



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

Pickup	WNTR 1984
FEB 10 '85	MAY 30 '85
OCT 18 '84	JUN 17 '85
MAY 24 '85	
MAY 15 '85	AUG 27 '86
JUL 22 '85	
37 R 202	DEC 28 '87
45 272	42 K 355
SEP 29 '85	
SEP 8 '85	
FEB 12 '86	

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF PERCEIVED PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS DERIVED
FROM TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN THE KENT PROFESSIONAL STAFF
DEVELOPMENT CENTER, WITH A VIEW TOWARD DEVELOPING
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
IN SAUDI ARABIA

By

Abdulhakeem Mousa Mubarak

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1982

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In the name of Allah the most merciful and the most beneficent

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF PERCEIVED PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS DERIVED
FROM TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN THE KENT PROFESSIONAL STAFF
DEVELOPMENT CENTER, WITH A VIEW TOWARD DEVELOPING
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
IN SAUDI ARABIA

By

Abdulhakeem Mousa Mubarak

The present study had two major purposes: (1) to examine the extent to which teachers are involved in the four governance processes of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC), namely, (a) needs assessment, (b) planning, (c) implementation, and (d) the policy board; and (2) to examine the teachers' perceptions of ways in which the in-service education provided by the teachers' center affects the teachers' classroom instruction. Furthermore, the researcher expected to be able to generate some recommendations regarding teachers' centers and in-service education in Saudi Arabia.

A survey of members of the KPSDC in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was conducted to gather information about the teachers' involvement in the activities and offerings of their center, as well as their perceptions of the benefits derived from this participation.

It was concluded that (1) the involvement in the various governance committees is relatively low and appears to be related principally to the level of the respondent's education, such that the more education members have, the more involved they tended to be in the

governance processes. (2) Additionally, the higher the education, the more benefits are perceived as deriving from participation in the center's activities, and (3) with increased involvement in the governance processes, the activities offered by the center are perceived as more beneficial. (4) Of the programs offered, workshops and lectures are most frequented by the respondents, are considered most helpful, and see most application in the classroom. (5) Activities having topics dealing with personal growth and the improvement of instructional skills are the ones most frequented, and (6) specific benefits of the participation in the center's activities are related to "learning from others," personal growth, and learning new teaching styles.

Copyright by

ABDULHAKEEM MOUSA MUBARAK

1982

To the memory of my parents, as well as to Al-Sheik Yaquab Y. Shaker.

To my wife, Laila, and to my children, Wael, Alaa, and Manar, for their love and support.

To my father-in-law and his brothers, who encouraged me with their love and prayers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The design and execution of this study depended on and received the help and cooperation of many individuals. Although all deserve my appreciation and thanks, it will be difficult to remember them all.

Special gratitude and appreciation are extended to Dr. Charles A. Blackman, the chairman of the doctoral committee, for his continuous assistance, encouragement, understanding, and limitless patience.

The writer is grateful to the other members of the dissertation committee: Dr. Ben A. Bohnhorst, Dr. Patrick DeMarte, and Dr. Howard Hickey, for their cooperation, time, and contributions to the study.

Without the help and cooperation of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center, this work would not have been possible: Barbara Bird, the director; Dr. George McMahon, consultant; Arlene Lanford, secretary; and the many KPSDC linkers between the center and the school districts.

Important assistance was received from the participants of Dr. Blackman's informal group for professional development, as well as from Dr. Robert C. Hatfield, through their thoughtful comments while thinking through my thesis. Special thanks go to Danford Austin and Ronald Crowell for their helpful suggestions. Likewise, I want to thank Dr. Hartmut Günther for his assistance with the statistical analysis of the data.

Last but not least, I want to acknowledge the moral and material support of many friends who knew me before I even thought of undertaking graduate work, and thank them for their confidence, encouragement, and support along this long path.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
The Concept of the Teachers' Center	3
Statement of Purpose	4
Research Questions	5
Importance of the Study	6
Assumptions Underlying the Study	11
Limitations	12
Definition of Terms	12
Overview	13
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Definition of In-service Education	15
The Importance of In-service Education	16
The Purposes of In-service Education	17
Types of In-service Education	18
Characteristics of Successful In-service Education	20
The Teachers' Center as an Important Aspect of Professional Development (In-service Education)	22
What Is a Teachers' Center?	22
Why Teachers' Centers?	23
Teachers' Involvement and Adult Learning Concepts	25
Importance of Teachers' Involvement in Needs Assessment	28
Importance of Teachers' Involvement in Planning and Designing Activities of the Center	30
Importance of Teachers' Involvement in Implemen- tation of the Activities	31
The Kent Professional Staff Development Center	32
Purposes of the Center	32
Goals of the Center	32
Staff of the Center	33
The Policy Board	33
Local District Linkers	34
Summary	34

	Page
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	36
Introduction	36
Research Questions	36
Population and Sample of the Study	37
The Survey Instrument	38
Demographic Data	38
Procedure and Data Collection	41
Data-Analysis Method	42
IV. FINDINGS	44
Introduction	44
Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	45
Professional Background	45
Educational Background	47
Teachers' Involvement in the Needs-Assessment Process	48
Simple Frequency Distributions	49
Membership on the Needs-Assessment Committee	52
Reasons for Noninvolvement in Needs Assessment	57
Intention to Continue Involvement in the Needs- Assessment Process	62
Teachers' Involvement in the Planning Process	67
Simple Frequency Distributions	67
Membership on the Planning Committee	70
Degree of Involvement in the Planning Process	74
Reasons for Noninvolvement in the Planning Process	79
Intention to Continue Involvement in the Planning Process	84
Teachers' Involvement in Implementation of Programs	88
Simple Frequency Distributions	88
Membership on Implementation Committee	90
Degree of Involvement in Implementation	95
Teachers' Involvement in Governance Processes	99
Membership on Governance Committees	99
Number of Past or Present Committee Memberships	101
Participation in KPSDC Activities	105
Simple Frequencies	106
Benefits Received From KPSDC	109
Simple Frequencies	110
Number of Benefits Derived	111
Number of Benefits Derived and Involvement in Governance	116
Suggestions for More Meaningful and Useful Programs	120

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	123
Summary	123
Summary of the Findings	124
Conclusions	130
Recommendations	130
Recommendations for Further Research	130
Recommendations for KPSDC	131
Recommendations for In-Service Education in Saudi Arabia	132
APPENDICES	136
A. QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS	137
B. SCHOOL DISTRICT OF RESPONDENTS	147
C. SCHOOL OF RESPONDENTS	149
D. NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	152
E. UNDERGRADUATE FIELD OF STUDY	154
F. UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION	156
G. GRADUATE FIELD OF STUDY	158
H. YEAR OF BIRTH	160
I. RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION: SUGGESTIONS FOR MORE MEANINGFUL AND USEFUL PROGRAMS	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. School Level Taught	45
2. Subject Matter Taught	46
3. Highest Degree Held	47
4. Type of Teaching Certificate	48
5. Sex of Respondent	48
6. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee	49
7. Types of Needs-Assessment Processes Known	50
8. Involvement in Needs-Assessment Processes	51
9. Reasons for Not Being Involved in Needs Assessment	51
10. Intention to Continue in the Needs-Assessment Process	52
11. Membership on the Needs-Assessment Committee and School Level Taught	53
12. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee and Subject Area Taught	54
13. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee and Highest Degree Held	55
14. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee and Type of Teaching Certificate	55
15. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee and Sex of Respondent	56
16. Membership on Needs-Assessment Committee and Years of Experience	57
17. Reasons for Noninvolvement and School Level Taught	58
18. Reasons for Noninvolvement and Subject Area Taught	59

	Page
19. Reasons for Noninvolvement and Highest Degree Held	60
20. Reasons for Noninvolvement and Teaching Certificate	60
21. Reasons for Noninvolvement and Sex of Respondent	61
22. Reasons for Noninvolvement and Years of Teaching Experience	62
23. Intention to Continue Involvement and School Level Taught .	63
24. Intention to Continue Involvement and Subject Area Taught .	64
25. Intention to Continue Involvement and Highest Degree Held .	64
26. Intention to Continue Involvement and Teaching Certificate .	65
27. Intention to Continue Involvement and Sex of Respondent . .	66
28. Intention to Continue Involvement and Years of Teaching Experience	66
29. Membership on Planning Committee	68
30. Participation in Particular Planning Activities	68
31. Total Number of Planning Activities in Which Respondents Participated	69
32. Reasons for Noninvolvement With Planning	70
33. Intention to Continue Involvement in the Planning Process .	70
34. Membership on Planning Committee and School Level Taught . .	71
35. Membership on Planning Committee and Subject Area Taught . .	72
36. Membership on Planning Committee and Highest Degree Held . .	72
37. Membership on Planning Committee and Type of Teaching Certificate	73
38. Membership on Planning Committee and Sex of Respondent . . .	74
39. Membership on Planning Committee and Years of Teaching Experience	75
40. Degree of Involvement With Planning and School Level Taught	76

	Page
41. Degree of Involvement With Planning and Subject Area Taught	76
42. Degree of Involvement With Planning and Highest Degree Held	77
43. Degree of Involvement With Planning and Type of Teaching Certificate Held	78
44. Degree of Involvement With Planning and Sex of Respondent .	79
45. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and School Level Taught	80
46. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and Subject Area Taught	80
47. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and Highest Degree Held	81
48. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and Type of Teaching Certificate	82
49. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and Sex of Respondent	83
50. Reasons for Noninvolvement in Planning and Years of Teaching Experience	83
51. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and School Level Taught	84
52. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and Subject Area Taught	85
53. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and Highest Degree Held	86
54. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and Type of Teaching Certificate	86
55. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and Sex of Respondent	87
56. Intention to Continue Involvement in Planning and Years of Experience Teaching	88
57. Membership on Implementation Committee	89

	Page
58. Degree of Involvement in Implementation	90
59. Membership on Implementation Committee and School Level Taught	91
60. Membership on Implementation Committee and Subject Area Taught	92
61. Membership on Implementation Committee and Highest Degree Held	92
62. Membership on Implementation Committee and Type of Teaching Certificate	93
63. Membership on Implementation Committee and Sex of Respondent	94
64. Membership on Implementation Committee and Years of Teaching Experience	94
65. Degree of Involvement in Implementation and School Level Taught	95
66. Degree of Involvement in Implementation and Subject Area Taught	96
67. Degree of Involvement in Implementation and Highest Degree Held	97
68. Degree of Involvement in Implementation and Type of Teaching Certificate	98
69. Degree of Involvement in Implementation and Sex of Respondent	98
70. Membership on Governance Committees	100
71. Number of Current Committee Memberships	101
72. Number of Past or Present Committee Memberships	101
73. Number of Committee Memberships and School Level Taught . .	102
74. Number of Committee Memberships and Subject Area Taught . .	103
75. Number of Committee Memberships and Highest Degree Held . .	103
76. Number of Committee Memberships and Type of Teaching Certificate	104

	Page
77. Number of Committee Memberships and Sex of Respondent . . .	105
78. Participation in KPSDC Activities	107
79. Topics of Activities	108
80. Comparison of the Relative Participation in Activities With Various Topics	109
81. Ever Requested Help?	110
82. Benefits Derived From KPSDC	111
83. Number of Benefits Mentioned	112
84. Number of Benefits Derived by School Level Taught	112
85. Number of Benefits Derived by Subject Area Taught	113
86. Number of Benefits Derived by Highest Degree Held	114
87. Number of Benefits Derived by Type of Teaching Certificate . .	114
88. Mean Number of Benefits Derived by Sex of Respondent	115
89. Number of Benefits Derived by Involvement in Needs- Assessment Processes	116
90. Number of Benefits Derived by Participation in the Planning Process	117
91. Number of Benefits Derived by Participation in Implemen- tation	118
92. Number of Benefits Derived by Participation on Policy Board	119
93. Committee Membership and Number of Benefits Derived	119
94. Suggestions for the Improvement of Kent PSDC Programs . . .	121

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The inadequacies of in-service education have been well documented in many professional journals and speeches. Edelfelt and Lawrence described the present status of in-service education as follows:

In-service teacher education today bears a close resemblance to the concepts that have shaped it historically. It is usually required of teachers. Content and approach are prescribed by universities and school districts. Course credits are mandated by state department regulations and school district policies. Although intentions have usually been good, too often programs are low level, piecemeal, and patchwork. Teachers achieve advanced degrees, credits for salary increments, and higher levels of certification, but the effort yields too little in the improvement of teaching or school program. In fact, in-service education does not often deal directly with helping teachers improve their skills in instruction or become more adept at planning and organizing curriculum. In school district programs, the focus is on introducing new curriculums, beefing up existing programs, or following new fads and trends, typically at the supervisor's discretion. In formal graduate work, study is largely divorced from the specifics of the teacher's job. In-service education takes place on the teacher's own time and frequently at her or his expense. It is seldom based on teacher need and is often conducted in a manner that negates the principles of good teaching and learning.¹

Howey and Willie indicated educators' dissatisfaction with current in-service education practice. They wrote, "Public school

¹Roy Edelfelt and Gordon Lawrence, "In-service Education: The State of the Art," in Rethinking In-service Education, ed. Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 14.

in-service training has more than a century of history, yet there is considerable dissatisfaction over current practice."¹ Perhaps the dissatisfaction with current practice has evolved because there is a gap between in-service education programs and the critical problems of the schools. According to Goodlad,

Our study of sixty-seven elementary schools in the United States revealed a formidable gap between the inservice educational pursuits of teachers and the critical problems of the schools as identified in interviews with principals and teachers.²

Edelfelt and Lawrence also noted some of the deficiencies of in-service education. They concluded their article by saying,

In summary, in-service education has been the weakest and most haphazard component of teacher education. Even the most charitable would have to admit that it has not been nearly as effective as it might have been, considering the expenditure of time, effort, and resources. However, to say that in-service education has been inadequate is not to say that teachers can or want to do without it. During the 1974-75 school year, the NEA conducted assessments of teacher needs in instruction and professional development in 18 local school districts that were representative of the country in terms of size, geographical location, types of clients served, and urban/suburban/rural setting. Inadequacy of or interest in in-service education was one of three categories of concern to surface in every single district. The positive conclusion to be drawn from this information is that teachers want quality in-service education; they also recognize a significant discrepancy between what exists and what they would like.³

¹Kenneth Howey and Reynold Willie, "A Missing Link in School Renewal: The Program and Staff Development Specialist," Journal of Teacher Education 28 (March-April 1977): 20.

²John Goodlad, "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education," Teachers College Record 72 (September 1970): 65.

³Edelfelt and Lawrence, "In-service Education," p. 16.

The Concept of the Teachers' Center

In the 1970s, the concept of teachers' centers emerged as a new hope for the professional development (in-service education) of teachers. Waskin stated, "The nature of Teachers' Centers now in existence seems to indicate that much of the renewal or in-service education of teachers might well become the responsibility of the teacher center."¹

The uniqueness of the teachers' center concept for professional development has attracted the attention of educators in Europe as well as in the United States. The idea spread to the United States from England in 1971.

Reports began coming to the United States from England telling about the establishing of "Teachers' Centers" for in-service education. One significant article by Stephen K. Bailey in the Phi Delta Kappan in November of 1971, entitled, "Teachers' Centers: A British First," was widely read in this country and is credited with igniting the spark that set many educators scurrying to establish their own teacher centers. It was estimated that within several months after the appearance of Bailey's article, almost 100 centers were already in operation in the United States.²

Schmieder and Yarger described the rapid development of teachers' centers:

The teacher or teaching center is one of the hottest educational concepts on the scene today . . . and that is no mean compliment, given the rapid ascendancy of career education, competency-based education, the open classroom, schools and universities without walls, and a myriad of other outstanding new education alternatives. It has been generally estimated

¹Yvonne Waskin, "The Teachers' Center Movement in the United States and Its Implications for Teacher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1976), p. 1.

²Ibid.

that it takes over twenty years for a new innovation to work its way into the mainstream of American education. It has taken less than half a decade for the teaching center to become a well known locus for new approaches to educational personnel development.¹

The teachers' center is a powerful aspect of in-service education because its fundamental purpose is to involve teachers more directly in their own professional development. In addition, the teachers' center facilitates the sharing of classroom experiences and links teachers with new research findings and other important educational developments that may have implications for what they do in the classroom.²

Teachers come to the teachers' center to share new ideas and to seek new ways to teach their students; hence all participants in teachers' centers should be both learners and teachers. "The center should focus on needs as perceived by teachers, and the teachers should have the major voice in identifying persons and resources for meeting these needs."³

Statement of Purpose

The researcher had two major purposes in conducting this study: (1) to examine the extent to which teachers are involved in needs assessment, planning, and implementation of the teachers' center activities and (2) to examine teachers' perceptions of the ways in which the

¹Allen Schmiöder and Sam Yarger, "Teacher/Teacher Centering in America," Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 5.

²Allen Schmeider and Charles Lovett, "Teacher Centering for Ongoing In-service Education," Action in Teacher Education 2 (Spring 1980): 1-7.

³Ibid., p. 3.

in-service education provided by teachers' centers affects teachers' classroom instruction. The investigator also intended to generate recommendations for in-service teacher education in Saudi Arabia.

The locale for the study was the Kent Professional Staff Development Center, located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. This Center was chosen because it serves a variety of sizes of school districts and a socioeconomic cross-section of community types. Access to the Center was readily available to the researcher.

Research Questions

This was a descriptive study. The investigator posed the following research questions in an attempt to generate the information needed to fulfill the purposes of the study:

1. To what extent are teachers involved in the needs-assessment process?
2. To what extent are teachers involved in the planning process?
3. To what extent are teachers involved in the developing and implementing processes?
4. To what extent are teachers involved in committees dealing with the governance of the teachers' center?
5. In what types of activities of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC) do the teachers participate?
6. What benefits did the teachers perceive in the activities/programs offered by the teachers' center?

7. Is there any relationship between active involvement in the committees and perceived benefit from the activities offered by the Center?

8. What recommendations can be generated from this study for in-service teacher education in Saudi Arabia?

Importance of the Study

Edelfelt and Johnson defined in-service education of teachers as "any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice."¹ In-service education is important because it is designed to serve the needs of teachers and to improve their teaching.

Mangieri and McWilliams described the scope of in-service education as follows: "By in-service education we mean all activities engaged in by professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job."²

Dissatisfaction with current in-service education has grown in recent years. In a 1974 study conducted by Brimm and Tollett, 73 percent of the teachers surveyed said that in-service activities often did not seem relevant to teachers' needs.³

¹Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, "Introduction," in Rethinking In-Service Education, ed. Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 5.

²John Mangieri and David McWilliams, "Designing an Effective In-Service Program," Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Summer 1976).

³Jack L. Brimm and Daniel J. Tollett, "How Do Teachers Feel About In-service Education?" Educational Leadership Research Supplement (March 1974): 523.



Van Fleet noted that although needs-assessment teachers' center programs supposedly are directed toward teachers' expressed needs, these needs must be assessed. He found that most centers started programs without understanding the problems involved in needs assessment.¹ In addition,

Traditionally, in-service education has been prescribed for teachers by others. Psychology supports the notion that learning is optimum when what is learned satisfies the needs of the learner. There is also research evidence that teacher involvement is crucial in change projects if success is to be expected.²

The preceding paragraphs indicate the lack of involvement of teachers in needs assessment and in planning in-service education activities. They also point out that to have successful in-service education, teachers must be involved in these processes. Much literature and some research have indicated that teachers' centers do, in fact, offer a valuable alternative to in-service education for public-school teachers because they actively involve the participants in their activities. As Schmieder and Lovett said, "The fundamental purpose of the teachers' center is to involve teachers more directly in their own professional development and to support their efforts to provide the best possible education for their students."³

Most of the persons on policy boards in teachers' centers are teachers because this "may give teachers the dominant influence

¹Alanson A. Van Fleet, "Teacher Centers in Florida: A Case Study," School Review 85 (May 1977): 420.

²Farwest Teacher Corps Network, In-service Education: Criteria for Local Programs (Bellingham: Western Washington State College Press, 1976), p. 11.

³Schmieder and Lovett, "Teacher Centering for Ongoing In-service Education," p. 3.

in developing the program of a teachers' center. That is, it may be that teacher needs are assessed accurately and that the program grows from these assessed needs."¹

The present study was undertaken as a means of confirming this claim and of seeing to what extent teachers are involved in need assessment and in planning, designing, and implementing in-service education activities. A study of whether teachers' centers are a good alternative to having in-service education is important because "few research efforts have been undertaken to determine the types of in-service programs which would be most beneficial to teachers."²

The inadequacies of in-service education in Saudi Arabia have recently been expressed by several Saudi researchers, although Saudi educational authorities have often stressed the importance of in-service education because they believe such education is a continuous process in providing quality education to public-school students. Al-Ghamdi cited two articles from the educational policy in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (published in 1970) that deal with the professional development of Saudi teachers:³

¹Roy Edelfelt, "Federally Funded Teacher Centers: What Will They Become?" Action in Teacher Education 2 (Spring 1980): 19.

²Brimm and Tollett, "How Do Teachers Feel About In-service Education?" p. 521.

³Abdulrahim M. Al-Ghamdi, "The Professional Development of In-service Teachers in Saudi Arabia" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982), p. 17.

Article 170: Teacher training is a continuous operation. A plan is set up to train and rehabilitate professionally disqualified ones, and another plan is set up to re-orient and improve the standards of qualified ones.

Article 171: Teachers are given every opportunity to pursue academic training that qualifies them for higher posts in their fields of specialty.

In response to these articles, a one-year development program was established at Umm-al-Qura University and King Saud University to provide public-school principals with an opportunity for professional development that is supposed to increase their skills, knowledge, and personal growth. These programs started in 1972. Hariri wrote, "These programs have retrained 731 elementary and 388 intermediate and secondary school principals."¹

To indicate that the present training programs are less than adequate, Hariri cited Al-Zaid's findings: "Al-Zaid's study supported the fact that the present training programs were less than adequate."²

Al-Ghamdi expressed very clearly the dissatisfaction with current in-service education practices in Saudi Arabia:

It should be mentioned here that the Ministry of Education, in cooperation with the two major universities, has on-going programs to upgrade school administrators' skills and knowledge. These programs may not have been planned carefully and may not have been based on the needs of the participants. According to MOE (1980, p. 293), in-service training of teachers and headmasters was conducted with moderate success. In fact, many of those who have participated in in-service activities have expressed to this researcher their dissatisfaction

¹ Hashim Hariri, "School Climate, Competency and Training of Principals in Intermediate Schools in Saudi Arabia" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1982), p. 14.

² Ibid., p. 15.

with the programs, but said it was a good source of income, since they are paid to attend.¹

The preceding paragraphs indicate the following facts:

1. There is a sincere intention among the educational authorities in the Ministry of Education and educators in major universities to provide the teachers and school personnel in Saudi Arabia with professional-development activities that lead them to gain instructional skills, knowledge, and personal growth.

2. The Ministry of Education provides the teachers and school principals with released time and allowances to attend in-service activities.

3. Despite the aforementioned efforts, the current practice of in-service education is ineffective, as the studies of Hariri and Al-Ghamdi indicated.

Al-Ghamdi tried to explain why in-service activities in Saudi Arabia are ineffective or inadequate. He said:

Despite recognition of the importance of in-service training by the Saudi educational authorities, in-service activities afforded educational personnel--and specifically teachers--seem to lack direction, organization, and careful planning. In-service program activities appeared to be planned and conducted without forethought, as revealed in the interviews obtained by this researcher with some Saudi educational authorities. The same interviews also exposed that the participants' needs for whom in-service training activities are planned were not systematically assessed.² Such needs, therefore, may have not been adequately realized.

¹Al-Ghamdi, "Professional Development of In-service Teachers," p. 18.

²Ibid., pp. 145-46.

In 1971, the concept of teachers' centers for in-service education came from England to the United States. In the last decade, this concept has spread very fast because it has been thought to be successful. The teachers' center concept may be used to alleviate the in-service education problem in Saudi Arabia. Although Saudi Arabia has a different social structure, culture, religion, and education from the United States, it does not mean that Saudi Arabia cannot adapt and adopt the methods and concepts that have been used to tackle a problem common to both countries.

Assumptions Underlying the Study

The assumptions underlying this study were as follows:

1. "Learning to teach and maintaining competence to teach is a continuous, never-ending process,"¹ and the continued growth in knowledge and skills of all teachers is a legitimate concern of school districts. This concern may be satisfied by providing in-service education for school personnel, which improves their job-related competencies and prepares them for new professional roles.
2. Teachers' centers are a very important aspect of in-service education and have been very successful in this process.
3. The role of teachers in the teachers' center activities is a major one because the teachers themselves are involved in planning and executing these activities. "If a central purpose of in-service education is school improvement, teachers must be involved."²

¹Farwest Teacher Corps Network, In-service Education, p. 16.

²Ibid.

One of the inadequacies of in-service education is the lack of teacher involvement in planning and executing the activities, but in teachers' centers, teachers play positive and active roles.

Limitations

The study outcomes may be limited by the following:

1. The nature of the sampling process, including the procedures used to identify respondents.
2. The degree of understanding of the respondents concerning what "being involved" means.

Definition of Terms

To avoid semantic confusion or ambiguity in interpreting this study, the following terms are defined in the context in which they are used in this dissertation.

Coordinator or director: As used in this study, the coordinator or director is "the person who is in charge of the organization and operation of the teacher center."¹

In-service education: In-service education comprises the training programs or activities that help teachers maintain or improve their status within the profession. Teachers engage in these activities after they receive their teaching certificates and begin their professional practice.

Professional development: According to the Michigan Department of Education, professional development is "a planned and organized

¹Waskin, "The Teachers' Center Movement in the United States," p. 20.

effort to provide teachers and other educational workers with knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate improved student learning and performance."¹

Teacher center: The teachers' center is a place where teachers meet and exchange ideas and experiences. In this center the teachers assess their professional and personal needs, and they plan activities to satisfy these needs with the help of resource personnel.

Overview

Chapter I contained the background of the study; an explanation of the teachers' center concept; the purposes, importance, and assumptions of the study; and definitions of terms used in the dissertation. Included in Chapter II is a review of related literature on in-service education, the teachers' center as an important aspect of in-service education, and the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The study design and methodology are discussed in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains the analysis of data gathered in the study. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations may be found in Chapter V.

¹Michigan Department of Education, Office of Professional Development, "Professional Development for School Staffs: The Michigan Approach" (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, n.d.).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Every nation wants to provide a high quality of education for its young people because the country's future depends on them. To provide high-quality education, educators must prepare qualified teachers who will help achieve the nation's educational objectives and goals. Educators in preservice institutions have done their best to prepare teachers, but certain forces require the continuity of the preparation process throughout a teacher's lifetime. Johnson said, "Three types of forces are making inservice education essential: social and economic, scientific and technological, and educational."¹ Although there are some differences in the meanings given to in-service teacher education, staff development, and professional development, they have been used synonymously throughout this dissertation.

In this chapter, pertinent literature in the following areas is reviewed: (1) definition of in-service education; (2) the importance of in-service education; (3) the purposes, types, and characteristics of in-service education; (4) the teachers' center as an important

¹Margo Johnson, Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s (Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1980), p. 2.

aspect of in-service education, and (5) the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Definition of In-service Education

A number of educators have described the characteristics and purposes of in-service education. Some of these definitions are the following:

Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre described in-service education as the "planned activities for the instructional improvement of professional staff members."¹ According to Cane, in-service training includes "all those courses and activities in which a serving teacher may participate for the purpose of extending his professional knowledge, interest or skill. Preparation for a degree, diploma or other qualification subsequent to initial training is included within this definition."²

Johnston stated that in-service education may consist of carefully planned, sustained work over a lengthy period leading to a further qualification in the form of an advanced certificate, diploma, or higher degree; it may equally well be casual study, pursued irregularly in the evenings or during vacations, and in no sense leading to measurable recognition for purposes of salary or of promotion.³

¹Ben M. Harris, Wailand Bessent, and Kenneth E. McIntyre, In-service Education: A Guide to Better Practice (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 2.

²Brian Cane, In-service Training: A Study of Teachers' Views and Preferences, Occasional Publication Series No. 22 (London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1969), p. x.

³D. J. Johnston, Teachers' In-service Education (New York: Pergamon Press, Ltd., 1971), p. 9.

Dillon-Peterson defined staff development as "a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive, positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools."¹

The Importance of In-service Education

No one would deny the importance of in-service education for school personnel. Burrello and Orbaugh stated, "We believe inservice education is an absolute necessity if schools are to develop their most important resource, their people."² Research has indicated that there is a correlation between staff development and organization development; this means that whenever in-service education is provided for school personnel, the schools can provide better learning for students because

in-service training programs can be tied into the day-to-day development of instructional materials and programs, can serve the periodic and special needs of educators, can be employed for purposes of exposure to new equipment and materials and can be used to bring teachers and administrators/teachers and teachers/administrators and administrators together for purposes of social interaction/group training or the exchange of ideas and experiences.³

¹Betty Dillon-Peterson, "Staff Development/Organization Development--Perspective 1981," in Staff Development/Organization Development, ed. Betty Dillon-Peterson (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), p. 3.

²Leonard Burrello and Tim Orbaugh, "Reducing the Discrepancy Between the Known and the Unknown in In-service Education," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 385. ✓

³Richard O. Peters, "Affecting Teacher Awareness and Attitudes: An Inservice Program Strategy for Rural Schools" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 114 225, 1975), p. 4.

Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre identified four reasons why in-service education is important. These are:

1. Pre-service preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to professional preparation rather than professional preparation as such.
2. Social and educational change makes current professional practices obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools, and substantive knowledge itself.
3. Coordination and articulation of instructional practices require changes in people. Even when each instructional staff member is functioning at a highly professional level, employing an optimum number of the most effective practices, such an instructional program might still be relatively uncoordinated from subject to subject and poorly articulated from year to year.
4. Other factors argue for in-service education activities of rather diverse kinds. Morale can be stimulated and maintained through in-service education and is a contribution to instruction in itself, even if instructional improvement of any dynamic kind does not occur.¹

The Purposes of In-service Education

According to Peters, one of the purposes of in-service education is to provide practicing classroom teachers and building administrators with quality training that

1. develops their awareness of new practices and techniques.
2. exposes practitioners to the "how-to-do-its" of their profession.
3. provides social interaction situations.
4. allows for the exchange of ideas and experiences.
5. provides the opportunity for skill development/application.
6. provides for exposure to and interaction with new instructional equipment and materials.

¹Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre, In-service Education, pp. 3-4.

7. directly involves educators in the process of instructional program development.
8. provides the opportunity to use teachers/staff personnel/administrators as resource people to other educators; using the resource person's expertise and skills in instructional situations.¹

Continuing the education of beginning teachers is another purpose of in-service education. Moffitt asserted,

Regardless of the quantity and quality of academic education received in a college or university, a teacher new to any given school system needs in-service education. . . .

The beginning teacher enters into a strange and completely new situation. For many, it is the first real job the teacher has had, with the responsibilities attached thereto. Everything is strange. Commonly, he is unacquainted with the other teachers, the principal, or the administrative or supervisory personnel. The students are strange, and often the community is one about which he has little knowledge.²

Types of In-service Education

Yarger identified the following five types of in-service education:

1. Job-embedded in-service education is programming that occurs within the context of a teacher's fulfilling his/her assigned responsibilities. It is directly related to the provision of skills that can be translated into working with children, developing classroom materials, and/or planning curriculum.
2. Job-related in-service education is programming that is either directly or indirectly related to the provision of skills for the performance of a teacher's primary responsibility of instructing children. It may result in the acquisition of directly applicable skills, or it may provide content that, while not directly applicable, is clearly related. Job-related in-service training does not occur within the context of the instruction of children.

¹Peters, "Affecting Teacher Awareness and Attitudes," p. 4.

²John C. Moffitt, In-service Education for Teachers (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), p. 6.

effort to provide teachers and other educational workers with knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate improved student learning and performance."¹

Teacher center: The teachers' center is a place where teachers meet and exchange ideas and experiences. In this center the teachers assess their professional and personal needs, and they plan activities to satisfy these needs with the help of resource personnel.

Overview

Chapter I contained the background of the study; an explanation of the teachers' center concept; the purposes, importance, and assumptions of the study; and definitions of terms used in the dissertation. Included in Chapter II is a review of related literature on in-service education, the teachers' center as an important aspect of in-service education, and the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The study design and methodology are discussed in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains the analysis of data gathered in the study. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations may be found in Chapter V.

¹Michigan Department of Education, Office of Professional Development, "Professional Development for School Staffs: The Michigan Approach" (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, n.d.).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Every nation wants to provide a high quality of education for its young people because the country's future depends on them. To provide high-quality education, educators must prepare qualified teachers who will help achieve the nation's educational objectives and goals. Educators in preservice institutions have done their best to prepare teachers, but certain forces require the continuity of the preparation process throughout a teacher's lifetime. Johnson said, "Three types of forces are making inservice education essential: social and economic, scientific and technological, and educational."¹ Although there are some differences in the meanings given to in-service teacher education, staff development, and professional development, they have been used synonymously throughout this dissertation.

In this chapter, pertinent literature in the following areas is reviewed: (1) definition of in-service education; (2) the importance of in-service education; (3) the purposes, types, and characteristics of in-service education; (4) the teachers' center as an important

¹Margo Johnson, Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s (Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1980), p. 2.

aspect of in-service education, and (5) the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Definition of In-service Education

A number of educators have described the characteristics and purposes of in-service education. Some of these definitions are the following:

Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre described in-service education as the "planned activities for the instructional improvement of professional staff members."¹ According to Cane, in-service training includes "all those courses and activities in which a serving teacher may participate for the purpose of extending his professional knowledge, interest or skill. Preparation for a degree, diploma or other qualification subsequent to initial training is included within this definition."²

Johnston stated that in-service education

may consist of carefully planned, sustained work over a lengthy period leading to a further qualification in the form of an advanced certificate, diploma, or higher degree; it may equally well be casual study, pursued irregularly in the evenings or during vacations, and in no sense leading to measurable recognition for purposes of salary or of promotion.³

¹Ben M. Harris, Wailand Bessent, and Kenneth E. McIntyre, In-service Education: A Guide to Better Practice (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 2.

²Brian Cane, In-service Training: A Study of Teachers' Views and Preferences, Occasional Publication Series No. 22 (London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1969), p. x.

³D. J. Johnston, Teachers' In-service Education (New York: Pergamon Press, Ltd., 1971), p. 9.

Dillon-Peterson defined staff development as "a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive, positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools."¹

The Importance of In-service Education

No one would deny the importance of in-service education for school personnel. Burrello and Orbaugh stated, "We believe inservice education is an absolute necessity if schools are to develop their most important resource, their people."² Research has indicated that there is a correlation between staff development and organization development; this means that whenever in-service education is provided for school personnel, the schools can provide better learning for students because

in-service training programs can be tied into the day-to-day development of instructional materials and programs, can serve the periodic and special needs of educators, can be employed for purposes of exposure to new equipment and materials and can be used to bring teachers and administrators/teachers and teachers/administrators and administrators together for purposes of social interaction/group training or the exchange of ideas and experiences.³

¹Betty Dillon-Peterson, "Staff Development/Organization Development--Perspective 1981," in Staff Development/Organization Development, ed. Betty Dillon-Peterson (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), p. 3.

✓²Leonard Burrello and Tim Orbaugh, "Reducing the Discrepancy Between the Known and the Unknown in In-service Education," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 385. ✓

³Richard O. Peters, "Affecting Teacher Awareness and Attitudes: An Inservice Program Strategy for Rural Schools" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 114 225, 1975), p. 4.

Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre identified four reasons why in-service education is important. These are:

1. Pre-service preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to professional preparation rather than professional preparation as such.
2. Social and educational change makes current professional practices obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools, and substantive knowledge itself.
3. Coordination and articulation of instructional practices require changes in people. Even when each instructional staff member is functioning at a highly professional level, employing an optimum number of the most effective practices, such an instructional program might still be relatively uncoordinated from subject to subject and poorly articulated from year to year.
4. Other factors argue for in-service education activities of rather diverse kinds. Morale can be stimulated and maintained through in-service education and is a contribution to instruction in itself, even if instructional improvement of any dynamic kind does not occur.¹

The Purposes of In-service Education

According to Peters, one of the purposes of in-service education is to provide practicing classroom teachers and building administrators with quality training that

1. develops their awareness of new practices and techniques.
2. exposes practitioners to the "how-to-do-its" of their profession.
3. provides social interaction situations.
4. allows for the exchange of ideas and experiences.
5. provides the opportunity for skill development/application.
6. provides for exposure to and interaction with new instructional equipment and materials.

¹Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre, In-service Education, pp. 3-4.

7. directly involves educators in the process of instructional program development.
8. provides the opportunity to use teachers/staff personnel/administrators as resource people to other educators; using the resource person's expertise and skills in instructional situations.¹

Continuing the education of beginning teachers is another purpose of in-service education. Moffitt asserted,

Regardless of the quantity and quality of academic education received in a college or university, a teacher new to any given school system needs in-service education. . . .

The beginning teacher enters into a strange and completely new situation. For many, it is the first real job the teacher has had, with the responsibilities attached thereto. Everything is strange. Commonly, he is unacquainted with the other teachers, the principal, or the administrative or supervisory personnel. The students are strange, and often the community is one about which he has little knowledge.²

Types of In-service Education

Yarger identified the following five types of in-service education:

1. Job-embedded in-service education is programming that occurs within the context of a teacher's fulfilling his/her assigned responsibilities. It is directly related to the provision of skills that can be translated into working with children, developing classroom materials, and/or planning curriculum.
2. Job-related in-service education is programming that is either directly or indirectly related to the provision of skills for the performance of a teacher's primary responsibility of instructing children. It may result in the acquisition of directly applicable skills, or it may provide content that, while not directly applicable, is clearly related. Job-related in-service training does not occur within the context of the instruction of children.

¹Peters, "Affecting Teacher Awareness and Attitudes," p. 4.

²John C. Moffitt, In-service Education for Teachers (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), p. 6.

3. Professionally-related in-service education focuses on those aspects of a teacher's role which are clearly required, but are not directly related to the instruction of children. In every sense, however, they relate to "professional" attributes which generally differentiate teachers from others who work in schools. Such training might focus on parent conferences, community-based education programs, legally mandated record keeping, and a long list of professionally related responsibilities.
4. Mobility-related in-service education is primarily designed to prepare the teacher to assume a new position and/or obtain a new credential. Although usually related to "upward" mobility, it need not be. Programs that facilitate the transition from provisional to permanent certification and from teacher to administrator, and from teacher to specialist, are common examples of this kind of in-service education.
5. Personally-related in-service education is characterized by its emphasis on helping the participant become a more effective person rather than a more effective professional. Implicit in this type of in-service is that the more secure and well-adjusted a person is, the better teacher that person will be. Typically, this type of in-service programming will be self-selected and on occasion even self-directed.¹

Howey also identified several basic types of in-service education. They are as follows:

1. transitional (from pre- to in-)
2. comprehensive school renewal/role reorientation
3. content or skill-specific development
4. personal growth
5. continuing graduate level education
6. general professional development
7. career progression²

¹Sam J. Yarger, "In-service Education and Teacher Centers," in Teacher Centers, Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions, 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977), pp. 21-22.

²Kenneth R. Howey, "Putting Inservice Teacher Education Into Perspective," Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Summer 1976): 102.

Hatfield and Ralston indicated that

the growth of the professional educator involves three aspects: (1) human growth, (2) growth in competence to carry out the educator's role, and (3) growth as training to implement reform decided on by the persons responsible for the shape of the school in which the educator works.¹

Characteristics of Successful In-service Education

Burrello and Orbaugh listed five major characteristics of effective in-service programs:

1. Inservice education should be designed so that programs are integrated into and supported by the organization within which they function.
 - Inservice education should be an integral part of the total school program.
 - Programs of inservice education should be explicitly supported at the outset by district and building administrators.
2. Inservice education programs should be designed to result in collaborative programs.
3. Inservice education programs should be grounded in the needs of the participants.
 - Inservice programs should respond to assessed needs, including the interests and strengths of participants.
 - The development of problem-solving skills should be made a part of inservice training.
4. Inservice education programs should be responsive to changing needs.
 - The design of inservice programs should be complex and ambitious.
 - Each person is often his or her own most competent trainer.
 - Inservice education should model good teaching.
 - Trainees should make use of peer-teaching strategies.
 - The content should be directed toward changing teaching, not changing student behavior.

¹Robert C. Hatfield and Sherry Ralston, "Professional Assessment and Development" (paper presented at the Annual ATE Convention, 1978), p. 14.

- The implementation strategy should include continual professional growth activities and the local development of collaboratively prepared materials.
 - Outside agencies or consultants may be helpful in supportive roles, especially as catalysts during start-up or as process helpers during times of crisis or stalemates.
5. Inservice education activities should be evaluated over time and be compatible with the underlying philosophy and approach of the district.
 - The evaluation of inservice education should be a collaborative venture whose primary purpose is to assist with the planning and implementing of programs.
 - Decisions concerning the in-service education program should be based on the findings from continuing program evaluation by program participants and others affected by the program.
 - The evaluation design should address planning, implementation, and dissemination.¹

Lawrence et al. identified seven major characteristics of successful in-service education:

1. Individualized inservice education tends to be better than single offerings for large groups.
2. Active involvement in inservice programs tends to be better than passive-receptive involvement.
3. Demonstration of skills with supervised feedback tends to be better than the provision of skills to be stored for future use.
4. Teacher-help-teacher inservice tends to be better than teacher-work-alone inservice.
5. Inservice that is integrated into a large program tends to be more effective than one-shot affairs.
6. Inservice that has an emerging design with teacher input tends to be better than totally preplanned inservice.
7. Self-initiated inservice tends to be more effective than self-prescribed inservice.²

¹Burrello and Orbaugh, "Reducing the Discrepancy," pp. 385-86.

²Gordon Lawrence et al., Pattern of Effective Inservice Education (Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1974); cited in Yarger, "Inservice Education and Teacher Centers," p. 24.

The Teachers' Center as an Important Aspect of
Professional Development (In-service Education)

The inadequacies of in-service education activities have forced educators in the United States to look for new delivery systems, methods, and approaches to make in-service education activities more meaningful for public-school personnel. As a result of that research, a British innovation, the teachers' center, was adopted. An American educator, Arline Julius, wrote about this search:

Along with college colleagues, I have struggled to develop a teaching center in an impoverished area of the South Bronx in New York City. Last spring I visited Britain, studying for six weeks what has been widely publicized as a successful teacher center movement. I gathered some insights that may be helpful in attempts to establish teacher centers in the United States.¹

This clearly indicates that the concept of teachers' centers evolved in Great Britain and was later espoused by educators in the United States.

Writing about the evolution of these centers, Bailey said,

Perhaps the most significant potential British contribution to American education . . . is only now being identified and discussed: the development of teachers' centers. British experience with these centers, at least in their present form, is a matter of three or four years only. But the idea is so simple, so obvious, so psychologically sound, as to make one wonder why teachers' centers have not dotted the educational landscape for decades.²

What Is a Teachers' Center?

Bailey defined the teachers' center as follows:

¹Arline Julius, "British Teacher Centers: Practical Applications for America," Phi Delta Kappan (November 1976): 250.

²Stephen Bailey, "Teachers' Centers: A British First," Phi Delta Kappan (November 1971): 146.

Teachers' centers are just what the term implies: local physical facilities and self-improvement programs organized and run by the teachers themselves for purposes of upgrading educational performance. Their primary function is to make possible a review of existing curricula and other educational practices by groups of teachers and encourage teacher attempts to bring about changes.¹

Schmeider and Yarger defined the teachers' center somewhat more broadly than Bailey did:

A teacher center is a place, in situ or a changing location, which develops programs directed at the improvement of classroom instruction in which the participating personnel have an opportunity to share successes, to utilize a wide range of educational resources, and to receive training specifically related to the most pressing instructional problems. Programs are primarily for inservice teachers--but may involve other kinds of educational personnel as they relate to the improvement of classroom instruction--and usually serve both individual and system-wide needs.²

Why Teachers' Centers?

Schmieder and Yarger identified the following reasons for establishing and/or maintaining teachers' centers:

1. Search for ways to link more effectively the preservice and in-service training of educational personnel.
2. Search for more systematic and effective in-service training of educational personnel.
3. Search for ways to integrate more effectively curriculum development and staff development.
4. Search for more effective systems of introducing preservice teachers into the schools.
5. New emphasis on continuous teacher training--from the time of career choice until retirement.

¹Ibid.

²Yarger, "In-service Education and Teacher Centers," p. 29; a first version of this definition appeared in Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America," Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974).

6. Search for new and more effective ways to share experiences and resources better among generally noncommunicating educational constituencies (students, teachers, administrators, supervisors, college and university staff, interested community).
7. Strongly advocated by a number of important educational writers, e.g., Silberman, Bailey, James.
8. Support of pilot programs (especially of British Model) by Ford, Carnegie, and other foundations.
9. Recommendation by Task Force '72 of U.S. Office of Education (USOE) that the concept is one of the five most promising new ones in teacher education.
10. Positions of National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, and United Federation of Teachers, who have strongly supported the concept, developed a number of position papers on the subject, and started a number of demonstration centers.
11. Recommendation (in one form or another) by both the Teachers' and Higher Education National Field Task Forces on the Improvement and Reform of American Education that the teaching center is the best route to better staff training.
12. Increasing commitment of the education profession to find better ways continually to upgrade and review the qualifications of all educational personnel.¹

Mertens further endorsed the concept of teachers' centers.

She wrote:

Teacher Centers are propelled by a sincere commitment to meet the needs of teachers as they are perceived by teachers. Most importantly, however, Teacher Centers appear to have the potential of delivering on this commitment through flexible structures and without institutional constraints. Teacher Centers have the potential to give teachers what teachers believe they need, when and where they believe it to be appropriate.²

¹Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975), pp. 4-5.

²Sally Mertens, "On the Way to Describing the Federal Teacher Centers Program," Action in Teacher Education 2 (Spring 1980): 42.

Teachers' Involvement and Adult Learning Concepts

Successful in-service programs can be developed if the involvement of the teachers who participate in such programs is increased.

Baden wrote,

Because many teachers have had unsatisfactory experiences with professional or inservice activities in the past, it is critical that teachers be involved in the identification and articulation of their own training needs. When teachers are involved in enunciation and organization of training activities, conditions are enhanced for peer support, shared effort, and eventual utilization of new insights and skills.¹

Teachers are adult learners in any in-service education activity; they can learn from each other as well as from the educators who are involved in these activities as resource personnel and as facilitators. Because teachers are adult learners, adult-learning concepts should be used in their in-service activities, which will make these activities more effective.

One of the concepts involved in adult education is andragogy, "the art and science of helping adults learn."² Knowles explained the assumptions on which andragogy is based:

Andragogy is premised on at least four crucial assumptions about the characteristics of adult learners that are different from the assumptions about child learners on which traditional pedagogy is premised. These assumptions are that, as a person matures, (1) his self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward one of being a self-directing human being; (2) he accumulates a growing reservoir of experience that becomes

¹Donald J. Baden, "Developing and Implementing a Teacher Directed Professional Development Model" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 121 730, February 1976), p. 2.

²Malcolm S. Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy, 8th ed. (New York: Association Press, 1977), p. 39.

an increasing resource for learning; (3) his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of his social roles; and (4) his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly his orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of problem-centeredness.¹

Knowles indicated why learning activities for adults should be self-directed:

[The adult] sees himself as being able to make his own decisions and face their consequences, to manage his own life. In fact, the point at which a person becomes an adult, psychologically, is that point at which he perceives himself to be wholly self-directing. And at that point he also experiences a deep need to be perceived by others as being self-directing.

For this reason, adults have a need to be treated with respect, to make their own decisions, to be seen as unique human beings. They tend to avoid, resist, and resent situations in which they feel they are treated like children--being told what to do and what not to do, being talked down to, embarrassed, punished, judged. Adults tend to resist learning under conditions that are incongruent with their self-concept as autonomous individuals.²

According to Knowles, certain principles are very important in adults' learning activities. These are:

1. Adults are motivated to learn as they experience needs and interests that learning will satisfy; therefore, these needs and interests are appropriate starting points for organizing adult learning activities.
2. Adult orientation to learning is life-centered; therefore, the appropriate units for organizing adult learning are life situations, not subjects.
3. Experience is the richest resource for adult learning; therefore, the core methodology of adult education is the analysis of experience.
4. Adults have a deep need to be self-directing. Therefore, the role of the teacher is to engage in a process of mutual inquiry rather than to transmit knowledge to them and then evaluate their conformity to it.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 40.

5. Individual differences among people increase with age; therefore, adult education must make optimal provision for differences in style, time, place, and pace of learning.¹

Because the preceding principles are important in adult-learning activities, they should be used in in-service education. Some educators who have been involved in professional-development activities for a long time have asserted that teachers must have an active role in such activities. They also have recommended the use of adult-education concepts in some preservice activities. Edelfelt supported this viewpoint by stating,

Schools of education need to give attention to adult learning. If schools of education personnel are to help teachers and other professionals in schools, they have got to develop new ways to treat and associate with school personnel. College professors cannot continue to treat school personnel like children, or like students in the traditional sense. I make this argument not only because professors can no longer defend the status of such a relationship, but, more important, because that relationship is unsound psychology. Mature school personnel will not respond to--nor will they learn much from--professors who expect or demand conformity, subservience, and deference.²

Edelfelt and Lawrence identified some patterns of effective in-service education, which contain some of the concepts of adult education. These are as follows:

1. In-service education programs that place the teacher in an active role (constructing and generating materials, ideas, and behavior) are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that place the teacher in a receptive role.

¹Malcolm S. Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species (Houston: Gulf, 1978); cited in Richard H. Bents and Kenneth R. Howey, "Staff Development--Change in the Individual," in Staff Development/ Organization Development, ed. Betty Dillon-Peterson (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), p. 33.

²Roy A. Edelfelt, "The School of Education and Inservice Education," Journal of Teacher Education 28 (March-April 1977): 12.

2. Teachers are more likely to benefit from in-service programs in which they can choose goals and activities for themselves, as contrasted with programs in which the goals and activities are preplanned.
3. Inservice education programs in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which each teacher does separate work.
4. In-service education programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (that is, "individualized") are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants.
5. School-based programs in which teachers participate as helpers to each other and planners of in-service activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than do programs which are conducted by college or other outside personnel without the assistance of teachers.¹

Importance of Teachers' Involvement in Needs Assessment

Needs assessment is the first step in developing a teachers' center program, and as such it is very important. "Planning is based on an assessment of teacher training needs conducted by each center."²

A sound needs assessment can be carried out by using several approaches; some of these are the following:

1. Survey questionnaires: "Each teacher is asked to report which of several teaching skills and subject matter competencies they feel most knowledgeable about and those in which they feel most in need of training. The survey results are then used to determine what kinds of training should be offered."³

¹Roy Edelfelt and Gordon Lawrence, "In-service Education: The State of the Art," in Rethinking In-service Education, ed. Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), pp. 18-19.

²Alanson A. Van Fleet, "Teacher Centers in Florida: A Case Study," School Review 85 (May 1977): 417.

³Ibid.

2. Individual requests: The director and/or the personnel of the center may receive special requests from a teacher or groups of teachers.¹

3. Interviews with individual teachers or groups of teachers by teachers' center personnel: "Interviews with individual teachers or groups of teachers can provide insight and information for needs assessment."²

4. Observation: "Observation takes many forms: teacher or student self-observation, observation of students by teachers or others, and observation of teachers by supervisors, or advisors. To be useful, observation should focus on both students and teachers."³

5. Small-group discussions: A group of teachers can conduct discussions that help clarify some of their needs for in-service education.

Using these approaches, data are generated concerning teachers' needs for in-service education. Teachers must be involved in collecting and analyzing the data; they must also be included in setting priorities of needs. As Luke stated, "An intrinsic part of the needs assessment process is gathering data on the delivery system teachers

¹Ibid., p. 418.

²National Education Association, Teacher Centers and Needs Assessment (Washington, D.C.: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Teacher Center Project, and National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development, 1980), p. 4.

³Ibid., p. 3.

perceive to be most effective in making available to them the skills and information they require."¹

Importance of Teachers' Involvement
in Planning and Designing Activities
of the Center

The second important step in developing a teachers' center program is the planning process. Each teachers' center should have a planning committee composed of teachers, administrators, and center personnel. Luke indicated that it is important for this committee to (1) clarify participants' responsibilities, (2) be clear about the task, (3) review how adults learn, and (4) think about motivation. He also stated that the second component of the planning function would involve the following tasks: (1) reviewing needs-assessment data, (2) writing a problem statement, and (3) previewing training materials.²

Luke indicated that four tasks, therefore, confront the planning committee in the beginning stages of program design:

1. Identifying learning strategies appropriate to the need to be met and the time available for in-service.
2. Searching available program materials to uncover a useful range and variety of in-service education strategies.
3. Inventing new strategies when the materials at hand fail to supply what is required.
4. Adapting, revising, and arranging learning strategies into a workable sequence.³

¹Robert A. Luke, Teacher Centered In-service Education: Planning and Products (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1980).

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

Gmelch, Rose, and Erickson indicated that involving teachers in planning will result in successful in-service education activities. They wrote, "The development of a successful inservice program many times is contingent upon the involvement of participants in the planning. A close relationship exists between involvement in an enterprise and the commitment to its goal."¹

Teachers can be involved in the following activities:

1. identifying the content of teacher professional-development programs (in-service education).
2. suggesting programs for professional development.
3. suggesting speakers or presenters for professional-development programs.
4. writing mini grant proposals for projects of teachers' design.

Importance of Teachers' Involvement in Implementation of the Activities

Teachers should play an active role in implementing teachers' center activities because

teachers come to a good Teacher Center to give as well as to take; they come bringing energy and expertise as well as questions and problems. . . . The center is a place to share successes, to practice teaching adults--other teachers--as well as children.²

¹Walter H. Gmelch, Robert L. Rose, and Kenneth A. Erickson, "Rx for Professional Growth: Inservice Education," OSSC Bulletin (Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, n.d.), p. 10.

²Kathleen Devaney, "Ingredients of Teacher Centers' Uniqueness," Action in Teacher Education 2 (Spring 1980): 46.

The Kent Professional Staff Development Center

The Kent Professional Staff Development Center was created in 1977 by the Kent Intermediate School District in Grand Rapids, Michigan. This center serves 35 school districts and provides

professional growth opportunities for more than six thousand professional personnel within Kent and Ionia Intermediate School Districts. The center brings together representatives from teachers' groups, administrators, school boards, colleges, and universities to identify needs, establish priorities, and plan and implement programs to improve staff competencies and skills, that will result in improved learning experiences for students.¹

Purposes of the Center

The Kent Center has three major purposes:

1. To provide teachers and other educational workers with knowledge and skills to facilitate improved student learning and performance commensurate with individual student incentive and potential.
2. To provide teachers and other educational workers with knowledge and skills to meet additional development needs of students.
3. To meet the specific needs of professional staff that may or may not be related to cognitive outcomes in students.²

Goals of the Center

The Kent Center has five major goals. These are:

1. To establish a two-way dissemination/communication linkage from building, through system, to Center.
2. To establish a bank of resource personnel to be used in implementing programs.
3. To design, implement, and evaluate programs based on priority needs.

¹Kent Professional Staff Development Center, "Final Report, October 1, 1980-September 30, 1981" (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kent Intermediate School District, 1981), p. 4.

²Ibid., p. 3.

4. To establish a coordination between services available in existing projects and agencies and identified needs.
5. To establish an on-going needs-assessment process.¹

Staff of the Center

The staff of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center comprises a director, a consultant, and a secretary. They have eight major responsibilities:

1. To assist local districts in planning effective staff-development programs.
2. To assist local districts in identifying material and human resources.
3. To design and coordinate an on-going needs-assessment process.
4. To coordinate the evaluation of staff-development activities.
5. To maintain records of staff-development activities.
6. To coordinate the Committee of Twenty-Eight [local school-district linkers].
7. To make recommendations for staff-development programs to the Policy Board.
8. To deliver staff-development programming which meets the generic needs of the service area.²

The Policy Board

The Kent Center is governed by an 18-member Policy Board. Three individuals are ex-officio members and cannot vote. Of the 15 voting members, eight are classroom teachers. The responsibilities of the Policy Board are as follows:

1. To identify the broad goals and objectives for staff-development efforts.
2. To coordinate professional-development activities.
3. To approve programming of interest to the entire service area.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 6.

4. To endorse Kent Professional Staff Development Center staffing.
5. To evaluate the effectiveness of programs.¹

Local District Linkers

Each school district has a communication linker selected by the school. "These people [have] important responsibilities in keeping the center aware of needs in that school district as well as assisting in acquainting personnel in their district with professional-development opportunities."²

Summary

In-service education is a continuous process in the preparation of classroom teachers; as such, it is a very important factor in providing better education for students. The inadequacies of in-service education have forced educators in colleges and public schools to look for new delivery systems, methods, and approaches. The concept of the teachers' center has emerged as a new delivery system, as well as engendering new methods and approaches to in-service education. The review of related literature has indicated that in order to provide successful in-service activities, the teachers should be actively involved in the governance processes, namely, needs assessment, planning, implementation, and policy board activities, because it involves the teachers more directly in their own professional-development activities. The unique quality of the teachers' center is that it involves

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Ibid.

the teachers in planning, it applies some learning and teaching theories, and it employs some concepts of adult education.

In this review of related literature, the writer attempted to build a conceptual framework toward developing recommendations for in-service education in Saudi Arabia. The recommendations generated by the writer are set forth in Chapter V.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Introduction

The investigator employed a survey to describe teachers' involvement in the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC) and to describe the ways in which the in-service education provided by the KPSDC affects teachers' classroom instruction.

According to Borg and Gall, "descriptive studies typically employ either survey or observational research methods. Their purpose is to collect information that permits us to describe the characteristics of persons or an educational process or an institution."¹

In this chapter, the major research questions are presented. A description of the population and sample of the study, a description of the instrument and how it was distributed, and the methods used in analyzing the data are also included.

Research Questions

This was a descriptive study. The investigator posed the following research questions in an attempt to generate the information needed to fulfill the purposes of the study:

¹Walter R. Borg and Meredith Damien Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: Longmans, Inc., 1979), p. 38.

1. To what extent are teachers involved in the needs-assessment process?
2. To what extent are teachers involved in the planning process?
3. To what extent are teachers involved in the developing and implementing processes?
4. To what extent are teachers involved in committees dealing with the governance of the teachers' center?
5. In what types of activities of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC) do the teachers participate?
6. What benefits did the teachers perceive in the activities/programs offered by the teachers' center?
7. Is there any relationship between active involvement in the committees and perceived benefit from the activities offered by the Center?
8. What recommendations can be generated from this study for in-service teacher education in Saudi Arabia?

Population and Sample of the Study

The Kent Professional Staff Development Center serves 6,000 public-school personnel representing 35 school districts in the Kent and Ionia Intermediate School Districts. Since the entire population comprised 6,000 individuals, the investigator, after consultation with and direction from his chairperson, decided to take 300 members of the population as a sample for this study. Therefore, he decided to administer the questionnaire to a random sample of 300 elementary, middle school, and high school teachers in Kent and Ionia Intermediate

School Districts. A total of 161 questionnaires (53 percent) was returned.

The Survey Instrument

To fulfill the purposes of this study, the investigator developed a questionnaire because existing questionnaires were not designed to gather the information needed in this study. The instrument was developed to gather the following data:

1. Demographic data.
2. Committees existing in the Kent PSDC and teachers' involvement in such committees.
3. Needs-assessment process in Kent PSDC and teachers' involvement in such process.
4. Teachers' involvement in planning and implementing the activities of the Kent PSDC.
5. Activities teachers participate in, their quality as perceived by teachers, and their effect on classroom instruction.
6. The types of benefits that can be derived from the activities or programs offered by the Kent PSDC.
7. Comments about and recommendations for improvement of the Kent PSDC programs.

Demographic Data

To gather demographic information, the following ten questions were included in the questionnaire:

1. Please indicate the name of your school and of your school district.

School: _____

District: _____

2. Please indicate the number of years (including this one) that you have taught. _____ years
3. What is your major teaching assignment?
 _____ 1. Elementary
 _____ 2. Junior high/middle school
 _____ 3. Senior high
4. What subject fields do you teach? Please check appropriate field(s) and indicate grade level taught (e.g., Math: 5,7).
 _____ 1. Math
 _____ 2. Science
 _____ 3. Social studies
 _____ 4. Language arts
 _____ 5. Industrial arts
 _____ 6. Home economics
 _____ 7. Music
 _____ 8. Art
 _____ 9. Physical education
 _____ 10. Other (specify) _____
5. Highest degree held: _____ College major: _____
6. Year graduated from college: 19____ Institution: _____
7. In case of graduate study, please indicate field of study and year completed: _____
8. Type of teaching certificate
 _____ 1. Provisional
 _____ 2. Permanent
 _____ 3. Continuing
 _____ 4. Other (specify) _____
9. Year of birth: 19____
10. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Questions 2 (teaching experience), 3 (major teaching assignment), 4 (teaching subject fields), 5 (highest degree held), 8 (type of teaching certificate), and 10 (sex) were used to elicit information about the characteristics of the population and to make comparisons within these groups, which were the independent variables of the study.

Current literature relating to in-service education (professional development) claims that the teachers should be involved in committees such as needs assessment, planning, implementation, and

policy board in teachers' centers. Question 11 was developed to indicate to what extent the participants of this study were involved in such committees. (See Appendix A.)

Research in professional development has also indicated the importance of teachers' involvement in (1) the needs-assessment process, (2) planning and designing in-service programs and activities offered by the centers, and (3) implementation of in-service activities offered by the centers. To determine to what extent the teachers were involved in such processes, Question 12 was designed to indicate which methods the Kent PSDC was using to assess teachers' needs. Questions 13-19 were developed to indicate to what extent teachers are involved in needs assessment, the planning process, and the implementing process, and to indicate existing barriers that have kept some teachers from being involved. Some of the above-mentioned questions also attempted to determine the teachers' intention to become involved in such processes in the future.

Question 20 was developed to explore what types of activities are offered by the Kent PSDC and how often the teachers were involved in such activities. This question also asked to what extent such activities were helpful to the teachers and what effect such activities have had on classroom instruction.

Question 21 was developed to indicate to what extent the Kent PSDC activities related to: (1) general personal growth, (2) improving instructional skills related to teachers' teaching assignments, (3) keeping current about educational matters, (4) facilitating change and improvement in the school and in school programs,

(5) helping to move up the career ladder, and (6) organizing and managing the classroom.

Question 22 was designed to indicate whether teachers who had a special problem and who needed help in solving it could obtain such help from the Kent PSDC.

Question 23 was developed to indicate some of the benefits teachers had derived from the activities or programs offered by the Kent PSDC. This question consisted of nine items, the last of which was open ended.

The last two questions were open ended. Teachers were asked to comment about and make recommendations for improving the existing services in the Kent PSDC. Teachers were also asked to suggest some ways and methods by which to make the Kent PSDC programs and activities more meaningful for them.

Procedure and Data Collection

After the preparation of the survey, the Kent Professional Staff Development Center was contacted. An exploratory meeting with the director of the Center was set. At that meeting the investigator discussed in detail with the director and a consultant of the Center the purposes of the study. Their general reaction was very positive, and they offered to cooperate in distributing the questionnaires to the participants.

Since the investigator could not obtain a mailing list of the subjects, the director and consultant of the Center suggested that they could distribute the questionnaires through the local district

linkers. After consulting with his research chairperson, the investigator decided to accept that suggestion. As a result of that decision, two letters were written to the linkers, one by the chairperson and the director and the other by the director of the Kent PSDC. (See Appendix A.) The investigator also wrote a cover letter to the questionnaire to explain the purposes and intentions of the study.

The questionnaires were submitted to Kent PSDC personnel on April 26, 1982. On April 27, the Kent PSDC linkers had their annual meeting with Kent PSDC personnel. At that meeting, every linker was instructed to select randomly from his/her school system the elementary, middle school, and secondary school teachers who would be willing to complete the enclosed survey. The linkers were also instructed to have the teachers complete their surveys the week of May 3-7, 1982, and to return them to the director of the Kent PSDC no later than May 14, 1982.

Data-Analysis Method

The results of the study are presented in terms of demographic information regarding the personal and professional background of the respondents. Furthermore, responses to the various sections of the questionnaire are presented in simple frequency distribution, as well as in terms of personal and professional background variables. Where appropriate, analysis of variance is used to compare groups with regard to attitude-scale items. Chi-square is

used where frequency cross-tabulations are presented. Computations were executed with the help of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).¹

¹Norman Nie, H. Hull, C. Hadulai, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

In this chapter, the data collected and the findings derived from them are reported and are presented in nine sections. The first section deals with the demographic description of the population studied. Subsequent sections concern seven of the research questions formulated in Chapter I:

1. To what extent are teachers involved in the needs-assessment process?
2. To what extent are teachers involved in the planning process?
3. To what extent are teachers involved in the developing and implementing processes?
4. To what extent are teachers involved in committees dealing with the governance of the teachers' center?
5. In what types of activities of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC) do the teachers participate?
6. What benefits did the teachers perceive in the activities/programs offered by the teachers' center?
7. Is there any relationship between active involvement in the committees and perceived benefit from the activities offered by the Center?

In the last section, responses to the open-ended questions posed in the questionnaire are summarized.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

In this section, demographic information about the study sample is presented.

Professional Background

Information about the professional background of the respondents is included in several appendices, as well as in the following discussion and tables. The school districts and schools in which the respondents taught are listed in Appendices B and C, respectively. The mean number of years of teaching experience was 14.15; a detailed breakdown is presented in Appendix D.

School level taught.--Table 1 indicates that about 42% of the respondents were elementary-school teachers, 21% of them were junior-high-school teachers, and 37% were teaching in a senior high school.

Table 1.--School level taught.

School Level	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Elementary	67	41.6	41.9
Junior H.S.	34	21.1	21.2
Senior H.S.	59	36.6	36.9
No response	1	.6	..
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Subject matter taught.--Respondents reported grade level and subjects taught. Their responses are summarized in Table 2, which indicates the number of individuals teaching a given subject as the first or second option. For future use in cross-tabulation, these responses were reduced by collapsing Mathematics and Science into one category--Science, and Social Studies and Language Arts into a second category--Humanities (see, for example, Table 12). The remaining subject areas taught, as listed in Table 2, were included, where appropriate, in a third category--Other.

Table 2.--Subject matter taught.

Subject Matter ^a	Yes	
	N	%
1 - Mathematics	71	44.1
2 - Mathematics	24	14.9
1 - Science	59	36.6
2 - Science	19	11.8
1 - Social Studies	63	39.1
2 - Social Studies	22	13.7
1 - Language Arts	75	46.6
2 - Language Arts	30	18.6
1 - Industrial Arts	2	1.2
2 - Industrial Arts	1	0.6
1 - Home Economics	2	1.2
2 - Home Economics	2	1.2
1 - Music	9	5.6
2 - Music	2	1.2
1 - Art	24	14.9
2 - Art	6	3.7
1 - Physical Education	14	8.7
2 - Physical Education	6	3.7

^a1 = first option
2 = second option

Educational Background

Information about the educational background of the respondents is presented in the appendices, as well as in the following discussion. The undergraduate field of study is listed in Appendix E, the undergraduate institution in Appendix F, and the graduate field of study in Appendix G.

Highest degree held.--Table 3 presents the highest degree held by the respondents. The majority of the teachers held an M.A. degree, and about one-fourth held a B.A. Again, for use in later cross-tabulations, codes 1 and 2, as well as codes 4 and 7, were collapsed, as may be seen in Table 13.

Table 3.--Highest degree held.

Highest Degree	Code	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
B.A., B.S.	1	37	23.0	23.3
B.A., B.S. + TC	2	8	5.0	5.0
M.A., M.S.	3	92	57.1	57.9
M.A., M.S. Plus	4	16	9.9	10.1
Ed. Specialist	7	6	3.7	3.8
No response	-1	2	1.2	..
Total		161	100.0	100.0

Type of teaching certificate.--As may be noted in Table 4, some 6% of the respondents had only a provisional teaching certificate, more than half held a permanent certificate, and about one-third had a continuing certificate.

Table 4.--Type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Provisional	10	6.2	6.2
Permanent	102	63.4	63.4
Continuing	49	30.4	30.4
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Personal characteristics.--The mean age of the respondents was 40 years. A detailed listing of years of birth is presented in Appendix H. The sex of the respondents is reported in Table 5. Sixty percent of the respondents were female, and 40% were male.

Table 5.--Sex of respondent.

Sex	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Female	96	59.6	60.4
Male	63	39.1	39.6
No response	2	1.2	..
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Teachers' Involvement in the Needs-Assessment Process

Five questions in the questionnaire addressed the teachers' involvement in the needs-assessment process:

11. In case there are such, or similar, committees, are you a member of any of the following: needs assessment (partial item)

12. Considering the needs-assessment process, which of the following is being used:
13. In which of the following aspects of the needs-assessment process in Kent PSDC have you ever been involved:
14. If you indicated in Question 13 that you have not been involved, what has kept you from being involved?
15. If you indicated any involvement above, do you hope to continue to be involved?

Simple Frequency Distributions

Initially, simple frequency distributions of the responses to each of these five questions are presented.

Membership on needs-assessment committee.--As may be noted in Table 6, nearly 15% of the participants did not respond to this question; another 23% stated that no committee dealing with needs assessment existed. Furthermore, almost 33% of the respondents, in addition to the 38% already mentioned, indicated that they had never been a member of such a committee. Only 29% of the respondents either had been a member of a needs-assessment committee in the past or were currently a member.

Table 6.--Membership on needs-assessment committee.

Membership	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
No committee	37	23.0	27.0
Never a member	53	32.9	38.7
Former member	24	14.9	17.5
Current member	23	14.3	16.8
No response	<u>24</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Types of needs-assessment processes known. Whereas 23% of the respondents indicated that there was no such thing as a needs-assessment committee (Table 6), even more, 27%, did not answer the question about the types of needs-assessment processes known (see Table 7). The greatest percentage of respondents, 44%, knew about surveys; the rest mentioned interviews, observations, or a combination of these methods.

Table 7.--Types of needs-assessment processes known.

Process	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
(1) Survey	70	43.5	59.3
(2) Observation	4	2.5	3.4
(1) + (2)	6	3.7	5.1
(4) Interview	9	5.6	7.6
(1) + (4)	16	9.9	13.6
(2) + (4)	1	.6	.8
(1) + (2) + (4)	7	4.3	5.9
Other	5	3.1	4.2
No response	43	26.7	..
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Involvement in needs-assessment processes.--Even fewer respondents indicated any involvement in the needs-assessment process, as may be noted from Table 8. Of the one-third of the respondents who did indicate such involvement, nearly half indicated involvement in data collection and another third in data collection and analysis.

Table 8.--Involvement in needs-assessment processes.

Process	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
(1) Design instrument	1	.6	2.0
(2) Collect data	23	14.3	45.1
(1) + (2)	2	1.2	3.9
(4) Analyze data	0	0	0
(1) + (4)	1	.6	2.0
(2) + (4)	17	10.6	33.3
(1) + (2) + (4)	7	4.3	13.7
No response	<u>110</u>	<u>68.3</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Reasons for noninvolvement.--More than half of the respondents did not answer the question about reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process, as shown in Table 9. Of those who did answer, nearly half mentioned lack of time, about one-fourth indicated that they had not been invited, and another 15% did not know about this activity.

Table 9.--Reasons for not being involved in needs assessment.

Reason	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Not invited	21	13.0	27.3
No time	32	19.9	41.6
Didn't know	12	7.5	15.6
Other	6	3.7	7.8
No interest	6	3.7	7.8
No response	<u>84</u>	<u>52.2</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Intention to continue involvement.--Nearly two-thirds of the participants did not respond to the question regarding an intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process (see Table 10). Of those who did answer, 71% indicated their intention to continue their involvement.

Table 10.--Intention to continue in the needs-assessment process.

Intention	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Yes	41	25.5	70.7
Maybe	7	4.3	12.1
No time	10	6.2	17.2
No response	<u>103</u>	<u>64.0</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Next, responses to Questions 11, 14, and 15 are presented in more detail, with responses being broken down by various characteristics of the respondents.

Membership on the Needs- Assessment Committee

Table 6 presented the simple frequency distribution of the respondents in terms of their membership on a needs-assessment committee. In the following tables, the same data are presented in such a way as to detect whether there was a relationship between membership on this committee and various professional and personal characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 11 presents a tabulation of membership on the needs-assessment committee in terms of the schools in which the respondents taught. No systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Table 11.--Membership on the needs-assessment committee and school level taught.

School Level		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Elementary	Count	19	19	10	9	57
	Row %	33.3	33.3	17.5	15.8	41.9
	Col. %	51.4	35.8	41.7	40.9	
Junior H.S.		9	10	3	5	27
		33.3	37.0	11.1	18.5	19.9
		24.3	18.9	12.5	22.7	
Senior H.S.		9	24	11	8	52
		17.3	46.2	21.2	15.4	38.2
		24.3	45.3	45.8	36.4	
Column total	N	37	53	24	22	136
	%	27.2	39.0	17.6	16.2	100.0
Raw chi-square = 5.34439 with 6 df		Sig. = .5005				
Missing observations = 25						

Subject area taught.--Table 12 presents a tabulation of membership on the needs-assessment committee in terms of the two major subject areas taught; again, no systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Table 12.--Membership on needs-assessment committee and subject area taught.

Subject Area		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Science	Count	7	10	4	2	23
	Row %	30.4	43.5	17.4	8.7	24.0
	Col. %	21.2	39.4	25.0	15.4	
Humanities		26	24	12	11	73
		35.6	32.9	16.4	15.1	76.0
		78.8	70.6	75.0	84.6	
Column total		N	34	16	13	96
		%	34.4	35.4	13.5	100.0
Raw chi-square = 1.22569 with 3 df			Sig. = .7468			
Missing observations = 65						

Highest degree held.--Table 13 presents a tabulation of membership on the needs-assessment committee in terms of the highest degree held by the respondents. The results of a chi-square analysis suggested a highly significant relationship between these two variables: Subjects who had only a B.A. degree tended not to know of the committee's existence or had never been a member, whereas those respondents who had an M.A. degree plus credit hours tended either to be current or past members of such a committee.

Type of teaching certificate held.--Table 14 presents a tabulation of membership on the needs-assessment committee in terms of the type of teaching certificate held; again, no systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Table 13.--Membership on needs-assessment committee and highest degree held.

Degree Held		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	15	13	4	6	38
	Row %	39.5	34.2	10.5	15.8	28.1
	Col. %	40.5	25.5	16.7	26.1	
M.A., M.S.	Count	20	34	17	9	80
	Row %	25.0	42.5	21.2	11.2	59.3
	Col. %	54.1	66.7	70.8	39.1	
M.A., M.S. +	Count	2	4	3	8	17
	Row %	11.8	23.5	17.6	47.1	12.6
	Col. %	5.4	7.8	12.5	34.8	
Column total		N	37	51	24	135
		%	27.4	37.8	17.8	100.0
Raw chi-square = 17.48682 with 6 df			Sig. = .0077			
Missing observations = 26						

Table 14.--Membership on needs-assessment committee and type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Provisional	Count	5	4	1	0	10
	Row %	50.0	40.0	10.0	0	7.3
	Col. %	13.5	7.5	4.2	0	
Permanent	Count	19	35	15	15	84
	Row %	22.6	41.7	17.9	17.9	61.3
	Col. %	51.4	66.0	62.5	65.2	
Continuing	Count	13	14	8	8	43
	Row %	30.2	32.6	18.6	18.6	31.4
	Col. %	35.1	26.4	33.3	34.8	
Column total		N	37	53	24	137
		%	27.0	38.7	17.5	100.0
Raw chi-square = 5.51442 with 6 df			Sig. = .4797			
Missing observations = 24						

Sex of respondent.--Table 15 presents the tabulation of membership on the needs-assessment committee in terms of sex of the respondents. Although the data suggested a higher degree of involvement of the female than the male respondents, no statistically significant relationship existed.

Table 15.--Membership on needs-assessment committee and sex of respondent.

Sex		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Female	Count	21	29	18	15	83
	Row %	25.3	34.9	21.7	18.1	61.5
	Col. %	58.3	54.7	75.0	68.2	
Male	Count	15	24	6	7	52
	Row %	28.8	46.2	11.5	13.5	38.5
	Col. %	41.7	45.3	25.0	31.8	
Column total	N	36	53	24	22	135
	%	26.7	39.3	17.8	16.3	100.0

Raw chi-square = 3.44386 with 3 df Sig. = .3281
Missing observations = 26

Years of teaching experience.--Table 16 presents a tabulation of mean number of years of teaching experience by membership on the needs-assessment committee. Although, overall, the respondents averaged 14 years of teaching experience, those who did not answer the question regarding membership averaged 17 years of experience, and those who thought there was no such committee averaged 13 years. Those who had never been a member had, on the average, 14 years of teaching experience, and those with current or past membership, 13 to 14 years.

However, there was no statistically significant difference between these groups.

Table 16.--Membership on needs-assessment committee and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
16.667	7.069	24	No answer
12.750	6.322	36	No committee
14.453	7.412	53	Never a member
13.333	6.690	24	Former member
13.818	6.223	22	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	4	245.85	61.46	1.306	.270
Within groups	154	7247.82	47.06		
Total	158	7493.67			

Reasons for Noninvolvement in Needs Assessment

Table 9 presented the simply frequency distribution of the respondents in terms of the reasons they gave for not being involved in the needs-assessment process. In the following tables, the same data are presented in such a way as to determine whether there was a relationship between membership on this committee and various professional and personal characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 17 presents a tabulation of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process in terms of the school level taught. No systematic relationship between the two variables was found.

Table 17.--Reasons for noninvolvement and school level taught.

School Level		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	Other	No Interest	Row Total
Elementary	Count	6	12	4	3	1	26
	Row %	23.1	46.2	15.4	11.5	3.8	33.8
	Col. %	28.6	37.5	33.3	50.0	16.7	
Junior H.S.		7	9	6	2	1	25
		28.0	36.0	24.0	8.0	4.0	32.5
		33.3	28.1	50.0	33.3	16.7	
Senior H.S.		8	11	2	1	4	26
		30.8	42.3	7.7	3.8	15.4	33.8
		38.1	34.4	16.7	16.7	66.7	
Column total	N	21	32	12	6	6	77
	%	27.3	41.6	15.6	7.8	7.8	100.0
Raw chi-square = 6.68021 with 8 df				Sig. = .5715			
Missing observations = 84							

Subject area taught.--Table 8 presents the tabulation of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process in terms of the subject area taught, i.e., science or humanities. Among those teaching humanities, some respondents indicated such reasons as "No Interest" and "Illness" for their noninvolvement, in addition to those also offered by the science teachers.

Table 18.--Reasons for noninvolvement and subject area taught.

Subject Area		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	Other	No Interest	Row Total
Science	Count	7	5	4	0	0	16
	Row %	43.8	31.3	25.0	0	0	28.6
	Col.%	53.8	21.7	40.0	0	0	
Humanities		6	18	6	6	4	40
		15.0	45.0	15.0	15.0	10.0	71.4
		46.2	78.3	60.0	100.0	100.0	
Column total		N	23	10	6	4	56
		%	23.2	41.1	10.7	7.1	100.0
Raw chi-square = 9.23532 with 4 df				Sig. = .0555			
Missing observations = 105							

Highest degree held.--Table 19 presents the tabulation of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process in terms of the highest degree held. No systematic relationship was observed.

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 20 presents the tabulation of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. A systematic relationship was found: Among the respondents holding a provisional teaching certificate, "No Time" was the most frequently given reason; among those with a permanent certificate, the reason was "No Time" and "Not Invited," whereas among those with a continuing certificate, it was "No Time" and "Don't Know."

Table 19.--Reasons for noninvolvement and highest degree held.

Degree Held		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	Other	No Interest	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	4	13	5	0	0	22
	Row %	18.2	59.1	22.7	0	0	29.3
	Col. %	20.0	41.9	41.7	0	0	
M.A., M.S.	Count	12	13	7	5	5	42
	Row %	28.6	31.0	16.7	11.9	11.9	56.0
	Col. %	60.0	41.9	58.3	83.3	83.3	
M.A., M.S. +	Count	4	5	0	1	1	11
	Row %	36.4	45.5	0	9.1	9.1	14.7
	Col. %	20.0	16.1	0	16.7	16.7	
Column total		N	20	31	12	6	75
		%	26.7	41.3	16.0	8.0	100.0
Raw chi-square = 11.40518 with 8 df				Sig. = .1798			
Missing observations = 86							

Table 20.--Reasons for noninvolvement and teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	Other	No Interest	Row Total
Provisional	Count	0	5	0	0	2	7
	Row %	0	71.4	0	0	28.6	9.1
	Col. %	15.6	0	0	33.3		
Permanent	Count	16	19	3	3	3	44
	Row %	36.4	43.2	6.8	6.8	6.8	57.1
	Col. %	76.2	59.4	25.0	50.0	50.0	
Continuing	Count	5	8	9	3	1	26
	Row %	19.2	30.8	34.6	11.5	3.8	33.8
	Col. %	23.8	25.0	75.0	50.0	16.7	
Column total		N	21	32	12	6	77
		%	27.3	41.6	15.6	7.8	100.0
Raw chi-square = 20.94010 with 8 df				Sig. = .0073			
Missing observations = 84							

Sex of respondent.--Table 21 presents the tabulation of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process in terms of the sex of the respondents. A systematic relationship was observed: "No Time" dominated as a reason among the female respondents, whereas "Not Invited" dominated among the male respondents.

Table 21.--Reasons for noninvolvement and sex of respondent.

Sex		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	Other	No Interest	Row Total
Female	Count	9	25	9	1	2	46
	Row %	19.6	54.3	19.6	2.2	4.3	60.5
	Col.%	45.0	78.1	75.0	16.7	33.3	
Male	Count	11	7	3	5	4	30
	Row %	36.7	23.3	10.0	16.7	13.3	39.5
	Col.%	55.0	21.9	25.0	83.3	66.7	
Column total		N	20	32	12	6	76
		%	26.3	42.1	15.8	7.9	100.0
Raw chi-square = 13.90626 with 4 df				Sig. = .0076			
Missing observations = 85							

Years of teaching experience.--Table 22 presents the tabulation of the number of years of teaching experience in terms of reasons given for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process. No systematic relationship was observed. Yet it is notable that those who gave no reason for noninvolvement corresponded to the overall mean in terms of number of years of experience, whereas those who said they were "Not Invited" had the highest number of years of experience, and those who

"Didn't Know" about the process had the lowest mean number of years of experience.

Table 22.--Reasons for noninvolvement and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
14.361	6.740	83	No answer
16.810	8.412	21	Not invited
13.129	6.732	31	No time
11.167	4.509	12	Didn't know
14.000	6.633	6	Other
13.167	7.111	6	No interest

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	5	297.29	59.46	1.264	.282
Within groups	153	7196.38	47.04		
Total	158	7493.67			

Intention to Continue Involvement in the Needs-Assessment Process

Table 10 presented the simple frequency distribution of the respondents in terms of their intention to continue in the needs-assessment process. In the following tables, the same data are presented in such a way as to determine whether there was a relationship between membership on this committee and various professional and personal characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 23 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process by school level taught. As may be noted, no systematic relationship was observed.

Table 23.--Intention to continue involvement and school level taught.

School Level		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Elementary	Count	16	3	5	24
	Row %	66.7	12.5	20.8	42.1
	Col. %	39.0	42.9	55.6	
Junior H.S.		9	0	1	10
		90.0	0	10.0	17.5
		22.0	0	11.1	
Senior H.S.		16	4	3	23
		69.6	17.4	13.0	40.4
		39.0	57.1	33.3	
Column total	N	41	7	9	57
	%	71.9	12.3	15.8	100.0
Raw chi-square = 2.99125 with 4 df			Sig. = .5593		
Missing observations = 104					

Subject area taught.--Table 24 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process by major subject area taught. As may be noted, no systematic relationship existed.

Highest degree held.--Table 25 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process by highest degree held. As the data in the table suggest, no systematic relationship existed.

Table 24.--Intention to continue involvement and subject area taught.

Subject Area		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Science	Count	5	1	1	7
	Row %	71.4	14.3	14.3	20.0
	Col. %	18.5	25.0	25.0	
Humanities		22	3	3	28
		78.6	10.7	10.7	80.0
		81.5	75.0	75.0	
Column total	N	27	4	4	35
	%	77.1	11.4	11.4	100.0
Raw chi-square = .16204 with 2 df			Sig. = .9222		
Missing observations = 126					

Table 25.--Intention to continue involvement and highest degree held.

Degree Held		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	8	0	3	11
	Row %	72.7	0	27.3	19.0
	Col. %	19.5	0	30.0	
M.A., M.S.		24	5	6	35
		68.6	14.3	17.1	60.3
		58.5	71.4	60.0	
M.A., M.S. +		9	2	1	12
		75.0	16.7	8.3	20.7
		22.0	28.6	10.0	
Column total	N	41	7	10	58
	%	70.7	12.1	17.2	100.0
Raw chi-square = 2.93499 with 4 df			Sig. = .5688		
Missing observations = 103					

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 26 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process by teaching certificate. Although no systematic relationship was observed, it is noteworthy that among the respondents with provisional teaching certificates, no one even responded to the question about continuation of involvement.

Table 26.--Intention to continue involvement and teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Permanent	Count	29	4	6	39
	Row %	74.4	10.3	15.4	67.2
	Col. %	70.7	57.1	60.0	
Continuing		12	3	4	19
		63.2	15.8	21.1	32.8
		29.3	42.9	40.0	
Column total		N	7	10	58
		%	12.1	17.2	100.0
Raw chi-square = .78889 with 2 df			Sig. = .6741		
Missing observations = 103					

Sex of respondent.--Table 27 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process by sex of respondents. No systematic relationship was observed.

Years of teaching experience.--Table 28 presents a breakdown of the number of years of teaching experience in terms of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the needs-assessment process. Although the respondents who indicated "No Time" had the

Table 27.--Intention to continue involvement and sex of respondent.

Sex		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Female	Count	21	5	6	32
	Row %	65.6	15.6	18.8	56.1
	Col. %	51.2	71.4	66.7	
Male		20	2	3	25
		80.0	8.0	12.0	43.9
		48.8	28.6	33.3	
Column total	N	41	7	9	57
	%	71.9	12.3	15.8	100.0

Raw chi-square = 1.47267 with 2 df Sig. = .4789
 Missing observations = 104

Table 28.--Intention to continue involvement and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
13.971	7.007	102	No answer
14.683	6.362	41	Yes
11.571	5.682	7	Maybe
15.667	8.944	9	No time

Total cases = 161
 Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	3	82.17	27.39	.573	.634
Within groups	155	7411.50	47.82		
Total	158	7493.67			

highest average number of years of experience and those indicating "Maybe" the lowest, the overall difference between the various groups was not statistically significant.

Teachers' Involvement in the Planning Process

Four questions in the questionnaire addressed the teachers' involvement in the planning process:

11. In case there are such, or similar committees, are you a member of the following: planning (partial item)
16. In which of the following planning processes have you ever been involved?
 1. Identifying the content of teacher professional development.
 2. Suggesting programs for professional development.
 3. Suggesting speakers or presenters for professional development.
 4. Writing mini grant proposals for projects of your own design.
 5. Defining desired outcomes of in-service programs.
 6. Developing evaluation procedures for programs sponsored by Kent County PSDC.
17. If you indicated in the above list that you have not been involved, what has kept you from being involved?
18. If you indicated any involvement above, do you hope to continue to be involved?

Simple Frequency Distributions

Initially, simply frequency distributions of the responses to each of these four questions are presented.

Membership on planning committee.--As may be noted from Table 29, one-fourth of those who responded to the question about membership on a planning committee stated that no such committee

existed. One-third of the respondents indicated that they had never been a member, and 13% did not respond. Of all the respondents, 36% either had been or currently were members of the planning committee.

Table 29.--Membership on planning committee.

Membership	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
No committee	34	21.1	24.3
Never a member	47	29.2	33.6
Former member	20	12.4	14.3
Current member	39	24.2	27.9
No response	21	13.0	..
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Participation in planning.--Table 30 presents the kinds of planning activities in which respondents participated. Interestingly enough, although only 59 respondents indicated in Table 29 a past or present membership, 66 respondents mentioned "Suggest Programs" as a form of participation on the planning committee.

Table 30.--Participation in particular planning activities.

Topic	Yes	
	N	%
Identify content	46	28.6
Suggest programs	66	41.0
Suggest speakers	56	34.8
Write mini-grants	15	9.3
Define objectives	23	14.3
Evaluate programs	10	6.2

Number of planning activities.--Table 31 presents the total number of different planning activities mentioned by the respondents. Nearly half of the respondents, some 44.7%, indicated they had not been involved in any activity. An approximately equal number mentioned one, two, or three activities; considerably fewer mentioned four or five activities, and only one respondent indicated six activities.

Table 31.--Total number of planning activities in which respondents participated.

Number of Activities	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
0	72	44.7	44.7
1	23	14.3	14.3
2	28	17.4	17.4
3	25	15.5	15.5
4	4	2.5	2.5
5	8	5.0	5.0
6	1	.6	.6
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Reasons for noninvolvement with planning.--Asked about their reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process, some 70% of the participants did not respond, as may be noted in Table 32. Of those who did answer, nearly half indicated "No Time," one-fourth were "Not Invited," and the rest either did not know or had no interest.

Intention to continue involvement in planning.--Table 33 presents the answers to the question about intention to continue involvement in the planning process. Slightly more than half of the study participants did not respond at all. Of those who did answer,

82% said "Yes," they intended to continue their involvement in the planning process.

Table 32.--Reasons for noninvolvement with planning.

Reason	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Not invited	13	8.1	26.5
No time	23	14.3	46.9
Didn't know	6	3.7	12.2
No interest	7	4.3	14.3
No response	<u>112</u>	<u>69.6</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Table 33.--Intention to continue involvement in the planning process.

Intention	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Yes	64	39.8	82.1
Maybe	7	4.3	9.0
No time	7	4.3	9.0
No response	<u>83</u>	<u>51.6</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Membership on the Planning Committee

Whereas Table 29 presented the simply frequency distribution of the respondents in terms of membership on the planning committee, the following tables present the same information in terms of the educational and personal characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 34 presents the tabulation of membership on the planning committee in terms of the school level taught. No systematic relationship was observed.

Table 34.--Membership on planning committee and school level taught.

School Level		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Elementary	Count	17	17	9	13	56
	Row %	30.4	30.4	16.1	23.2	40.3
	Col. %	50.0	36.2	45.0	34.2	
Junior H.S.		9	10	3	7	29
		31.0	34.5	10.3	24.1	20.9
		26.5	21.3	15.0	18.4	
Senior H.S.		8	20	8	18	54
		14.8	37.0	14.8	33.3	38.8
		23.5	42.6	40.0	47.4	
Column total	N	34	47	20	38	139
	%	24.5	33.8	14.4	27.3	100.0
Raw chi-square = 5.34360 with 6 df			Sig. = .5006			
Missing observations = 22						

Subject area taught.--Table 35 presents the tabulation of membership on the planning committee in terms of the subject area taught. As the data suggest, no systematic relationship existed.

Highest degree held.--Table 36 presents the tabulation of membership on the planning committee in terms of the highest degree held. Again, no systematic relationship was observed.

Table 35.--Membership on planning committee and subject area taught.

Subject Area		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Science	Count	7	8	4	5	24
	Row %	29.2	33.3	16.7	20.8	24.2
	Col. %	23.3	26.7	30.8	19.2	
Humanities		23	22	9	21	75
		30.7	29.3	12.0	28.0	75.8
		76.7	73.3	69.2	80.8	
Column total		N	30	30	13	26
		%	30.3	30.3	13.1	26.3
						100.0
Raw chi-square = .76662 with 3 df			Sig. = .8574			
Missing observations = 62						

Table 36.--Membership on planning committee and highest degree held.

Degree Held		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	13	12	3	10	38
	Row %	34.2	31.6	7.9	26.3	27.5
	Col. %	38.2	26.7	15.0	25.6	
M.A., M.S.		18	29	13	20	80
		22.5	36.2	16.2	25.0	58.0
		52.9	64.4	65.0	51.3	
M.A., M.S. +		3	4	4	9	20
		15.0	20.0	20.0	45.0	14.5
		8.8	8.9	20.0	23.1	
Column total		N	34	45	20	39
		%	24.6	32.6	14.5	28.3
						100.0
Raw chi-square = 7.69379 with 6 df			Sig. = .2614			
Missing observations = 23						

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 37 presents the tabulation of membership on the planning committee in terms of the type of teaching certificate held by the respondents. The data suggested no systematic relationship.

Table 37.--Membership on planning committee and type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Provisional	Count	4	3	0	3	10
	Row %	40.0	30.0	0	30.0	7.1
	Col. %	11.8	6.4	0	7.7	
Permanent		18	31	15	24	88
		20.5	35.2	17.0	27.3	62.9
		52.9	66.0	75.0	61.5	
Continuing		12	13	5	12	42
		38.6	31.0	11.9	28.6	30.0
		35.3	27.7	25.0	30.8	
Column total	N	34	47	20	39	140
	%	24.3	33.6	14.3	27.9	100.0
Raw chi-square = 4.16135 with 6 df			Sig. = .6549			
Missing observations = 21						

Sex of respondents.--Table 38 presents the tabulation of membership on the planning committee in terms of the sex of the respondents. No systematic relationship was found.

Table 38.--Membership on planning committee and sex of respondent.

Sex		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Female	Count	19	29	10	23	81
	Row %	23.5	35.8	12.3	28.4	58.7
	Col. %	57.6	61.7	50.0	60.5	
Male		14	18	10	15	57
		24.6	31.6	17.5	26.3	41.3
		42.4	38.3	50.0	39.5	
Column total	N	33	47	20	38	138
	%	23.9	34.1	14.5	27.5	100.0

Raw chi-square = .86861 with 3 df Sig. = .8330
Missing observations = 23

Years of teaching experience.--Table 39 presents a breakdown of the number of years of teaching experience by membership on the planning committee. Respondents who were former members of the committee had the highest average number of years of teaching experience, whereas those who said there was no such committee had the lowest number of years of experience, closely followed by those who were current members. However, no statistically significant difference was observed.

Degree of Involvement in the Planning Progress

In Table 31, the number of different planning-committee activities in which the respondents had participated was presented. This number was considered an index of the degree of involvement in planning and was broken down by various educational and personal characteristics of the respondents.

Table 39.--Membership on planning committee and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
15.810	6.562	21	No answer
12.333	6.293	33	No committee
14.191	7.383	47	Never a member
16.050	7.783	20	Former member
13.737	6.285	38	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	4	245.51	61.38	1.304	.271
Within groups	154	7248.17	47.07		
Total	158	7493.67			

School level taught.--Table 40 shows a breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement in planning in terms of the school level taught. The lowest degree of involvement was shown by the elementary-school teachers; however, no statistically significant difference was found.

Subject area taught.--Table 41 presents a breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement with planning in terms of the subject area taught. No significant difference was found.

Table 40.--Degree of involvement with planning and school level taught.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label		
1.350	1.522	160	Total population		
1.060	1.324	67	Elementary		
1.529	1.522	34	Junior, Middle		
1.576	1.694	59	Senior		
Total cases = 161					
Missing cases = 1 or .6%					
Analysis of Variance:					
<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	2	9.76	4.88	2.137	.121
Within groups	157	358.64	2.28		
Total	159	368.40			

Table 41.--Degree of involvement with planning and subject area taught.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label		
1.237	1.471	114	Total population		
1.385	1.627	26	Science		
1.193	1.429	88	Humanities		
Total cases = 161					
Missing cases = 47 or 29.2%					
Analysis of Variance:					
<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	1	.74	.74	.338	.562
Within groups	112	243.87	2.18		
Total	113	244.61			

Highest degree held.--Table 42 shows a breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement with planning in terms of the highest degree held. A highly significant difference was found: Respondents with but a B.A. or a B.S. degree were only half as involved as those with a master's degree or more.

Table 42.--Degree of involvement with planning and highest degree held.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.340	1.530	159	Total population
.756	1.171	45	B.A., B.S.
1.554	1.557	92	M.A., M.S.
1.636	1.787	22	M.A., M.S. +

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	21.53	10.77	4.824	.009
Within groups	156	348.13	2.23		
Total	158	369.66			

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 43 presents a breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement with planning in terms of the teaching certificate held. Although no statistically significant difference was observed, respondents with only a provisional teaching certificate indicated considerably less involvement than those with a permanent certificate.

Table 43.--Degree of involvement with planning and type of teaching certificate held.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.342	1.521	161	Total population
.700	.949	10	Provisional
1.431	1.638	102	Permanent
1.286	1.339	49	Continuing

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	5.09	2.55	1.102	.335
Within groups	158	365.12	2.31		
Total	160	370.21			

Sex of respondents.--Table 44 presents a breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement with planning in terms of the sex of the respondents. No significant differences were found.

Years of teaching experience.--Finally, a correlation between the number of years of teaching experience and the degree of involvement in planning activities indicated no relationship:

	Years of Teaching Experience
Involvement in Planning Activities	-.0418 (.159) P = .301

Table 44.--Degree of involvement with planning and sex of respondent.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.358	1.523	159	Total population
1.458	1.555	96	Female
1.206	1.472	63	Male

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	1	2.42	2.42	1.041	.309
Within groups	157	364.15	2.32		
Total	158	366.57			

Reasons for Noninvolvement in the Planning Process

Table 32 presented the simple frequencies of respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process. In the following tables, this information is broken down in terms of various personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 45 presents a tabulation of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process in terms of the school level taught. No systematic relationship was observed.

Subject area taught.--Table 46 presents the tabulation of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process in terms of the subject area taught. No systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Table 45.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and school level taught.

School Level		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	No Interest	Row Total
Elementary	Count	3	10	2	1	16
	Row %	18.8	62.5	12.5	6.3	32.7
	Col. %	23.1	43.5	33.3	14.3	
Junior H.S.	Count	1	3	2	3	9
	Row %	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3	18.4
	Col. %	7.7	13.0	33.3	42.9	
Senior H.S.	Count	9	10	2	3	24
	Row %	37.5	41.7	8.3	12.5	49.0
	Col. %	69.2	43.5	33.3	42.9	
Column total		N	13	23	6	49
		%	26.5	46.9	12.2	100.0

Raw chi-square = 7.67752 with 6 df Sig. = .2627
 Missing observations = 112

Table 46.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and subject area taught.

Subject Area		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	No Interest	Row Total
Science	Count	1	5	2	2	10
	Row %	10.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	30.3
	Col. %	33.3	27.8	40.0	28.6	
Humanities	Count	2	13	3	5	23
	Row %	8.7	56.5	13.0	21.7	69.7
	Col. %	66.7	72.2	60.0	71.4	
Column total		N	3	18	5	33
		%	9.1	54.5	15.2	100.0

Raw chi-square = .29994 with 3 df Sig. = .9600
 Missing observations = 128

Highest degree held.--Table 47 presents the tabulation of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process in terms of the highest degree held. A statistically significant relationship appeared to exist in that lack of time was indicated most frequently among respondents with but a bachelor's degree, whereas no interest was most often cited among those with more advanced degrees.

Table 47.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and highest degree held.

Degree Held		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	No Interest	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	4	13	2	0	19
	Row %	21.1	68.4	10.5	0	39.6
	Col. %	33.3	56.5	33.3	0	
M.A., M.S.		7	8	4	4	23
		30.4	34.8	17.4	17.4	47.9
		58.3	34.8	66.7	57.1	
M.A., M.S. +		1	2	0	3	6
		16.7	33.3	0	50.0	12.5
		8.3	8.7	0	42.9	
Column total		N	23	6	7	48
		%	25.0	12.5	14.6	100.0
Raw chi-square = 12.62357 with 6 df		Sig. = .0494				
Missing observations = 113						

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 48 presents the tabulation of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. No statistically significant relationship was observed.

Table 48.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	No Interest	Row Total
Provisional	Count	0	2	0	0	2
	Row %	0	100.0	0	0	4.1
	Col.%	0	8.7	0	0	
Permanent		8	16	1	5	30
		26.7	53.3	3.3	16.7	61.2
		61.5	69.6	16.7	71.4	
Continuing		5	5	5	2	17
		29.4	29.4	29.4	11.8	34.7
		38.5	21.7	83.3	28.6	
Column total		N	23	6	7	49
		%	26.5	46.9	12.2	100.0

Raw chi-square = 9.92000 with 6 df Sig. = .1281
 Missing observations = 112

Sex of respondents.--Table 49 presents the tabulation of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process in terms of the sex of the respondents. Although not significant, a tendency toward a systematic relationship was suggested by the data, in that lack of time was a somewhat more prominent reason among female respondents, and no interest was more common among male respondents.

Years of teaching experience.--Table 50 presents a breakdown of the number of years of teaching experience in terms of the respondents' reasons for noninvolvement in the planning process. No significant differences were observed.

Table 49.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and sex of respondent.

Sex		Not Invited	No Time	Didn't Know	No Interest	Row Total
Female	Count	6	13	5	1	25
	Row %	24.0	52.0	20.0	4.0	52.1
	Col. %	50.0	56.5	83.3	14.3	
Male	Count	6	10	1	6	23
	Row %	26.1	43.5	4.3	26.1	47.9
	Col. %	50.0	43.5	16.7	85.7	
Column total	N	12	23	6	7	48
	%	25.0	47.9	12.5	14.6	100.0

Raw chi-square = 6.55745 with 3 df Sig. = .0874
Missing observations = 113

Table 50.--Reasons for noninvolvement in planning and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
13.468	6.211	111	No answer
16.231	9.765	13	Not invited
16.000	8.089	22	No time
12.333	5.164	6	Didn't know
16.714	7.631	7	No interest

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	4	248.96	62.24	1.323	.264
Within groups	154	7244.71	47.04		
Total	158	7493.67			

Intention to Continue Involvement
in the Planning Process

Table 33 presented the simple frequencies of the responses to the question concerning respondents' future involvement in the planning process. In the following tables, these answers are broken down in terms of various personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 51 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process in terms of the school level taught. No significant relationship was observed.

Table 51.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and school level taught.

School Level		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Elementary	Count	23	2	3	28
	Row %	82.1	7.1	10.7	35.9
	Col. %	35.9	28.6	42.9	
Junior H.S.	Count	17	3	2	22
	Row %	77.3	13.6	9.1	28.2
	Col. %	26.6	42.9	28.6	
Senior H.S.	Count	24	2	2	28
	Row %	85.7	7.1	7.1	35.9
	Col. %	37.5	28.6	28.6	
Column total	N	64	7	7	78
	%	82.1	9.0	9.0	100.0
Raw chi-square = 1.04860 with 4 df			Sig. = .9023		
Missing observations = 83					

Subject area taught.--Table 52 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process in terms of the subject area taught. No statistically significant relationship appeared to exist.

Table 52.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and subject area taught.

Subject Area		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Science	Count	12	2	2	16
	Row %	75.0	12.5	12.5	29.1
	Col. %	26.1	33.3	66.7	
Humanities		34	4	1	39
		87.2	10.3	2.6	70.9
		73.9	66.7	33.3	
Column total	N	46	6	3	55
	%	83.6	10.9	5.5	100.0
Raw chi-square = 2.30700 with 2 df			Sig. = .3155		
Missing observations = 106					

Highest degree held.--Table 53 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process in terms of the highest degree held. Although it is not significant, a tendency toward a systematic relationship may be noted from this table.

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 54 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. No systematic relationship was observed.

Table 53.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and highest degree held.

Degree Held		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	11	2	2	15
	Row %	73.3	13.3	13.3	19.5
	Col. %	17.2	33.3	28.6	
M.A., M.S.	Count	45	1	4	50
	Row %	90.0	2.0	8.0	64.9
	Col. %	70.3	16.7	57.1	
M.A., M.S. +	Count	8	3	1	12
	Row %	66.7	25.0	8.3	15.6
	Col. %	12.5	50.0	14.3	
Column total	N	64	6	7	77
	%	83.1	7.8	9.1	100.0

Raw chi-square = 8.52233 with 4 df Sig. = .0742
Missing observations = 84

Table 54.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Provisional	Count	4	0	0	4
	Row %	100.0	0	0	5.1
	Col. %	6.3	0	0	
Permanent	Count	41	6	4	51
	Row %	80.4	11.8	7.8	65.4
	Col. %	64.1	85.7	57.1	
Continuing	Count	19	1	3	23
	Row %	82.6	4.3	13.0	29.5
	Col. %	29.7	14.3	42.9	
Column total	N	64	7	7	78
	%	82.1	9.0	9.0	100.0

Raw chi-square = 2.38110 with 4 df Sig. = .6660
Missing observations = 83

Sex of respondents.--Table 55 presents the tabulation of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process in terms of the sex of the respondents. No systematic relationship was observed.

Table 55.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and sex of respondent.

Sex		Yes	Maybe	No Time	Row Total
Female	Count	39	4	4	47
	Row %	83.0	8.5	8.5	60.3
	Col. %	60.9	57.1	57.1	
Male	Count	25	3	3	31
	Row %	80.6	9.7	9.7	39.7
	Col. %	39.1	42.9	42.9	
Column total	N	64	7	7	78
	%	82.1	9.0	9.0	100.0
Raw chi-square = .06907 with 2 df			Sig. = .9661		
Missing observations = 83					

Years of teaching experience.--Table 56 presents the breakdown of number of years of teaching experience in terms of the respondents' intention to continue their involvement in the planning process. No significant difference was found between respondents who said they would and those who said they would not continue their involvement in planning.

Table 56.--Intention to continue involvement in planning and years of experience teaching.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
13.852	6.876	81	No answer
14.641	7.284	64	Yes
14.000	4.397	7	Maybe
13.143	6.094	7	No time

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	3	29.86	9.45	.207	.892
Within groups	155	7463.81	48.15		
Total	158	7493.67			

Teachers' Involvement in Implementation of Programs

Two questions in the questionnaire addressed the teachers' involvement in the implementation of programs:

11. In the case there are such, or similar, committees, are you a member of any of the following: implementation (partial item)
19. Considering the scale below, would you characterize your involvement in the implementation of the activities of Kent PSDC more as actively involved (1) or as not involved at all (5)?

Simple Frequency Distributions

Initially, simple frequency distributions of the responses to each of these two questions are presented.

Membership on the implementation committee.--Table 57 presents the responses to the question concerning membership on the implementation committee. Nearly 20% of the respondents did not answer this question at all; of the remainder, 30% indicated that there was no such committee, and another 40% said that they had never been a member. Only about one-fourth of the total number of respondents either had been or currently were members of the implementation committee.

Table 57.--Membership on implementation committee.

Membership	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
No committee	38	23.6	29.5
Never a member	52	32.3	40.3
Former member	14	8.7	10.9
Current member	25	15.5	19.4
No response	<u>32</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Degree of involvement in implementation.--Table 58 presents the responses to an attitude scale concerning involvement in implementation. Some 85% of the total sample responded to this question, half of whom indicated "no involvement." The mean degree of involvement in implementation was 4.02, between "more or less" (value 3) and "not involved" (value 5).

Table 58.--Degree of involvement in implementation.

Involvement	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
Actively involved (1)	7	4.3	5.1
	13	8.1	9.5
More or less (3)	20	12.4	14.6
	28	17.4	20.4
Not involved (5)	69	42.9	50.4
No response	24	14.9	..
Total	161	100.0	100.0
Mean	4.015	Std. Err.	.105
Mode	5.000	Std. Dev.	1.225
		Median	4.507
		Variance	1.500

Membership on Implementation Committee

Table 57 presented the simple frequency distribution of membership on the implementation committee. In the following tables, these responses are broken down in terms of personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 59 presents the tabulation of membership on the implementation committee in terms of the school level taught. A significant relationship may be observed: Among the junior-high-school teachers were the fewest former or present members, followed by the elementary-school teachers, whereas among the senior-high-school teachers there was the largest proportion of former and present members.

Table 59.--Membership on implementation committee and school level taught.

School Level		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Elementary	Count	20	16	10	7	53
	Row %	37.7	30.2	18.9	13.2	41.4
	Col. %	52.6	30.8	71.4	29.2	
Junior H.S.		10	12	0	4	26
		38.5	46.2	0	15.4	20.3
		26.3	23.1	0	16.7	
Senior H.S.		8	24	4	13	49
		16.3	49.0	8.2	26.5	38.3
		21.1	46.2	28.6	54.2	
Column total	N	38	52	14	24	128
	%	29.7	40.6	10.9	18.8	100.0
Raw chi-square = 16.07907 with 6 df			Sig. = .0133			
Missing observations = 33						

Subject area taught.--Table 60 presents the tabulation of membership on the implementation committee in terms of the subject area taught. No systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Highest degree held.--Table 61 presents the tabulation of membership on the implementation committee in terms of the highest degree held. Although it is not significant, a tendency toward a systematic relationship may be observed in the sense that with a higher degree or more education, a higher proportion of the respondents were current or former members of the committee.

Table 60.--Membership on implementation committee and subject area taught.

Subject Area		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Science	Count	7	10	2	4	23
	Row %	30.4	43.5	8.7	17.4	25.3
	Col. %	20.6	30.3	22.2	26.7	
Humanities		27	23	7	11	68
		39.7	33.8	10.3	16.2	74.7
		79.4	69.7	77.8	73.3	
Column total	N	34	33	9	15	91
	%	37.4	36.3	9.9	16.5	100.0
Raw chi-square = .89695 with 3 df			Sig. = .8262			
Missing observations = 70						

Table 61.--Membership on implementation committee and highest degree held.

Degree Held		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
B.A., B.S.	Count	16	12	3	3	34
	Row %	47.1	35.3	8.8	8.8	26.8
	Col. %	42.1	24.0	21.4	12.0	
M.A., M.S.		19	33	9	15	76
		25.0	43.4	11.8	19.7	59.8
		50.0	66.0	64.3	60.0	
M.A., M.S. +		3	5	2	7	17
		17.6	29.4	11.8	41.2	13.4
		7.9	10.0	14.3	28.0	
Column total	N	38	50	14	25	127
	%	29.9	39.4	11.0	19.7	100.0
Raw chi-square = 11.92738 with 6 df			Sig. = .0636			
Missing observations = 34						

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 62 presents the tabulation of membership on the implementation committee in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. No systematic relationship was observed.

Table 62.--Membership on implementation committee and type of teaching certificate.

Type of Certificate		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Provisional	Count	5	3	1	1	10
	Row %	50.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	7.8
	Col. %	13.2	5.8	7.1	4.0	
Permanent	Count	20	34	8	15	77
	Row %	26.0	44.2	10.4	19.5	59.7
	Col. %	52.6	65.4	57.1	60.0	
Continuing	Count	13	15	5	9	42
	Row %	31.0	35.7	11.9	21.4	32.6
	Col. %	34.2	28.8	35.7	36.0	
Column total	N	38	52	14	25	129
	%	29.5	40.3	10.9	19.4	100.0

Raw chi-square = 3.15800 with 6 df Sig. = .7888
Missing observations = 32

Sex of respondent.--Table 63 presents the tabulation of membership on the implementation committee in terms of the sex of the respondents. No systematic relationship appeared to exist.

Years of teaching experience.--Table 64 presents the breakdown of years of teaching experience in terms of membership on the implementation committee. No statistically significant differences between the various membership groups were found. However, it may be observed that those who did not answer this question had notably more years of

Table 63.--Membership on implementation committee and sex of respondent.

Sex		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	Row Total
Female	Count	22	29	9	14	74
	Row %	29.7	39.2	12.2	18.9	58.3
	Col. %	59.5	55.8	64.3	58.3	
Male		15	23	5	10	53
		28.3	43.4	9.4	18.9	41.7
		40.5	44.2	35.7	41.7	
Column total	N	37	52	14	24	127
	%	29.1	40.9	11.0	18.9	100.0

Raw chi-square = .36366 with 3 df Sig. = .9476
Missing observations = 34

Table 6.--Membership on implementation committee and years of teaching experience.

Mean Years	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
14.145	6.887	159	Total population
16.469	6.686	32	No answer
12.027	6.103	37	No committee
14.635	7.499	52	Never a member
13.929	8.213	14	Former member
13.375	5.339	24	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	4	366.12	91.53	1.978	.101
Within groups	154	7127.55	46.28		
Total	158	7493.67			

teaching experience that the mean, with present or former members of the committee having fewer years of experience than the group mean.

Degree of Involvement
in Implementation

Table 58 presented a simple breakdown of the respondents' degree of involvement in the implementation process. The following tables present these data in terms of personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 65 presents a breakdown of the participants' degree of involvement in the implementation process in terms of the school level taught. No significant difference between the groups was observed.

Table 65.--Degree of involvement in implementation and school level taught.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
4.029	1.217	136	Total population
4.019	1.157	54	Elementary
4.281	1.198	32	Junior H.S.
3.880	1.288	50	Senior H.S.

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 25 or 15.5%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	3.15	1.58	1.066	.347
Within groups	133	196.73	1.48		
Total	135	199.88			

Subject area taught.--Table 66 presents a breakdown of the participants' degree of involvement in the implementation process in terms of the subject area taught. No systematic difference appeared to exist.

Table 66.--Degree of involvement in implementation and subject area taught.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
4.158	1.123	95	Total population
4.227	1.232	22	Science
4.137	1.097	73	Humanities

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 66 or 41.0%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	1	.14	.14	.108	.743
Within groups	93	118.49	1.27		
Total	94	118.63			

Highest degree held.--Table 67 presents a breakdown of the participants' degree of involvement in the implementation process in terms of the highest degree held. A significant difference was found between the three groups in that subjects with more education had increasingly more involvement in the implementation process.

Table 67.--Degree of involvement in implementation and highest degree held.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label		
4.007	1.226	136	Total population		
4.378	1.037	37	B.A., B.S.		
3.950	1.200	80	M.A., M.S.		
3.526	1.504	19	M.A., M.S. +		
Total cases = 161					
Missing cases = 25 or 15.5%					
Analysis of Variance:					
<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	2	9.75	4.88	3.356	.038
Within groups	133	193.24	1.45		
Total	135	202.99			

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 68 presents a breakdown of the participants' degree of involvement in the implementation process in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. A significant difference was observed: Respondents with a permanent certificate were notably more involved in the implementation process than those with either a continuing or, especially, a provisional certificate.

Sex of respondent.--Table 69 presents a breakdown of the participants' degree of involvement in the implementation process in terms of the sex of the respondents. No significant difference was observed.

Table 68.--Degree of involvement in implementation and type of teaching certificate.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
4.015	1.225	137	Total population
4.778	.441	9	Provisional
3.849	1.260	86	Permanent
4.190	1.194	42	Continuing

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 24 or 14.9%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	2	8.90	4.45	3.058	.050
Within groups	134	195.07	1.46		
Total	136	203.97			

Table 69.--Degree of involvement in implementation and sex of respondent.

Mean Degree	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
4.022	1.218	135	Total population
4.025	1.219	79	Female
4.019	1.228	56	Male

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 26 or 16.1%

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	1	.00	.00	.001	.972
Within groups	133	198.93	1.50		
Total	134	198.93			

Years of teaching experience.--Finally, the correlation between the respondents' degree of involvement in implementation and the number of years of teaching experience was not significant:

	Degree of Involvement
Teaching Experience	-.0192 (135) P = .413

Teachers' Involvement in Governance Processes

In the three previous sections, results pertaining to the respondents' involvement in the needs-assessment process, planning process, and implementation process were presented. In this section, the respondents' overall involvement in these three areas and a fourth, policy board, are presented. Only one question in the questionnaire dealt specifically with this topic:

11. In the case there are such, or similar, committees, are you a member of the following:

Needs assessment
Planning
Implementation
Policy board

Membership on Governance Committees

In previous sections, membership on three governance committees was discussed. Table 70 presents a summary of the information presented in Tables 6, 29, and 57, as well as data concerning membership on the policy board of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center. As may be noted from this table, even more respondents were not aware of the existence of a policy board, nor had they ever been

members of such a committee. Only about 15% of the respondents either had been or currently were members of the policy board.

Table 70.--Membership on governance committees.

Membership		No Committee	Never a Member	Former Member	Current Member	No Response	Row Total
Needs Assessment	Total	37	53	24	23	24	161
	Row %	23.0	32.9	14.9	14.3	14.9	
Planning	Total	34	47	20	39	21	161
	Row %	21.1	29.2	12.4	24.2	13.0	
Implemen- tation	Total	38	52	14	25	32	161
	Row %	23.6	32.3	8.7	15.5	19.9	
Policy Board	Total	42	62	5	18	34	161
	Row %	26.1	38.5	3.1	11.2	21.1	

Current membership in governance process.--Table 71 presents the number of different committees (needs assessment, planning, implementation, and/or policy board) of which respondents currently were members. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents were not involved on a single committee, whereas approximately equal numbers were involved in one, two, three, or even all four governance committees.

Past or current membership in governance process.--In contrast with Table 71, Table 72 presents the number of different committees of which respondents had ever been members, either currently or in the past. Even with the inclusion of past membership, more than half of the respondents still appeared never to have been involved in any of the four committees in question.

Table 71.--Number of current committee memberships.

Number of Memberships		Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)	Cumulative Freq. (%)
0		117	72.7	72.7	72.7
1		12	7.5	7.5	80.1
2		13	8.1	8.1	88.2
3		9	5.6	5.6	93.8
4		10	6.2	6.2	100.0
Total		161	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.652	Std. Err.	.096	Median	.188
Mode	0	Std. Dev.	1.216	Variance	1.478

Table 72.--Number of past or present committee memberships.

Number of Memberships		Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)	Cumulative Freq. (%)
0		95	59.0	59.0	59.0
1		17	10.6	10.6	69.6
2		13	8.1	8.1	77.6
3		19	11.8	11.8	89.4
4		<u>17</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>10.6</u>	100.0
Total		161	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.043	Std. Err.	.114	Median	.347
Mode	0	Std. Dev.	1.451	Variance	2.104

Number of Past or Present
Committee Memberships

In the following tables, the number of past and present committee memberships are presented in such a way as to determine whether there was any relationship between this variable and personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

School level taught.--Table 73 presents a breakdown of the mean number of past and present committee memberships in terms of school level taught. No significant difference was found.

Table 73.--Number of committee memberships and school level taught.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.025	1.436	160	Total population
1.000	1.414	67	Elementary
.765	1.281	34	Junior H.S.
1.203	1.540	59	Senior H.S.

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 1 or .6%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	4.22	2.11	1.024	.361
Within groups	157	323.68	2.06		
Total	159	327.90			

Subject area taught.--Table 74 presents a breakdown of the mean number of past and present committee memberships in terms of subject area taught. No statistically significant difference was found.

Highest degree held.--Table 75 presents a breakdown of the mean number of past and present committee memberships in terms of highest degree held. The following significant difference was found: With increasing education, there was more participation in the various governance committees.

Table 74.--Number of committee memberships and subject area taught.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.043	1.451	161	Total population
1.298	1.573	47	Other
.923	1.440	26	Science
.943	1.384	88	Humanities

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	4.30	2.15	1.023	.362
Within groups	158	332.39	2.10		
Total	160	336.70			

Table 75.--Number of committee memberships and highest degree held.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.057	1.455	159	Total population
.756	1.300	45	B.A., B.S.
1.054	1.455	92	M.A., M.S.
1.682	1.615	22	M.A., M.S. +

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	12.68	6.34	3.073	.049
Within groups	156	321.81	2.06		
Total	158	334.49			

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 76 presents a breakdown of the mean number of past and present committee memberships in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. No statistically significant difference was observed.

Table 76.--Number of committee memberships and type of teaching certificate.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.043	1.451	161	Total population
.600	1.075	10	Provisional
1.039	1.428	102	Permanent
1.143	1.568	49	Continuing

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	2.45	1.23	.580	.561
Within groups	158	334.24	2.12		
Total	160	336.70			

Sex of respondent.--Table 77 presents a breakdown of the mean number of past and present committee memberships in terms of the sex of the respondents. No significant difference was observed.

Years of teaching experience.--As the following correlation index indicates, there was no systematic relationship between the

Table 77.--Number of committee memberships and sex of respondent.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
1.031	1.438	159	Total population
1.094	1.515	96	Female
.937	1.318	63	Male

Total cases = 161

Missing Cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	1	.94	.94	.453	.502
Within groups	157	325.90	2.08		
Total	158	326.84			

number of years of teaching experience and the number of past and present committee memberships.

Years of
Teaching Experience

Past and Present
Membership

-.0330
(159)
P = .340

Participation in KPSDC Activities

The four previous sections dealt with the teachers' involvement in the governance processes of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC), i.e., needs assessment, planning, implementation, and policy board. The following sections deal with the teachers' participation in the activities offered by the Center, as

well as their evaluation of the benefits obtained from such participation. Two questions in the questionnaire, each with several sub-parts, asked about participation in and usefulness of the activities of the Center:

20. During the 1980-81 school year, which of the following activities have you participated in at Kent PSDC:

Workshops
Courses
Study groups
Lectures

For each alternative, respondents were asked (a) how often, (b) helpfulness, and (c) use of what was learned in the classroom.

21. During your participation in the Kent Professional Staff Development Center's activities, have you found the activities you have participated in are related to:

General personal growth
Improving instructional skills
Keeping current about educational matters
Facilitating change and improvement
Helping with one's career
Organizing the classroom

Simple Frequencies

In the following pages, descriptive data for the two questions are presented.

Participation in Kent PSDC activities.--Table 78 presents an overview of the responses to Questionnaire Item 20. Considering participation, it may be noted that the highest degree of participation was in workshops, of which slightly over half of the respondents availed themselves. This was followed by lectures, which about one-third of the respondents attended. Courses and study groups appeared

to have very little appeal to the respondents, with less than 10% indicating participation in either of these two activities.

Table 78.--Participation in KPSCD activities.

Activity	Participation		Helpfulness ^a		Use of Material		
	Yes	No	Mean	N	Yes	No	NA
Workshops	82	79	1.85	92	70	11	80
Courses	10	151	2.33	12	5	2	154
Study groups	5	156	2.67	6	2	2	157
Lectures	52	109	1.99	67	39	14	108

^aScale: 1 = very helpful, 5 = not helpful.

Parallel to the degree of participation, the degree of helpfulness attributed to these four activities was highest for workshops, followed by lectures, courses, and study groups, in that order. It is noteworthy that more people judged the helpfulness of the activities than actually participated in them.

Considering the use of the material presented in the various activities, it may be noted that the proportion of respondents who indicated a use was highest among workshop participants, followed by those who had taken part in lectures, courses, and study groups.

Topics of activities in which teachers participated.--Table 79 presents a tabulation of the topics presented in the various activities offered by the Center. The topics are presented in the order of their importance to the respondents. Topics related to personal growth appeared to be the most relevant, followed by improvement of

instructional skills. Information about career advancement was mentioned by the fewest respondents.

Table 79.--Topics of activities.

Topic	Often (1)	Sometimes (2)	Little (3)	Never (4)	Mean	No Response	Mean ^a
Personal growth	30	65	7	4	1.86	55	1.88
Improve instructional skills	32	51	12	2	1.84	64	1.93
Keep current about education management of classroom	22	40	21	3	2.06	75	2.14
Facilitation of improvement	22	39	18	6	2.09	76	2.16
Career advancement	2	14	22	32	3.20	91	3.22

^aMean for the 58 subjects who checked all six topics.

ANOVA of topics.--Since only 58 subjects checked all six activity topics, Table 80 presents the results of an analysis of variance of repeated measures, comparing the degree of participation in activities with the various topics indicated in Table 79. As may be noted from the results presented in Table 80, a highly significant difference was found in the degree of participation.

Table 80.--Comparison of the relative participation in activities with various topics.

Source of Variation	SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between people	92.566	57	1.624		
Within people	210.500	290	.726		
Between measures	72.670	5	14.534	30.053	.0001
Residual	137.830	285	.484		
Total	303.066	347	.873		

Grand mean = 2.22701

Note: The means compared in this analysis appear in Table 79.

Benefits Received From KPSDC

Two questions sought information regarding the benefits respondents had received from the Kent Professional Staff Development Center.

22. During your participation in the Kent PSDC activities, have you ever requested help or aid with a classroom problem? If yes, please state the problem and the help received.
23. What are some of the benefits that you have derived from the activities or programs offered by Kent PSDC? Please check all appropriate categories.
 - An opportunity
 - a. for personal growth
 - b. to learn from others' experiences and ideas
 - c. to open myself for feedback
 - d. to be updated in my teaching field(s)
 - e. to continue to develop a greater perspective on my profession
 - f. to learn new teaching styles
 - g. to know more about some societal problems
 - h. for better understanding of human growth

Simple Frequencies

In the following discussion and tables, simple frequencies of responses to questions regarding the benefits received from participation in the Kent Professional Staff Development Center are presented.

Ever requested help?--Table 81 presents the number of individuals who had ever requested help from the Center. Some 77% of the respondents explicitly stated "No"; only seven respondents indicated "Yes," giving the topic of their need. Of these seven, five had requested help with classroom discipline.

Table 81.--Ever requested help?

Category	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
No	124	77.0	94.7
Curriculum problem	1	.6	.8
New didactic approach	1	.6	.8
Classroom control	5	3.1	3.8
No response	<u>30</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>..</u>
Total	161	100.0	100.0

Specific benefits derived.--Table 82 presents the number of affirmative responses to Questionnaire Item 23, which asked respondents to check whether particular benefits applied to them. Again, the topics are presented in the order of their importance to respondents (rather than the order in which they appeared in the questionnaire). "Learning from others" was mentioned most often, followed closely by "personal growth" and "new teaching styles," i.e.,

improvement of instructional skills. "Understanding human growth" and "learning about social problems" were mentioned least often.

Table 82.--Benefits derived from KPSDC.

Benefit	Yes	
	N	%
Learn from others	105	65.2
Personal growth	93	57.8
New teaching styles	81	50.3
Updated information	70	43.5
Greater perspective	69	42.9
Open self to feedback	66	41.0
Understand human growth	59	36.6
Learn about social problems	47	29.2

Number of benefits mentioned.--On the basis of the responses presented in Table 82, an index of benefits derived was computed on the basis of the number of benefits mentioned. Table 83 presents a tabulation of the number of benefits checked, as well as the mean number of benefits, namely, 3.7.

Number of Benefits Derived

In the following pages, the data presented in Table 83 are broken down by various personal and professional characteristics.

School level taught.--Table 84 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the school level taught. Although junior-high-school teachers appeared to derive more benefits than did elementary-school or high-school teachers, no statistically significant difference was found.

Table 83.--Number of benefits mentioned.

Number of Benefits	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Adjusted Freq. (%)
0	36	22.4	22.4
1	9	5.6	5.6
2	13	8.1	8.1
3	16	9.9	9.9
4	21	13.0	13.0
5	19	11.8	11.8
6	19	11.8	11.8
7	10	6.2	6.2
8	18	11.2	11.2
Total	161	100.0	100.0
Mean	3.665	Std. Err. .214	Median 3.810
Mode	0	Std. Dev. 2.716	Variance 7.374

Table 84.--Number of benefits derived by school level taught.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.656	2.722	160	Total population
3.567	2.840	67	Elementary
4.500	2.339	34	Junior H.S.
3.271	2.728	59	Senior H.S.

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 1 or .6%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	33.48	16.74	2.296	.104
Within groups	157	1144.61	7.29		
Total	159	1178.09			

Subject area taught.--Table 85 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the subject area taught. No significant difference was observed.

Table 85.--Number of benefits derived by subject area taught.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
4.000	2.458	47	Other
4.192	3.175	26	Science
3.330	2.686	88	Humanities

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	22.41	11.20	1.529	.220
Within groups	158	1157.48	7.33		
Total	160	1179.89			

Highest degree held.--Table 86 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the highest degree held. A significant difference was found: Respondents with a bachelor's degree indicated fewer benefits than respondents with a more advanced education.

Type of teaching certificate.--Table 87 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the type of teaching certificate held. No significant difference was found.

Table 86.--Number of benefits derived by highest degree held.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.667	2.727	159	Total population
2.778	2.439	45	B.A., B.S.
4.011	2.748	92	M.A., M.S.
4.045	2.903	22	M.A., M.S. +

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	49.61	24.81	3.438	.035
Within groups	156	1125.72	7.22		
Total	158	1175.33			

Table 87.--Number of benefits derived by type of teaching certificate.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
3.600	2.951	10	Provisional
3.755	2.802	102	Permanent
3.490	2.526	49	Continuing

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	2	2.37	1.19	.159	.853
Within groups	158	1177.52	7.45		
Total	160	1179.89			

Sex of respondents.--Table 88 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the sex of the respondents. No significant difference was observed.

Table 88.--Mean number of benefits derived by sex of respondent.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.648	2.729	159	Total population
3.583	2.650	96	Female
3.746	2.862	63	Male

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 2 or 1.2%

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	1	1.01	1.01	.135	.714
Within groups	157	1175.27	7.49		
Total	158	1176.28			

Number of years of teaching experience.--Finally, the correlation between the mean number of benefits received and the number of years of teaching experience was not significant.

	Years of Teaching Experience
Mean Number of Benefits	-.0212 (159) p = .395

Number of Benefits Derived and
Involvement in Governance

A final question that needs to be answered is whether the degree of participation in the various governance committees, as reported above, bore any relationship to the number of benefits that respondents indicated they had derived from the teachers' center.

Needs-assessment process.--Table 89 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of the participation in the needs-assessment committee (see Table 6). As may be noted, with increased involvement in the needs-assessment process, respondents reported receiving a significantly higher number of benefits from the teachers' center.

Table 89.--Number of benefits derived by involvement in needs-assessment processes.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
2.125	2.365	24	No answer
2.757	2.618	37	No committee
3.642	2.690	53	Never a member
5.417	2.283	24	Former member
4.957	2.225	23	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	4	199.47	49.87	7.935	.000
Within groups	156	980.41	6.28		
Total	160	1179.89			

Planning committee.--Table 90 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of involvement in the activities of the planning committee. As may be noted, with increased participation, respondents perceived significantly more benefits emanating from the teachers' center.

Table 90.--Number of benefits derived by participation in the planning process.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
2.238	2.791	21	No answer
2.912	2.690	34	No committee
3.468	2.701	47	Never a member
5.350	2.059	20	Former member
4.462	2.426	39	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-Prob.</u>
Between groups	4	145.40	36.35	5.482	.000
Within groups	156	1034.49	6.63		
Total	160	1179.89			

Implementation committee.--Table 91 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of participation in the activities of the implementation committee. As may be noted, with increased participation, a significantly higher number of benefits was reported.

Table 91.--Number of benefits derived by participation in implementation.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
2.656	2.719	32	No answer
2.947	2.760	38	No committee
3.558	2.608	52	Never a member
5.714	1.939	14	Former member
5.120	2.128	25	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	4	164.45	41.11	6.316	.000
Within groups	156	1015.44	6.51		
Total	160	1179.89			

Policy board.--Table 92 presents a breakdown of the mean number of benefits received in terms of membership on the policy board of the teachers' center. Once more, it may be observed that increased involvement in the governance committee was related to a significant increase in the number of perceived benefits.

Membership and benefits.--Table 93 presents correlation coefficients between the mean number of benefits (BENEFT), the number of current memberships on the governance committees (CURMEM), and the number of past and present memberships on governance committees (MEMBER). There was a highly significant correlation between the number of memberships and the number of benefits derived from the

teachers' center activities, although a causal relationship has yet to be established.

Table 92.--Number of benefits derived by participation on policy board.

Mean Number	Std. Dev.	N	Value Label
3.665	2.716	161	Total population
2.853	2.732	34	No answer
3.024	2.664	42	No committee
4.000	2.698	62	Never a member
7.200	1.304	5	Former member
4.556	2.007	18	Current member

Total cases = 161

Missing cases = 0

Analysis of Variance:

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	F-Prob.
Between groups	4	123.40	30.85	4.555	.002
Within groups	156	1056.49	6.77		
Total	160	1179.89			

Table 93.--Committee membership and number of benefits derived.

	BENEFT	CURMEM	MEMBER
BENEFT	1.0000 (0) P = *****	.2143 (161) P = .003	.3734 (161) P = .001
CURMEM	.2143 (161) P = .003	1.0000 (0) P = ****	.7811 (161) P = .001
MEMBER	.3734 (161) P = .001	.7811 (161) P = .001	1.0000 (0) P = ****

Suggestions for More Meaningful
and Useful Programs

The questionnaire concluded with two open-ended questions:

24. Please list any specific comments or recommendations you have regarding ways the Kent PSDC involves teachers in (1) needs assessment, (2) planning programs, and (3) implementing programs.
25. Please identify at least three ways Kent PSDC could provide for more meaningful and useful programs and activities for teachers.

The responses to Question 25 were considerably more numerous than those to Question 24 and are presented on the following pages. Verbatim responses are transcribed in Appendix I. Table 94 presents a tabulation of the frequency of suggestions, grouped in various categories.

Approximately 25% of the suggestions, offered by nearly half of the respondents, dealt with the programming process. A few of the respondents implied that administrators in the schools as well as school districts needed to value the program activities of the Kent Center more. A series of suggestions dealt with the manner in which the local teachers are heard when programs are developed. Parallel to this group of suggestions, comments were made about better needs-assessment procedures and follow-up and evaluation of programs. The majority of the comments and suggestions in this category, however, specifically addressed the need for better publicity, including a series of suggestions about how to reach the teachers better.

Table 94.--Suggestions for the improvement of Kent PSDC programs.

Type of Suggestion	Number of Responses		Number of Respondents	
<u>Programming</u>				
Value programs	3		3	
Input to programming	7		6	
Needs assessment	6		5	
Evaluation	5		4	
Publicity	<u>18</u>		<u>16</u>	
Total	39	24.5%	34	45.9%
<u>Topics</u>				
Specific	12		8	
General	21		18	
Resources	<u>14</u>		<u>12</u>	
Total	47	29.6%	38	51.1%
<u>Location & Audience</u>				
Specific audience	16		15	
Cooperative program	<u>9</u>		<u>8</u>	
Total	25	15.7%	23	31.1%
<u>Scheduling</u>				
Advanced planning	3		3	
After school	11		11	
Released time	8		8	
Academic credit	<u>4</u>		<u>3</u>	
Total	26	16.4%	25	33.8%
<u>Finances</u>	10	6.3%	10	15.5%
<u>Other</u>	<u>10</u>	6.3%	<u>9</u>	12.2%
Total	159		74	

Nearly 30% of the suggestions, presented by more than half of those responding, concerned topics of Center activities. The majority of these suggestions were of a general nature, such as pointing to the need for more applied rather than theoretical workshops. However,

About one-third of those responding commented about the location and audience for Center activities. Of these, about a third called for more cooperative activities that might join faculty members in the same subject area across school-district lines. The majority, though, called for more specific presentations, directed at the "building" level within a given school district and covering problems of that particular school.

An equal number of individuals made suggestions regarding the scheduling of Center activities. These suggestions ranged from basics like "start on time" to such concerns as released time versus after-school activities and the possibility of receiving college or career credit.

A number of respondents mentioned the problem of decreasing funds, while suggesting that the Center do more of what it even now has difficulty doing because of lack of money.

A few respondents simply praised the Center for the work it was doing or criticized the survey as superfluous.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the findings is presented in the first section of this chapter. The two subsequent sections contain the conclusions of the study and recommendations for the Kent Professional Staff Development Center (KPSDC) and for in-service education in Saudi Arabia.

Summary

This study had two major purposes: (1) to examine the extent to which teachers are involved in the four governance processes of the KPSDC, namely (a) needs assessment, (b) planning, (c) implementation, and (d) the policy board; and (2) to examine the teachers' perceptions of ways in which the in-service education provided by the teachers' center affects teachers' classroom instruction. Furthermore, the researcher expected to be able to generate some recommendations regarding teachers' centers and in-service education in Saudi Arabia.

Initially, a review of the literature dealing with in-service education, teachers' centers, and their role in in-service education was conducted. In addition, a survey of members of the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was conducted to gather information about the teachers' involvement in the

activities and offerings of the Center, as well as their perceptions of the benefits derived from such participation.

Summary of the Findings

In this section, the findings of the study are summarized, beginning with the demographic information about the respondents, followed by their involvement in the various governance activities, and concluding with their responses regarding benefits derived from participation in the activities of the Kent PSDC.

Demographic information.--Concerning their professional background, some 42% of the respondents indicated that they taught at an elementary school, 21% at a middle school, and 37% at a senior high school. Most of the respondents taught mathematics, science, social studies, or language arts; fewer taught industrial arts, home economics, music, art, or physical education. The mean number of years of teaching experience was slightly more than 14 years.

In regard to their educational background, some 68% of the respondents held at least an M.A. degree, whereas about 28% held a B.A. or B.S. degree; the remainder held an educational specialist degree. Asked about their teaching certificate, the majority of respondents (63%) indicated that they had a permanent certificate, about 30% had a continuing certificate, and 6% had a provisional certificate.

Concerning the personal characteristics of the respondents, 60% were female, and the mean age was 40 years.

Involvement in the needs-assessment process.--When asked about their membership on the needs-assessment committee, only 29% of the respondents either had been or currently were members of this committee. Some 23% even indicated that there was no such committee. Regarding the types of needs-assessment processes known to the respondents, about 44% knew about surveys, and 29% mentioned interviews, observation, or a combination of these methods. Only one-third of the respondents indicated they were actually involved in the needs-assessment process. Asked about the reasons for noninvolvement, less than half of the respondents indicated a reason at all, mostly saying that there was a lack of time, that they did not know about the committee, or that they had not been invited. Regarding their intentions to continue involvement in the needs-assessment process, about two-thirds of the respondents did not answer at all; of the rest, some 71% indicated an intention for future involvement.

When participation in the needs-assessment process in terms of the background variables was analyzed, a few statistically significant relationships were found, most notably: (1) respondents with more advanced education were more likely to be members of the needs-assessment committee; (2) among respondents teaching in the humanities, there was a tendency to indicate "no time" as a reason for noninvolvement on the needs-assessment committee; (3) among respondents with permanent teaching certificates, there was a tendency to indicate "no time" as a reason for noninvolvement on the needs-assessment committee; and (4) more females indicated "no time,"

whereas more male teachers indicated "not invited" as a reason for noninvolvement in the needs-assessment process.

Involvement in the planning process.--Asked about membership on the planning committee, only 36% of the respondents either had been or currently were members. Some 21% even indicated that there was no such committee. Regarding the kinds of planning activities respondents participated in, 41% indicated "suggestion of programs," 34% indicated "suggestion of speakers," and 29% indicated "suggestion of content." Asked why they did not participate in the planning process, only 30% responded to this question. Of those who did respond, nearly half indicated "no time." When asked about their intention to continue involvement in the planning process, more than half did not answer; of those who did, 82% planned to continue their involvement.

Participation in the planning process was analyzed in terms of the background variables, and a few statistically significant relationships were found, most notably: (1) the higher the educational degree obtained, the more involvement in planning activities; (2) those with only a B.A./B.S. degree tended to give "no time" as a reason for noninvolvement in planning, whereas those with an M.A.+ degree tended to give "no interest" as a reason; (3) female respondents tended to give "no time" as a reason for noninvolvement in planning, whereas "no interest" was rather important for male respondents as well; and (4) among those with more education, there was a greater tendency to want to continue their involvement in the planning process.

Involvement in the implementation of programs.--When they were asked about membership on the implementation committee, only 30% of the respondents indicated that they either had been or currently were members of this committee. Some 23% even stated that there was no such committee. Asked to rate their degree of involvement on a 5-point scale (1 = high), the mean was 4.02; 50% stated they were not involved.

Participation in the implementation process was analyzed in terms of the background variables; the following statistically significant relationships were found: (1) hardly any junior-high-school teachers were present or former members of this committee; (2) the higher the education obtained, the more likely a membership on this committee; (3) the higher the education obtained, the stronger the involvement in the committee; and (4) respondents holding a permanent teaching certificate showed the greatest degree of involvement in this committee.

Membership in the governance process.--Asked about membership on the policy board, the general coordinating committee of the teachers' center, only 15% of the respondents indicated past or present membership, and 26% stated that there was no such committee. When respondents were asked about the number of different governance committees of which they were then or had been members, 60% indicated no membership and 10% indicated four committee memberships.

When participation in the governance process was analyzed in terms of the background variables, one statistically significant

relationship was found: The higher the education obtained, the higher the number of committee memberships.

Participation in activities offered by KPSDC.--Besides being asked about their participation in various governance processes, the teachers were also asked for their perceptions of the usefulness and applicability of the programs offered by the Kent Professional Staff Development Center.

Concerning the types of activities that respondents participated in and used, workshops were cited most often (50% participation; 1.9 helpfulness on a 5-point scale with 1 = very helpful). Lectures were cited by about one-third of the respondents (2.00 helpfulness), whereas courses and study groups were mentioned by less than 10% of the respondents. The actual use of what was learned in these activities in the classroom followed the above pattern.

In terms of topics of activities, those dealing with personal growth and improving instructional skills were cited most often; the facilitation of improvement and career advancement were mentioned least often.

Finally, respondents were asked about the benefits received from participation in the activities of the KPSDC. A noteworthy result was that 77% of the respondents indicated they never had asked for help from the Center; less than 5% stated they had done so explicitly. Of a series of potential benefits listed, "learn from others," "personal growth," and "new teaching style" were checked most often. Concerning the number of different benefits derived, a clear correlation was found with degree of education; that is, with more

education, more benefits were perceived as emanating from the teachers' center.

Concerning membership on the individual governance committees as well as the degree of involvement in the governance process as a whole, significant correlations were found between these measures and the number of benefits derived from the activities offered by the teachers' center. Consistently, those who were active on any one committee, or on more than one, rated the activities as more beneficial than those who were not active on a committee.

Suggestions for more meaningful and useful programs.--The open-ended suggestions for improvement of the programs offered by the KPSSDC were grouped into six categories. About 25% of the suggestions dealt with programming--more specifically, the need for administrators to value in-service programs, to have more teacher input, better needs assessment and evaluation, and more publicity. About 29% of the suggestions dealt with programming topics, either making specific topic suggestions or more general statements. Some 16% of the suggestions were made with regard to location and audience, primarily asking for programs directed at more specific audiences and/or locations. Some 17% of the suggestions dealt with scheduling of the activities, addressing such problems as advanced planning, after-school activities, released time, and academic credit. Finally, some 13% of the suggestions referred to problems of finances and other general topics.

Conclusions

Based on the summary of the results presented above, the following conclusions are offered:

1. Involvement in the various governance committees was relatively low and appeared to be related principally to the respondents' educational level; that is, the more education members had, the more involved in needs assessment, planning, implementation, and the policy board they tended to be.

2. In addition, the higher the education, the more benefits respondents perceived as being derived from the teachers' center.

3. With increased involvement in the governance process, the activities offered by the teachers' center were perceived as more beneficial.

4. Of the programs offered, workshops and lectures were most frequented by the respondents, were considered most helpful, and were seen as most applicable in the classroom.

5. Activities having topics dealing with personal growth and the improvement of instructional skills were the ones frequented most.

6. Specific benefits of participation in teachers' center activities were related to learning from others, personal growth, and learning new teaching styles.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Research

Given the findings of the present research, the following are some topics that might be followed up in future research on the effectiveness of teachers' centers:

1. Is there a relationship between age and/or number of years of teaching experience, highest degree obtained, and the motivation to get involved in the activities of teachers' centers? In other words, could it be that beyond a certain age, and given a relatively low level of education, this interest diminishes?

2. Would the findings of this study be repeated at other teachers' centers?

3. How do teachers' centers in the United States compare with those in Great Britain, where they were first developed? How do they compare with teachers' centers in other countries?

4. There should be careful monitoring of the development of teachers' centers in Saudi Arabia, in case they are established. What is the reaction to, participation in, and use of such centers by Saudi teachers?

Recommendations for KPSDC

Given the findings of this study, the following recommendations for the KPSDC are offered:

1. All teachers should be given more opportunities to take part in the various governance processes, be they needs assessment, planning, implementation, or the policy board.

2. More diverse methods should be employed in the needs-assessment process to obtain input from a wider portion of the audience, and more follow-up evaluations should be conducted.

3. A stronger communication bridge between the KPSDC and the administrators in the schools and school districts should be developed,

to increase their support and cooperation with the center's activities.

4. Programs offered by the KPSDC should be directed at the concerns of a particular school district as well as a school within a district and should include specific topics/subject areas that might invite cooperation across school districts or buildings.

5. More attention should be given to scheduling the activities in terms of released time, after-school activities, and college credit.

6. More awareness of Center organization and activities should be developed among the teachers served by the Kent Professional Staff Development Center.

Recommendations for In-Service Education in Saudi Arabia

As noted before, the final objective of the present study was to provide some recommendations for the nascent in-service education in Saudi Arabia. Without elaborating on the many social and cultural differences between education in Saudi Arabia and in the United States, it is clear that any adaptation of American educational innovations to conditions in Saudi Arabia must proceed with great care. However, one recent finding by Zafar shed light on one characteristic of Saudi public education.¹ He found that there appears to be a lack of coordination between college teaching in the field

¹A. A. Zafar, "An Evaluation of the Mathematics Curriculum Given at the College of Education, Makkah, From the Perspective of the Teachers Who Graduated From the College in the Years 1976-1980." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981.

of education and the actual tasks of teachers after graduation. In this context, teachers' centers in Saudi Arabia could serve as an important bridge between the theoretical knowledge taught in the universities and the practical problems encountered in the field. Given the observations made at the teachers' center studied in this research, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Since the success of teachers' centers for in-service education has been proven in England, the United States, and some developing countries, the establishment of such centers at every major university in Saudi Arabia may prove important in providing public-school personnel with professional development opportunities and in increasing their instructional skills, knowledge, and personal growth.

2. Because a teachers' center is a concept, in situ or in a changing location, the in-service activities can be offered in local school buildings as well as at a central location. This means that the center can operate in rural areas as well as major cities in Saudi Arabia.

3. To provide teachers with effective in-service programs in the centers, a well-organized needs-assessment process must be carried out. Such a process would include gathering information from the teachers themselves about their needs for in-service activities through surveys, interviews, supervisors' observations, and follow-up evaluations.

4. Successful professional-development programs can be developed in teachers' centers if the involvement of the teachers

who participate in such programs is increased. As the results of the present study demonstrated, and in the words of Baden, "When teachers are involved in enunciation and organization of training activities, conditions are enhanced for peer support, shared effort and eventual utilization of new insights and skills."¹

5. To facilitate such involvement, committees dealing with needs assessment, planning, and implementation of programs should be created in each teachers' center to give teachers an opportunity to participate actively in a well-organized manner.

6. The scheduling of activities of the teachers' centers in Saudi Arabia should not conflict with other school activities.

7. The cooperation of the Ministry of Education is essential because teachers could be given released time from their jobs to participate in professional-development activities, or they could be given some economic incentive to attend.

8. Each teachers' center in Saudi Arabia should offer some activities for college credit to motivate the teachers to attend.

9. Each teachers' center should make a sincere effort to increase the awareness of the administrators in the schools as well as school districts regarding the importance of in-service activities for public-school teachers.

10. Each teachers' center should offer workshops and lectures related to the improvement of instructional skills, updating knowledge in different teaching fields, and personal growth.

¹D. J. Baden, Developing and Implementing a Teacher-Directed Professional Development Model (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 121 730, 1976), p. 2.

11. The activities of the teachers' centers must be given ample publicity to let all teachers know about the programs offered.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS

 ent intermediate school district

TO: Kent Professional Staff Development Center Linkers
FROM: Barbara Bird, Director *B.B.*
Kent Professional Staff Development Center
DATE: April 27, 1982
RE: Professional Staff Development Center/In Cooperation
with Michigan State University Survey

Please randomly select elementary, middle school, and secondary school teachers from your school system who would be willing to complete the enclosed survey.

Please have the teachers complete the survey the week of May 3-7, 1982 and you return them to me at the Kent Professional Staff Development Center in the enclosed envelope no later than May 14, 1982.

BB/al
Encl;



KENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

2650 East Beltline S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 / Phone (616) 949-7270

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND CURRICULUM
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

April 26, 1982

TO: KPSDC Linkers
FROM: Barbara Bird and Charles Blackman
SUBJECT: A Study of Professional Staff Development Activities

The professional staff development activities carried on through the Kent Center are recognized as being particularly effective and helpful. One of the ways we can seek to make them even more effective is to get reactions to them by the people who use them - the teachers. In addition, we are able to share more fully what we're doing with other Centers by describing our activities in some detail.

Abdulhakeem Mubarak has designed a study which will be helpful, both to us and to others, in gathering information about KPSDC activities. We're asking your help, as linkers, in distributing a questionnaire to some 300 teachers of the over 6000 who participate in our activities. Results will be available to the Policy Board and Linkers to aid all of us to look more closely at what we're doing. In addition, our participation will aid us to share the concept of professional development with teachers in another country, Saudi Arabia.

We support this effort and we know we can count on your good help! Thanks to each of you!

dz

Dear Participant:

The enclosed questionnaire has been developed in order to conduct a descriptive study of perceived professional benefits derived from teacher involvement in the Kent Professional Staff Development Center. The results will be used in developing recommendations for in-service education in Saudi Arabia because the emergence of the teachers' center concept is a new hope for professional development (in-service education) of teachers as its fundamental purpose is to involve teachers more directly in their own professional development.

This study will be completed with your valued cooperation and assistance. At the same time, please be assured that confidentiality will be strictly maintained throughout the study. Names of all participants will be kept anonymous on any of the materials. I shall be very glad to share the summary of the findings with you if you so desire.

Thank you for your valuable time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Abdulhakeem M. Mubarak

The following questions relate to your current professional activities:

1. At which school do you work? Please indicate the name of your school and of your school district.
 School: _____
 District: _____
 2. Please indicate the number of years (including this one) that you have taught.
 _____ Years
 3. What is your major teaching assignment?
 _____ 1. Elementary
 _____ 2. Junior High/Middle School
 _____ 3. Senior High
 4. What subject fields do you teach? Please check appropriate field(s) and indicate grade level taught (e.g., Math: 5,7).

1. Math _____	6. Home Economics _____
2. Science _____	7. Music _____
3. Social Studies _____	8. Art _____
4. Language Arts _____	9. Physical Education _____
5. Industrial Arts _____	10. Other (specify) _____
 5. Highest degree held: _____ College major: _____
 6. Year graduated from college: 19__ Institution: _____
 7. In case of graduate study, please indicate field of study and year completed: _____
 8. Type of teaching certificate:

1. Provisional _____	3. Continuing _____
2. Permanent _____	4. Other (specify) _____
- Please answer the following questions about yourself.
9. Year of birth: 19__
 10. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

11. In case there are such, or similar, committees, are you a member of any of the following? (Please check at least one box for each category.)

Committee	There is no such committee	There is such a committee, and		
		I am currently a member	I am not now a member, but I was in the past	I have not been a member
Needs Assessment				
Planning				
Implementation				
Policy Board				

In the following questions, we would like to explore a little more about the needs-assessment process of Kent PSDC.

12. Considering the needs-assessment process, which of the following is being used? (Check all appropriate categories.)

- ☐ 1. Survey by means of a questionnaire.
☐ 2. A form of observation.
☐ 3. Interviews with individual teachers or groups of teachers by Teachers' Center personnel.
☐ 4. Other (specify) _____

13. In which of the following aspects of the needs-assessment process in Kent PSDC have you ever been involved? (Check all appropriate categories.)

- ☐ 1. Involved in designing one of the instruments and/or techniques that have been used in the needs-assessment process.
☐ 2. Involved in collecting data in the needs-assessment process.
☐ 3. Involved in analyzing data that have been gathered in the needs-assessment process.
☐ 4. Other (specify) _____

14. If you indicated in Question 13 that you have not been involved, what has kept you from being involved?

15. If you indicated any involvement above, do you hope to continue to be involved?

Next, we would like to explore your involvement in the process of planning programs and designing activities conducted or sponsored by the Kent County PSDC. (Check all appropriate categories.)

16. In which of the following planning processes have you ever been involved?

- ☐ 1. Identifying the content of teacher professional development (in-service education).
 - ☐ 2. Suggesting programs for professional development (in-service education).
 - ☐ 3. Suggesting speakers or presenters for professional development (in-service programs).
 - ☐ 4. Writing mini grant proposals for projects of your own design.
 - ☐ 5. Defining desired outcomes of in-service programs.
 - ☐ 6. Developing evaluation procedures for programs sponsored by Kent County PSDC.
 - ☐ 7. Involved in other aspects of planning (please specify).
-

17. If you indicated in the above list that you have not been involved, what has kept you from being involved?

18. If you indicated any involvement above, do you hope to continue to be involved?

19. Considering the scale below, would you characterize your involvement in the implementation of the activities of Kent PSDC as

actively involved 1 2 3 4 5 not involved at all

20. During the 1980-81 school year, which of the following activities have you participated in at Kent PSDC? (Check all appropriate categories.)

Activity	How Often?	To what extent were they helpful to you?					Are you using what you learned in your classroom?	
		very helpful 1	2	more or less 3	4	not helpful 5	Yes	No
Workshops								
Courses								
Study Groups								
Lectures								
Other Activity(ies) (Please specify)								

21. During your participation in the Kent Professional Staff Development Center's activities, have you found the activities you have participated in are related to: (Check all appropriate categories.)

	Often <u>1</u>	Some- times <u>2</u>	Little <u>3</u>	Never <u>4</u>
<u> </u> 1. General personal growth.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 2. Improving instructional skills related to your teaching assignment.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 3. Keeping current about educational matters not necessarily related to your assignment.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 4. Facilitating change and improvement in the school and school programs.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 5. Helping to move up the career ladder.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 6. Organizing and managing the classroom.	1	2	3	4
<u> </u> 7. Other (please specify) _____				

22. During your participation in the Kent PSDC activities, have you ever requested help or aid with a classroom problem?

1. Yes
 2. No

If yes, please state the problem and the help received.

23. What are some of the benefits that you have derived from the activities or programs offered by Kent PSDC? (Please check all appropriate categories.)

- a. An opportunity for personal growth. _____
- b. An opportunity to learn from others' experiences and ideas. _____
- c. An opportunity to open myself for feedback from and interaction with people who are in the same profession. _____
- d. An opportunity to be updated in my teaching field(s). _____
- e. An opportunity to continue to develop a greater perspective on my profession. _____
- f. An opportunity to learn new teaching styles, which helps me to meet the individual needs of the students. _____
- g. An opportunity to know more about some societal problems that will affect education. _____
- h. An opportunity for better understanding of human growth and development, with some focus on learning-teaching theories and applications. _____
- i. Other (please specify) _____

24. Please list any specific comments or recommendations you have regarding ways Kent PSDC involves teachers in (1) needs assessment, (2) planning programs, and (3) implementing programs.

25. Please identify at least three ways Kent PSDC could provide for more meaningful and useful programs and activities for teachers.

Thank you for your valuable cooperation
in answering this questionnaire.

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF RESPONDENTS

Appendix B

School District of Respondents

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
K-BYRON	1	5	3.1	3.1
K-CALEDONIA	2	10	6.2	6.3
K-CEDAR SPRINGS	3	12	7.5	7.5
K-COMSTOCK	4	4	2.5	2.5
K-FOREST HILLS	6	12	7.5	7.5
K-GODFREY-LEE	7	2	1.2	1.2
K-GODWIN	8	4	2.5	2.5
K-GRAND RAPIDS	9	25	15.5	15.6
K-GRANDVILLE	10	8	5.0	5.0
K-KELLOGGSVILLE	11	6	3.7	3.7
K-KENT CITY	13	7	4.3	4.4
K-KENTWOOD	14	6	3.7	3.7
K-NORTHVIEW	16	12	7.5	7.5
K-ROCKFORD	17	8	5.0	5.0
K-SPARTA AREA	18	8	5.0	5.0
K-WYOMING	20	14	8.7	8.8
I-IONIA	31	6	3.7	3.7
I-LAKEWOOD	33	7	4.3	4.4
I-SARANAC	35	4	2.5	2.5
	-1	1	.6	MISSING
		-----	-----	-----
TOTAL		161	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL OF RESPONDENTS

Appendix C

School of Respondents

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
CRESTON HS	1	10	6.2	6.3
CENTRAL HS	2	8	5.0	5.0
BURTON MS	3	2	1.2	1.3
RIVERSIDE MS	4	2	1.2	1.3
WESTWOOD MS	5	2	1.2	1.3
IROQUOIS MS	6	1	.6	.6
SOUTHWOOD KENTWOOD	7	6	3.7	3.8
SOUTH GODWIN	8	1	.6	.6
WEST GODWIN	9	3	1.9	1.9
CALEDONIA ES	10	3	1.9	1.9
CALEDONIA HS	11	4	2.5	2.5
MS KENT CITY	12	4	2.5	2.5
MAIN ES KENT CITY	13	1	.6	.6
CENTRAL ES GRANDV	14	4	2.5	2.5
EAST ES G	15	4	2.5	2.5
KETTLE LAKE CALEDONI	16	1	.6	.6
DUTTON CALEDONIA	17	1	.6	.6
CEDAR	18	6	3.7	3.8
MS CEDAR SPRING	19	2	1.2	1.3
ROGER'S HS	20	10	6.2	6.3
BELMONT ROCKFORD	21	4	2.5	2.5
LAKES ROCKFORD	22	3	1.9	1.9
RIVER VALLEY ES WYO	23	1	.6	.6
WEST ES WY	24	3	1.9	1.9
NEWHALL JH WYO	25	1	.6	.6
BROWN ES WYO	26	1	.6	.6
RIDER BYRON CTR	27	1	.6	.6
BLAIN BYRON CTR	28	1	.6	.6
MS BYRON CENTER	29	1	.6	.6
BYRON CTR HS	30	1	.6	.6
SECONDARY S COMSTOCK	31	4	2.5	2.5
BOYCE ES IONIA	32	1	.6	.6
IONIA HS	33	3	1.9	1.9
JEFFERSON IONIA	34	1	.6	.6

IONIA PUBLIC JH	35	2	1.2	1.3
CENTRAL ES SP	36	1	.6	.6
SPARTA MS	37	3	1.9	1.9
WHITE ES SPARTA	38	1	.6	.6
MYERS ES SPARTA	39	1	.6	.6
JH SHS KELLOGGSVILLE	40	1	.6	.6
SPARTA HS	41	2	1.2	1.3
MS SARANAC	42	2	1.2	1.3
SARANAC HS	43	2	1.2	1.3
SOUTHEAST ES	44	1	.6	.6
WEST KELLOGG V ES	45	2	1.2	1.3
NORTHWEST ES	46	1	.6	.6
KELLOGGSVILLE JH	47	1	.6	.6
NORTHVIEW HS	48	2	1.2	1.3
EAST OAKVIEW	49	1	.6	.6
HILL & DALES JH	50	4	2.5	2.5
HIGHLANDS ES	51	3	1.9	1.9
WOODLAND ES	52	3	1.9	1.9
LAKEWOOD MS	53	1	.6	.6
WOODLAND JH	54	1	.6	.6
CENTRAL HS	55	1	.6	.6
NORTH OAKVIEW	56	2	1.2	1.3
CALEDONIA JH	57	1	.6	.6
BEACH ES	58	2	1.2	1.3
HILL TOP ES	59	2	1.2	1.3
TWIN RIVERS ES	60	1	.6	.6
CENTRAL MS FOREST H	61	3	1.9	1.9
NORTHERN HS	62	2	1.2	1.3
CENTRAL HS FOREST H	63	3	1.9	1.9
ORCHARD VIEW	64	2	1.2	1.3
THORNAPPLE ES	65	2	1.2	1.3
LEE HS	66	1	.6	.6
LEE MS	67	1	.6	.6
	-1	2	1.2	MISSING
		-----	-----	-----
TOTAL		161	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX D

NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Appendix D

Number of Years of Teaching Experience

CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
3	1	.6	.6
4	5	3.1	3.1
5	4	2.5	2.5
6	8	5.0	5.0
7	6	3.7	3.8
8	12	7.5	7.5
9	9	5.6	5.7
10	12	7.5	7.5
11	10	6.2	6.3
12	9	5.6	5.7
13	7	4.3	4.4
14	14	8.7	8.8
15	5	3.1	3.1
16	4	2.5	2.5
17	9	5.6	5.7
18	6	3.7	3.8
19	2	1.2	1.3
20	8	5.0	5.0
21	5	3.1	3.1
22	6	3.7	3.8
23	1	.6	.6
24	2	1.2	1.3
25	1	.6	.6
26	4	2.5	2.5
28	1	.6	.6
29	1	.6	.6
31	3	1.9	1.9
32	3	1.9	1.9
33	1	.6	.6
-1	2	1.2	MISSING
TOTAL	161	100.0	100.0

MEAN 13.000	14.145	STD ERR	.546	MEDIAN
MODE 47.428	14.000	STD DEV	6.887	VARIANCE

APPENDIX E

UNDERGRADUATE FIELD OF STUDY

Appendix E

Undergraduate Field of Study

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
MATHEMATICS	10	9	5.6	6.0
SCIENCE	20	5	3.1	3.4
BIOLOGY	23	4	2.5	2.7
PHYSICAL SCI	24	1	.6	.7
SOCIAL SCIENCE	30	20	12.4	13.4
HISTORY	31	16	9.9	10.7
GEOGRAPHY	32	1	.6	.7
BUSINESS	34	6	3.7	4.0
ECONOMICS	35	1	.6	.7
COMMUNICATION	36	1	.6	.7
PSYCHOLOGY	37	6	3.7	4.0
LANGUAGE ARTS	40	3	1.9	2.0
ENGLISH	41	22	13.7	14.8
FRENCH	42	2	1.2	1.3
HOME ECONOMICS	60	3	1.9	2.0
EDUCATION	70	4	2.5	2.7
ELEMENTARY ED	71	23	14.3	15.4
SPECIAL ED	72	2	1.2	1.3
COUNSELIGN	74	3	1.9	2.0
AGRICULT ED	77	1	.6	.7
ADMINISTRATION	79	6	3.7	4.0
ART	80	2	1.2	1.3
MUSIC	85	6	3.7	4.0
PHYSICAL ED	90	2	1.2	1.3
	-1	12	7.5	MISSING
		-----	-----	-----
TOTAL		161	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX F

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION

Appendix F

Undergraduate Institution

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
EASTERN	101	2	1.2	1.3
WESTERN	102	43	26.7	27.0
CENTRAL	103	25	15.5	15.7
MSU	104	23	14.3	14.5
UM	105	4	2.5	2.5
FERRIS	106	4	2.5	2.5
WAYNE	107	2	1.2	1.3
DETROIT	108	3	1.9	1.9
CALVIN	114	9	5.6	5.7
GRAND VALLEY SC	117	19	11.8	11.9
AQUINAS	118	2	1.2	1.3
HOPE	119	5	3.1	3.1
SAINT JOSEPH	120	1	.6	.6
INDIANA STATE	201	1	.6	.6
MILW STATE TEACH COL	202	1	.6	.6
WASHINGTON & LEE	205	1	.6	.6
MISS VALLEY SC	206	1	.6	.6
WHEATON	208	2	1.2	1.3
NEW MEX HIGHLAND U	209	1	.6	.6
FURMAN U	210	1	.6	.6
U TOLEDO	211	1	.6	.6
OSU	212	1	.6	.6
HAMLIN U	213	1	.6	.6
U WISCONSIN	214	1	.6	.6
DOMINICA COLL	215	1	.6	.6
HOUGHTON	217	1	.6	.6
CAL STATE	218	1	.6	.6
TAYLOR U	219	1	.6	.6
BOWLING GREEN U	220	1	.6	.6
	-1	2	1.2	MISSING
		-----	-----	-----
	TOTAL	161	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX G

GRADUATE FIELD OF STUDY

Appendix G
Graduate Field of Study

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
EDUCATION	6	19	11.8	15.6
MATHEMATICS	10	3	1.9	2.5
SCIENCE	20	1	.6	.8
SOCIAL SCIENCE	30	2	1.2	1.6
HISTORY	31	2	1.2	1.6
BUSINESS	34	5	3.1	4.1
PSYCHOLOGY	37	1	.6	.8
LANGUAGE ARTS	40	13	8.1	10.7
ENGLISH	41	4	2.5	3.3
LIBRARY	45	2	1.2	1.6
ELEMENTARY ED	71	28	17.4	23.0
SPECIAL ED	72	5	3.1	4.1
SECUNDARY ED	73	6	3.7	4.9
COUNSELIGN	74	13	8.1	10.7
ED SPECIALIST	75	1	.6	.8
VOCATIONAL ED	76	1	.6	.8
ADMINISTRATION	79	13	8.1	10.7
ART	80	1	.6	.8
PHYSICAL ED	90	2	1.2	1.6
	-1	39	24.2	MISSING
		-----	-----	-----
TOTAL		161	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX H

YEAR OF BIRTH

Appendix H
Year of Birth

YEAR	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)
1918	1	.6	.6
1920	1	.6	.6
1921	2	1.2	1.3
1924	1	.6	.6
1925	1	.6	.6
1926	1	.6	.6
1927	5	3.1	3.2
1928	2	1.2	1.3
1929	2	1.2	1.3
1930	1	.6	.6
1931	1	.6	.6
1932	3	1.9	1.9
1933	2	1.2	1.3
1934	8	5.0	5.2
1935	2	1.2	1.3
1936	5	3.1	3.2
1937	5	3.1	3.2
1938	3	1.9	1.9
1939	6	3.7	3.9
1940	4	2.5	2.6
1941	8	5.0	5.2
1942	5	3.1	3.2
1943	9	5.6	5.8
1944	6	3.7	3.9
1945	7	4.3	4.5
1946	6	3.7	3.9
1947	10	6.2	6.5
1948	7	4.3	4.5
1949	10	6.2	6.5
1950	9	5.6	5.8
1951	5	3.1	3.2
1952	5	3.1	3.2

1953	5	3.1	3.2
1954	1	.6	.6
1956	3	1.9	1.9
1957	1	.6	.6
1982	1	.6	.6
NO ANSWER	7	4.3	MISSING
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	161	100.0	100.0
MEAN	1942.266	STD DEV	8.948

APPENDIX I

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION: SUGGESTION FOR MORE MEANINGFUL AND USEFUL PROGRAMS

Appendix I

Responses to Open-Ended Question:

Suggestion for More Meaningful and Useful Programs

Programming

Suggestions regarding the *Programming Process* have been subdivided in five categories, as follows:

1. Administrators should value the activities offered by the Kent Professional Staff Development Center

045 Emphasize importance of center through
 administration as as well as faculty

060 Administrators who see this as valuable for the
 dev. of their staff to keep up with times. If
 administrators in central office do not view this
 as important -- then much of the information is
 not disseminated to staff

113 I have not sensed much enthusiasm for these
 activities among the administration.

2. Input

- 011 Work harder to get input from more teachers -- rather than administration
- 014 Involve more teachers in planning programs
- 053 Continue to encourage (instruct) linkers to do their job and give inservice to the "how to" of teacher involvement
- 083 Provide educational personnel in participating districts an opportunity to suggest speakers, their topics, and other programs.

More involvement of local district personnel in the planning.
- 116 Keep in constant touch with teachers in the field before arranging programs
- 156 More input from teachers.

3. Need Assessment

- 007 Insure value of presentation before giving inservice
- 014 More frequent survey of teacher needs -- needs change in education
- 079 PSDC planners could come to the local school and speak with individual teachers on their needs. This is different than just sending an impersonal survey.
- 104 Better needs assessment.
- 122 when KPSDC has offered programs of appeal to people in the Education profession regardless of their particular assignment, there has usually been a \$20 fee associated with attendance. With plenty of free programs to choose from, I'm not ready to pay \$20 for another program of equal value.

If KPSDC offered programs/activities not already available within my own district, I *might* use them.

4. Follow-up and evaluation

- 008 Indicate how these programs can be of value to the classroom teacher.
- 058 Small-group follow-ups for specific programs.
Professional assessment of individual building atmospheres -- academic and social.
- 078 Bring back speakers for follow-up workshops, activities, lectures, etc. For example, I would like some follow-up activities or to know more about holistic teaching. Since I can't afford to go to one of Gayleann's workshops, could she come back with mini-workshops different from the first one.
- 106 If published material is not read, find out why.

5. Publicity

- 012 Use Ed. TV in the evenings to give a brief idea of what the inservice lecture/workshop will cover.
Sometimes information about such programs arrives just before or right after the planned event.
- 026 The only way I find out what is being offered in by flyers in our teachers lounge.
I don't know how their advisory groups are set up -- perhaps if people were aware, they'd volunteer to be on one of the committees.
- 040 More communication!
- 047 Be certain that the "grass roots" teachers get the necessary information on the planned activities.
- 060 Liaison person between county and district.
- 064 Stay alive.
- 079 Advertising for the individual speakers should be more interesting. You have a product to sell, yet often the very title of the program creates

disinterest.

- 083 Increase communication to local districts about programs. There is communication presently, but many people are unaware of what is occurring.
- 094 We need to spend more time alerting teachers to the possibilities of these opportunities.
- 097 More publicity so that teachers are aware of what is available to them through this committee.
- 104 Better advertising.
- 106 Make teachers more aware of what is being done.
- 129 Make their programs and activities better publicized in the larger school districts.
- 140 I believe more publicity is needed to present these programs to teachers as I have been unaware of their existence.
- 141 Keep teachers informed of new developments through newsletter.
- 153 Send a representative to verbalize about upcoming workshops. The flyers don't always reach people. (This could be done at a staff meeting, rotating from school to school).

Topics and Resources

Suggestions regarding topics and resources are presented in two major categories, as follows, the first, topics, being further subdivided into general and specific topical suggestions.

1. Topics - Specific Suggestions:

- 016 Undertake a study on *effect of TV watching by students.*

Explore possibility of 15/45 school year schedule.

Undertake a study on how parents can be responsible for homework and study time at home.

- 061 Many teachers are interested in alternative career information either because of the possibility of lay-offs or as an inducement to early retirement.

- 064 Workshops involving teachers in self examination.

- 072 Subject area workshops involving teachers from all KISD schools. Mathematics, home economics, media, industrial arts, etc. People would benefit from a one-day hands on meeting if the right leaders were obtained.

- 084 Programs on teacher motivation would be more helpful than student motivation.

- 090 Inservice on stress -- so all teachers could attend.

- 102 More involvement in programs dealing with gifted and/or talented students.

More involvement in Career Education.

- 119 Inservice which could stimulated educators to become more involved with future trends. Schools, to be effective, must keep up with the rapid changes found within society.

How do we combat current trends in private and/or parochial schools. Let's examine what is going on.

2. Topics - General Suggestions

- 007 Arrange or plan for new ideas and concepts learned can be utilized in classroom and not cut due to funds or lack of materials.

- 008 Be more classroom and/or subject-area oriented.

Become more classroom-teacher oriented.

- 010 Keep in touch with student needs and wants.
- 016 Study teacher credibility in academic approach in classroom as opposed to activity approach.
- 018 One month of inservice on each subject matter.
- 038 Set up regular repeated "hands on" experiences for the services offered by KISD.

Display samples, teaching devices (teacher made) instead of so much commercial, publishing co. materials. The economy is forcing educators back to the days of creative teaching methods and materials instead of to the school-supply catalogue -- and it's about time! The most effective teaching aids are teacher made.

- 046 Be practical! Most of us have had as much theory as we want, and need useful "right now" materials.
- 049 Make workshops for all teachers in Kent County divided by subject or department area.
- 064 Perhaps more "how to" workshops in specific content areas.
- 077 I attend two workshops a year put on by MITESOL -- they plan a variety of mini-lectures on a variety of subjects -- we choose the ones we are interested in -- and they are helpful -- they are all in one area -- a college campus or big school. This is one way I enjoy a workshop. I know teachers need maintaining and upgrading. The same speech can't service or reach everyone.
- 078 Handouts should be more specific.
- 079 PSDC planners try to cover too diversified a group -- elementary to senior high and science to English. Therefore, they are often so general in content that a teacher leaves with nothing specific. The computer lecture this year showed this weakness.
- 096 Have hands-on activities and handouts.
- 108 More practical and less theory.

Have more variety at one time.

- 122 Remember that my assignment is not like the typical classroom teacher's. I *might* participate in programs designed for my particular assignment (media center).
- 138 By conducting programs and/or activities that are of great interest to teachers.
- 141 Continue offering speakers on timely topics.
- 149 Have more activities.

3. Resources

- 004 Taping of especially pertinent lectures could be done, and offered to all interested parties for viewing at convenient times.
- 019 Bring in noted speaker in the field for a *panel discussion*, with teacher groups as questioning audience.
- 027 The excellent speakers and presenters.

The opportunity to attend workshops with such gifted presenters.
- 028 Provide experts to lecture on specific techniques of instruction.

Provide people from other states to lecture.
- 031 By continuing the excellent service they are already presenting (a) top speakers from across the country, (b) inservice training, (c) special planning committees to help provide assessed needs.
- 047 Have college department heads give workshops on bringing teachers up to date.
- 057 Provide more county-wide inservices such as this year's. Top speakers can be brought in that an individual district can't afford.
- 058 Experts in areas of teachers' specialty or

teachers at your level -- share techniques and strategy.

- 072 In-service meetings with another school district bringing in top-notch educational speakers from any area other than local people.
- 078 Bring back speakers who have proven to be popular; and/or who are in the process of developing new theories, instruments, etc. For example, I would like to have Gregorac's workshop after I heard him speak. From reading the handouts, I only had a vague idea of what he had to offer. After hearing him, I'd like to have more knowledge of his theories.
- 090 Getting someone to give ideas on classroom management -- i.e., Chick Moorman (KVISD) -- excellent!
- 093 Speakers from outside the educational field.

Location and Audience

Suggestions regarding the *location* and the *audiences* for Center Activities have been subdivided in two categories, as follows:

1. Specific Audiences:

- 004 If a specialist could be sent to a particular school to work with certain departments whenever there is something of particular importance during the school year, it would be very helpful. In other words, a more active program by Kent PSDC instead of the passive-type program now in use.
- 011 Have programs in more areas of the community.
- 014 Provide on-site workshops involving most staff of an entire school. If I go to a great workshop and come back with lots of neat ideas, but none of the people I work with have been exposed to these

ideas, then it's difficult to implement change.

- 019 Inservice in teachers' home building on related topics to that building. (They would need cooperation of Building Council and Principal.)
- 029 Inservice in our buildings would help. Caledonia has not participated, lately, in the programs offered by PSDC. If we could get founding, I'm sure that we would.
- 035 Bring programs to schools.
- 041 District inservice programs.
- 042 More programs located in the individual school district.
- 079 I would prefer an inservice that directly reflected the needs of my individual school to the all-district meetings.
- 115 It would be nice if some of the better inservice could be done in the outlying areas of Kent County.
- 116 Bring the programs to the individual school settings whenever possible (I would realize this would be difficult, but it would also be a way of familiarizing the participating schools with Kent PSDC.)
- 139 PSDC could take more programs and workshops to the local level. Many activities are overlooked because of the distance and time involved going to the main center.
- 150 The program offerings have been excellent but not enough people participate. There's a need for a large number of people per building (district?) to get excited by an activity so it can continue to generate back in the school. Otherwise, it often "dies on the vine" when only one or two people try to carry the ball. Perhaps speakers could be housed in buildings where whole staff is in attendance plus open to others in the county. If a whole staff could hear one good speaker per year there'd be more benefit than the "hit and miss" now used.

151 Provision of speakers and possible topics for building-level inservices.

More accessible consultive services at building level.

157 Inservice opportunities -- share district time -- 2-3 times per year.

2. Cooperative Programs

019 Small group of teachers in respective teaching assignments to *brainstorm* ideas in their field.

027 County-wide inservice days.

049 Arrange a rotation system where teachers visit other schools in the same department.

081 County-wide inservice (options).

102 More county-wide inservice programs.

139 Encourage more communication between teachers of the same grade level/subject from different districts.

151 Improve communication to general staff!

Continue county-wide inservice -- *excellent!*

153 Have teachers give input (in advance) about what they'd like to see presented. There are often many qualified presentors within the ranks.

Scheduling

Suggestings regarding the *scheduling* of program activities are presented in four categories, as follows:

1. Need for Advanced Planning

- 012 Perhaps a general calendar for the year/semester showing scheduled activities planned would be of value!
- 046 Have a listing of possible areas of concern that workshops could be arranged for and list distributed quite far in advance. Spring for fall, etc. Then publish schedule 6-8 weeks in advance.
- 106 Update information at a general meeting when staff are together.

2. After School Activities

- 004 Workshops -- lectures could be held at a time more convenient to teachers who cannot get released time for a day, and at various locations. Most of the above are held during the day, and only offered once.
- 006 Scheduling Saturday workshops, seminars and the like.
- 038 Plan more workshops during the summer.
- 041 Workshops (at each system local), during after-school time --- not evenings or weekends.
- 047 Schedule workshops, inservice, etc. after school hours. Difficult in getting released time is a problem.
- 096 Start *on time*.
- 104 Fewer programs during school hours -- our district

does not encourage leaving our classrooms.

- 107 Find the time for greater participation: difficult to be released for inservice; no money; try different time periods.
- 108 Check with all schools to make certain the meetings do not conflict with required school times. There have been two that I know of this year where we could not attend.
- 113 Perhaps Saturday offerings might have some appeal. I recently attended a conference on Saturday at M.S.U. and it was well attended.
- 138 Offer some of your programs after school hours.

3. Release Time

- 006 Scheduling in cooperation with local school districts in order to provide inservice activities on school time without increasing the length of the 180-day school year.
- 007 Develop inservice during school hours during preps or on days students are not in school.
- 028 Provide released time to attend inservices.
- 035 Provide more release time for teachers to attend.
- 047 Provide county-wide inservice meetings with released time for teachers.
- 060 Specific contract day or days negotiated for county-wide inservice -- perhaps one per semester.
- 079 Workshops and meetings are often night activities and as a working mother I find this impossible. it involves too much inconvenience and hassle for what I receive from the programs.
- 093 More inservice/released time programs.

4. Credit

- 045 Be sure such programs do not directly overlap current college course offerings in area.
Consider offering credit for sessions attended.
- 046 Offer these workshops for college credit as many of us are working toward advance degrees.
- 104 More college credit.

Finances

Suggestions regarding financing of the center activities are presented in the following:

1. Financing

- 005 As PSDC is operating now I find it most beneficial in providing programs and activities for teachers. Sometimes the fee charged for lectures and workshops dissuades teachers from participating.
- 070 Closer cooperation with business community.
- 081 Provide *funding* for continued programs.
- 085 Making changes in school environment or curriculum involves new money. Most schools are just hanging on or cutting deeply. It is one thing to present an idea, it is another to implement it.
- 096 Generate more funds so more people could take advantage of workshops.
- 113 I believe many excellent programs are offered. But it is difficult to attend. There are no funds to pay registration fees. I must pay it if I want to attend.
- 119 Programs dealing with innovative sources of funding education. No \$ means no school.

- 129 Provide programs and services that are not easily duplicated by other systems.
- 139 Because nearly all federal/state grants on introducing new programs have been cut, perhaps PSDC could support and introduce these programs into interested communities.
- 157 Continue funding to bring similar programs of the past.

Other comments

- 001 Program is satisfactory.
- 003 The programs are *not* necessary -- *discontinue!*
The same is true of these so-called doctoral program questionnaires!
- 026 I liked the semi-county-wide inservice day in March.
- 053 You're doing it.
- 088 Seem to be doing a good job.
- 099 I think they are doing an excellent job.
- 101 I am sorry, I think they are doing an excellent job. They only suggestion I have is that they might have a way to follow-up on the activities they sponsor. It might encourage the school to implement quicker.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Ghamdi, A. M. "The Professional Development of In-Service Teachers in Saudi Arabia." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982.
- Baden, D. J. Developing and Implementing a Teacher-Directed Professional Development Model. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 121 730, 1976.
- Bailey, S. "Teachers' Centers: A British First." Phi Delta Kappan 53 (1971): 146-49.
- Borg, W. R., and Gall, M. D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longmans, 1979.
- Brimm, J. L., and Tollett, D. J. "How Do Teachers Feel About In-Service Education?" Educational Leadership Research Supplement 1 (1974): 521-25.
- Burrello, L., and Orbaugh, T. "Reducing the Discrepancy Between the Known and the Unknown in In-Service Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1982): 385-88.
- Cane, B. In-Service Training: A Study of Teachers' Views and Preference. Occasional Publication Series No. 22. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England, 1969.
- Devaney, K. "Ingredients of Teachers' Centers' Uniqueness." Action in Teacher Education 2 (1980): 45-48.
- Dillon-Peterson, B. Staff Development--Organization Development. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.
- Edelfelt, R. A. "Federally Funded Teacher Centers: What Will They Become?" Action in Teacher Education 2 (1980): 19-23.
- _____. "The School of Education and In-Service Education." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (1977): 10-14.
- Edelfelt, R. A., and Johnson, M. Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

- Edelfelt, R. A., and Lawrence, G. "In-Service Education: The State of the Art." In Rethinking In-Service Education. Edited by R. Edelfelt and M. Johnson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- Farwest Teacher Corps Network. In-Service Education: Criteria for Local Programs. Bellingham, Wash.: Western Washington State College Press, 1976.
- Fleet, A. A. V. "Teacher Centers in Florida: A Case Study." School Review 85 (1977): 412-24.
- Gmelch, W. H.; Rose, R. L.; and Erickson, K. A. Rx for Professional Growth: In-Service Education. OSCC Bulletin. Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, n.d.
- Goodlad, J. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education." Teachers College Record 72 (1970): 61-72.
- Hariri, H. "School Climate, Competency and Training of Principals in Intermediate Schools in Saudi Arabia." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1982.
- Harris, B. M.; Bessent, W.; and McIntyre, K. E. In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Hatfield, R. C., and Ralston, S. "Professional Assessment and Development." Paper presented at the annual ATE convention, 1978.
- Howey, K. R. "Putting In-Service Teacher Education Into Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (1976): 101-105.
- Howey, K., and Willie, R. "A Missing Link in School Renewal: The Program and Staff Development Specialist." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (1977): 20-30.
- Johnson, M. In-Service Education: Priorities for the '80s. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on In-Service Education, 1980.
- Johnston, D. J. Teachers' In-Service Education. New York: Pergamon, 1971.
- Julius, A. "British Teacher Centers: Practical Applications for America." Phi Delta Kappan 48 (1976): 250-53.
- Kent Professional Staff Development Center. Final Report, October 1, 1980-September 30, 1971. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kent Intermediate School District, 1981.

- Knowles, M. S. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston: Guld, 1978.
- _____. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy. New York: Association Press, 1977.
- Lawrence, G., et al. Pattern of Effective In-Service Education. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1974.
- Luke, R. A. Teacher Centered In-Service Education: Planning and Products. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1980.
- Mangieri, J., and McWilliams, D. "Designing an Effective In-Service Program." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (1976): 110-12.
- Mertens, S. "On the Way to Describing the Federal Teacher Centers Program." Action in Teacher Education 2 (1980): 37-43.
- Michigan Department of Education, Office of Professional Development. Professional Development for School Staffs: The Michigan Approach. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, n.d.
- Moffitt, J. C. In-Service Education for Teachers. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Research in education, 1963.
- National Education Association. Teacher Centers and Needs Assessment. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1980.
- Nie, N. H.; Hull, C. H.; Jenkins, J. G.; Steinbrenner, K.; and Bent, D. H. SPSS--Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Peters, R. O. Affecting Teacher Awareness and Attitudes: An In-Service Program Strategy for Rural Schools. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 114 225, 1975.
- Schmieder, A., and Lovett, C. "Teacher Centering for Ongoing In-Service Education." Action in Teacher Education 2 (1980): 1-7.
- Schmieder, A., and Yarger, S. "Teacher/Teacher Centering in America." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (1974): 5-12.
- _____. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975.
- Waskin, Y. "The Teachers' Center Movement in the United States and Its Implications for Teacher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1976.

Yarger, S. J. "In-Service Education and Teacher Centers." In Teacher Centers. Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions, 1975-1976. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

Zafar, A. A. "An Evaluation of the Mathematics Curriculum Given at the College of Education, Makkah, From the Perspective of the Teachers Who Graduated From the College in the Years 1976-1980." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981.