.)	(_)	(_)
(_) 16. Meetings of teachers in a given grade level or subject field within a school.	(_)	(_)
(_) 17. Faculty meetings.	(_)	(_)
(_) 18. Summer professional courses at a college or university. (Materials and methods, etc.)	(_)	(_)
(_) 19. Summer content courses at a college or university. (Biology, English, Math, etc.)	(_)	(_)
(_) 20. Summer workshops at a college or university.	(_)	(_)
(_) 21. A.A.T.E.S. courses taken during the school year.	(_)	(_)
(_) 22. Child study.	(_)	(_)
(_) 23. Individual visits by a supervisor.	(_)	(_)
(_) 24. Study group led by a supervisor.	(_)	(_)
(_) 25. High school evaluations (Use of Evaluative Criteria).	(_)	(_)
(_) 26. Formal demonstration lessons.	(_)	(_)
(_) 27. Georgia Education Assn. meetings.	(_)	(_)

APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule

Number:_____
Date:_____
Time:____ min ____ sec

	plus	zero	minus
1. How do you think teachers in general feel about inservice study activities? Are there some things they see as especially valuable? Or as a waste of time?			
2. Can you describe an experience you have had that you felt was unusually helpful in improving your teaching?			
3. Would you comment briefly on each of the following:			
3.1 Countywide meetings			
3.2 Summer study			
3.3 AATES courses crs instr			
3.4 Faculty meetings			
3.5 Supervisory visits in your classroom. pr spr			
3.6 Demonstration lessons			
3.7 Supervising a student teacher			
3.8 GEA meetings			
3.9 Special interest clinics			

Interview No. _____

4. Teachers tended to rate summer workshops high. A D Amb Why?

5. Many teachers say they would prefer to work in subject-grade groups. A D Amb Why?

6. Teachers rated "observing other teachers" high ~ Observation of demonstration lessons low. A D Amb Can you explain this apparent conflict?

7. Taking part in a discussion group led by another teacher was rated low. A D Amb Why?

8. Leading a discussion group composed of other teachers came out low, too. A D Amb Why?

9. If you could make one or two suggestions to improve the inservice training program, what would they be?

Dear DeKalb Teacher:

As you may know, I am making a study of how teachers feel about the value of in-service training activities. Many of you have already helped a great deal by filling out questionnaires for me last spring. Now I need to "fill in the gaps" by arranging interviews with some of you.

To save your time and mine, I am selecting only a few teachers from each school. To make this selection a truly representative one, I need your help again. Please jot down, in the space provided below, the name of <u>one person</u> on your staff who can best represent <u>your</u> point of view in a conference with me.

Cordially yours,

Newt Hodgson

The teacher in my school who most nearly shares my opinions about in-service training activities is .....

Note: Please name only a <u>teacher</u> in <u>your</u> school. Principals, supervisors and others do not qualify for this study.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Newton Crocker Hodgson, was born in Atlanta, Georgia, April 30, 1915. I received my secondary education in The Out-of-Door School, Sarasota, Florida, and in the Mesa Ranch School, Mesa, Arizona. My undergraduate training took place at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, from which I received the Bachelor of Arts with honors in 1937. I received my Master of Arts degree from the Ohio State University in 1942, with secondary education as my field of specialization. While working toward my doctoral degree, I have been employed as an instructor in the College of Education of the Ohio State University. More recently I have served for two years as research consultant for the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service and for one year as visiting assistant professor at Emory University; both institutions are in Atlanta, Georgia.