

A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES AND TEACHERS'  
ATTITUDES REGARDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMS AS MANDATED BY HOUSE  
BILL 1706 FOR THE STATE  
OF OKLAHOMA

By

HORACE DON HALL

Bachelor of Science in Education  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1961

Master of Teaching  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1964

Specialist in Education  
Emporia State University  
Emporia, Kansas  
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1983

Thesis  
1983D  
#1765  
cop. 2



A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES AND TEACHERS'  
ATTITUDES REGARDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMS AS MANDATED BY HOUSE  
BILL 1706 FOR THE STATE  
OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth H. Clair*

Thesis Adviser

*William C. Seaman*

*A. Kenneth Stern*

*John D. Pearson*

*Norman N. Durka*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere gratitude to all persons who had a part in making this dissertation possible, including the respondents, who gave of their time to complete and return the questionnaire.

My sincere appreciation to the following people who contributed greatly to the completion of this study: Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, chairman of my advisory committee, for his tireless and most valuable time spent in guiding and encouraging me through the program; Dr. Ken Stern, Dr. Deke Johnson, and Dr. William Segall, members of the committee, for advice and interest in this work; Dr. Clarence Oliver, Jr., Superintendent, and Dr. Blaine Smith, Assistant Superintendent, for permitting my graduate work to have greatest priority in my responsibilities to them; Dr. Carla Thompson, for her assistance in the statistical analysis of data; Mrs. Ann Harris, my secretary, for her secretarial skills and tireless assistance; Mrs. Judy Gourd, for her assistance in editing and proofreading; Mrs. Sharon Phillips, for her expertise in polishing up and typing the final copy; and to my professional associates who gave words of encouragement along the way.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to members of my family and special friends for their understanding, sacrifices, and encouragement throughout the years. Without the help of my wife, Verna, and sons Marty and Donny, who unselfishly gave encouragement, patience, love, and prayers in this effort, the fulfillment of this graduate program would never have come about.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	5
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Research Questions . . . . .	6
Significance of the Study. . . . .	7
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	8
Assumptions. . . . .	9
Definition of Terms. . . . .	9
Summary. . . . .	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	12
Introduction . . . . .	12
Criteria Administrators Use in Planning Staff Development Programs . . . . .	14
Approaches to Providing Staff Development Pro- grams for Educators. . . . .	17
Teachers' Attitudes Regarding Staff Development Efforts. . . . .	20
Summary. . . . .	22
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE. . . . .	24
Introduction . . . . .	24
Population . . . . .	24
Sample . . . . .	25
Method of Selection of Schools and Teachers . .	26
Instrumentation. . . . .	27
Data Collection. . . . .	31
Analysis of Data . . . . .	32
Demographic Information . . . . .	33
Analysis of Data for Research Questions One to Eight. . . . .	35
Analysis of Data for Research Question Nine . .	35
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	37
Introduction . . . . .	37
Description of Subjects. . . . .	38
Comparison of School District Size and En- rollment. . . . .	39
Personal Information on Respondents . . . . .	40
Educational Background. . . . .	42

Chapter	Page
Involvement With Staff Development. . . . .	45
Analysis and Results of Research Questions . . . . .	49
Question One. . . . .	50
Question Two. . . . .	54
Question Three. . . . .	57
Question Four . . . . .	59
Question Five . . . . .	62
Question Six. . . . .	64
Question Seven. . . . .	66
Question Eight. . . . .	69
Question Nine . . . . .	70
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	77
Introduction . . . . .	77
Review, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Further Research Relative to the Nine Research Questions .	78
Question One. . . . .	78
Question Two. . . . .	81
Question Three. . . . .	82
Question Four . . . . .	83
Question Five . . . . .	84
Question Six. . . . .	85
Question Seven. . . . .	86
Question Eight. . . . .	87
Question Nine . . . . .	88
Summary. . . . .	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	94
APPENDIXES . . . . .	98
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	99
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENT . . . . .	105
APPENDIX C - DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS PER ATTITUDE AND CURRENT PRACTICES INSTRUMENT . . . . .	110

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. District Size Based on Number of Certificated Teachers . . . . .	39
II. Distribution of Respondents by Size of School Enrollment . . . . .	40
III. Distribution of Respondents by Age . . . . .	41
IV. Distribution of Respondents by Sex . . . . .	41
V. Distribution of Respondents by Highest Degree Held . . . . .	42
VI. Distribution of Respondents by Year Last Degree Was Obtained . . . . .	43
VII. Distribution of Respondents by Experience (Including Current Year). . . . .	44
VIII. Distribution of Respondents by Present Grade Level Taught . . . . .	45
IX. Distribution of Respondents by Class Size. . . . .	46
X. Distribution of Respondents by School District Participation in Staff Development Cooperative. . . . .	47
XI. Distribution of Participants by Role in Local Staff Development Committees . . . . .	47
XII. Distribution of Respondents by Number of Staff Development Points Earned Within the School Year 1981-82. . . . .	48
XIII. Distribution of Respondents by Whether or Not They Presented a Staff Development Program During the School Year 1981-82. . . . .	49
XIV. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to State Department of Education Regulations for Staff Development. . . . .	52
XV. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to State Department of Education Regulations for Staff Development. . . . .	53

Table	Page
XVI. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to Teachers Earning Staff Development Points . . . . .	55
XVII. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to Teachers Earning Staff Development Points . . . . .	56
XVIII. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to Teachers Receiving Monetary Compensation for Participation in Staff Development Activities . . . . .	58
XIX. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to Teachers Receiving Monetary Compensation for Participation in Staff Development Activities. . . . .	58
XX. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to Individualization and Flexibility of Staff Development Programs. . . . .	60
XXI. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to Individualization and Flexibility of Staff Development Programs. . . . .	61
XXII. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to New Teacher Orientation . . . . .	63
XXIII. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to New Teacher Orientation. . . . .	63
XXIV. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to Relevancy of Staff Development Programs . . . . .	65
XXV. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to Scheduling of Staff Development Activities, Attendance, and Involvement of Staff . . . . .	67
XXVI. Percentage Distribution of Responses to Teachers' Attitudes in Regard to Scheduling of Staff Development Activities, Attendance, and Involvement of Staff . . .	68
XXVII. Percentage Distribution of Responses to School Districts' Current Practices in Regard to Staff Development for Administrators. . . . .	69



Table	Page
XXVIII. Responses to Questionnaire Items Relating To Attitudes Regarding Staff Development, Prioritized According to Mean for Teachers and Chairpersons. . . . .	71

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The effort to upgrade the knowledge and skill of teachers has been a continuous, if somewhat uneven, one since the 1850s. In some school districts, the program of "staff development" was sophisticated, methodical, and honed to a sharp edge of analysis, reaction, and results. In others, teachers were left to their own resources for the classes and other instruction vital to their self-improvement.

Tyler (1971) noted that the need for staff development became recognized about 120 years ago, at the time that thousands of ill-prepared teachers were employed to fulfill the nation's commitment to universal elementary education. Moffitt (1963) pointed out that new social and economic forces in the early years of this century helped bring about some changes in teacher preparation, but in-service training was still rarely adequate. Rubin (1978) pointed out that the realization of the inadequacies of many teachers and the devastating effect on education eventually brought about the requirement of a college degree to teach school.

Even that requirement, though it may seem very basic to teachers of today, has proven insufficient to insure that practicing teachers maintain knowledge already gained, add to that knowledge, and become aware of new techniques and practices.

Harris and Bessent (1969, p. 15) indicated that hardly anything can bring a groan from a teacher as quickly as the phrase "another in-service session." One of the major reasons for this attitude has been a lackadaisical method of supplying staff development activities. Speakers were not dynamic, and did not relate to what teachers and other instructional staff members wanted and needed to know. Teachers generally felt "trapped" because in-service was not an option, but a requirement. And, in many school districts, a keynote speaker in an assembly for all teachers before classes began for the year generally supplied all of the staff development for that school year. It can be understood, then, that in-service might be less than welcome to staff members who were more concerned about getting ready for the students than about improving their own knowledge.

Times began to change all things related to education, and, in regard to staff development, the times sometimes change because laws change. That is very true in the state of Oklahoma, where some school districts required periodic upgrading of qualifications and others have provided in-service after school on weekdays and with pre- and post-school year activities.

Across Oklahoma many exciting programs of staff development are being developed and implemented. The fact that these programs are being developed during a period of scarce economic resources, a time in which many staff development programs in school systems across the nation are being severely curtailed or eliminated altogether, is directly attributable to a legislatively mandated program for staff development. Citizens concerned about providing opportunities and funds for school personnel to improve their professional competencies

helped to bring about the legislative requirement and resulting staff development programs being initiated in school systems across the state.

In 1980, the Oklahoma legislature enacted the broad-based House Bill 1706. This bill contained as two of its purposes, providing for allocation of funds for in-service teacher training programs and providing for teacher improvement programs. SECTION 3 of House Bill 1706 states:

Each school district shall receive an appropriate amount of funds for the exclusive purpose of in-service teacher education staff development. Such funds shall be used for in-service teacher education and staff development during the school year 1980-81. These funds shall be expended for in-service programs and planning staff development programs within guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education. All funds provided local districts after the school year 1980-81, shall be provided by and subject to the approval of plans submitted to the State Board of Education by each local district no later than July 1, 1981. Such plan shall conform to planning and implementation guidelines outlined by the Professional Standards Board and as approved and adopted by the State Board of Education, including provisions for the development of staff development guidelines in each local district as established by local district committees, as defined in this act, and approved by each local district. Beginning with the school year 1981-82, the revised plans of each school district for the succeeding year shall be submitted by May 1st of each year (Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980, p. 5).

Another portion of the bill which provided for teacher improvement programs is SECTION 11, which states:

Prior to July 1, 1981, the local boards of this state shall establish staff development programs for the certified and licensed teachers and administrators employed by said board. Such programs shall be adopted by each local school board based upon recommendations of a staff development committee appointed by the school board for said district. Such staff development committee shall include classroom teachers, administrators and parents of the local school district and shall consult with higher education instructors. The teacher

members shall be selected from a list of names submitted by the bargaining agent where one exists. In the absence of a bargaining agent, the teachers will elect a list of names to be submitted to the local board of education. The programs adopted may include, but not be limited to:

1. In-service training programs; and/or
2. Higher education courses.

Such programs shall be submitted for approval to the Board. No local school shall receive state funds for staff development until such time as said local board's program has been approved by the Board.

Beginning with the school year 1981-82, the revised plans of each local school board shall be submitted by May 1st of each year.

Any licensed and certified teacher in this state shall be required by the local school board to meet the staff development requirements established by said local school board, or established through the negotiation process. Failure of any teacher to meet local school board staff development requirements may be grounds for nonrenewal of such teacher's contract by the local school board. Such failure may also be grounds for nonconsideration of salary increments affecting said teacher (Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980, p. 13).

Simple enough is the act of providing staff development activities, but it is more complicated to present those activities in an organized, meaningful manner, recognizing needs of teachers and administrators, and helping meet those needs.

After a year of experiencing the effects of staff development programs which were developed because of this legislative mandate, it was felt that there was a basic need for more research to determine current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs. The attitudes of teachers toward any program of this magnitude should be a matter of great concern to those who are responsible for the planning, funding, and implementation of staff development in

Oklahoma schools. Whether school districts actually implemented the programs as mandated by the legislature was a concern.

#### Need for the Study

The planning for and implementation of an organized staff development program requires that many facets be considered. Just as each individual is different, so then will the needs of different school systems' staffs be diverse.

Staff development experts indicated that involvement of staff members, in research, presentation, and evaluation, is a key to successful programs. House Bill 1706 provided for an ongoing program of staff development, but specifics of the implementation of regulations and the law were left to individual school districts. If the intent of the legislation was fully carried out, teachers in Oklahoma would have been better prepared to teach youngsters, more aware of methods in several different areas, and more mature as educators and as persons. The key word, then, is "intent." How are school districts in the state of Oklahoma meeting the requirements of the staff development legislation? What are current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development? Research is imperative to determine the answers to these questions.

#### Statement of the Problem

The state of Oklahoma does not have a data base describing current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs. Since the implementation of House Bill 1706, a data base is

needed in order to effectively revise and improve the statewide staff development effort.

The purpose of this descriptive study was to establish a data base by ascertaining current practices and teachers' attitudes toward staff development programs now in use throughout the state. With this in mind, the following research questions were postulated.

#### Research Questions

Question One - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development?

Question Two - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding earning of staff development points?

Question Three - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding receiving monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities?

Question Four - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding individualization and flexibility of staff development programs?

Question Five - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding new teacher orientation?

Question Six - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding relevancy of staff development programs?

Question Seven - What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding scheduling of staff development activities, attendance, and involvement of staff?

Question Eight - What are current practices regarding staff development for administrators?

Question Nine - What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?

#### Significance of the Study

The results of this research presented a profile of current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development during the first year of implementation after the enactment of House Bill 1706 which mandated staff development programs for the State of Oklahoma. From this profile, the person in charge of staff development planning for individual school districts or State Department of Education personnel, responsible for revising regulations for staff development, should be able to draw certain inferences pertinent to the design of staff development activities. For example, if one of the objectives of staff development is to upgrade the teachers' classroom performance, then the staff development activities offered should appear relevant to the recognized needs of the teachers.

Those responsible for planning staff development activities might find it significant to know what priority teachers give to different activities pertaining to staff development. State Department of Education personnel may find that the answer to the statements contained within this study will further their knowledge concerning the applicability of regulations. The results may be pertinent to consideration of the need for revision or elimination of some requirements within the regulations. A general knowledge of the attitude of participants in staff development activities in Oklahoma will allow a base for



comparing the acceptance of the program of this state with other states where descriptive studies have been done. The information may also be used as supporting evidence to help justify to the state legislature the expenditures of funds in an area which has heretofore been foreign to them.

For the administrator who is constantly challenged to provide worthwhile in-service activities for teachers, the findings may be significant for developing and maintaining a quality program. The relationship between the success of the teacher in the classroom and participation in staff development activities which relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom may determine the effectiveness and quality of the program.

The Oklahoma State Department of Education may find the results significant in regard to current practices. Stricter enforcement of regulations may be deemed necessary as a result of the findings of this study.

Finally, it is hoped that this descriptive study will establish some variables from which far-reaching and more profitable research and knowledge of the field of staff development may emerge.

#### Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations inherent in the study were:

1. The use of a questionnaire as the source of data collection. This is a limitation for the following reasons: The selected staff development research findings and Oklahoma staff development regulations from which the questionnaire was developed constituted a representative sample of source materials. The validity of responses

depended upon the willingness of respondents to cooperate, their honesty in answering, and the motivating interest of the respondents.

2. The lack of direct involvement in the selection of participants and distribution of instruments.

3. The findings of the study being limited to the number of questionnaires returned by the subjects.

4. The study being limited to selected public school districts in Oklahoma.

5. The instruments for data gathering being distributed to five subjects within each of the school districts in the population without regard to size of district or location within the state.

#### Assumptions

When a descriptive study of this type is undertaken, there are certain assumptions that must be made. The most important assumption to this study appears to be that all teachers in the state of Oklahoma were participating in staff development programs as mandated by House Bill 1706. Other assumptions pertinent to the study were:

1. Persons responding to the survey questionnaire were representative of the teacher population of Oklahoma.

2. Teachers were involved in developing of purposes and evaluating staff development programs.

3. There was diversity in current staff development practices among school districts in Oklahoma.

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions were utilized to clarify terms used

throughout the study:

Staff Development, In-Service Education: For the purpose of this study, these two terms are used interchangeably to mean the same: "Systematic efforts designed to help teachers and administrators to improve their ability to function personally and professionally" (Harris and Bessent, 1969, p. 2).

Staff Development Committee: According to State Department of Education regulations, the Staff Development Committee is defined as a committee appointed by the local board of education to: (1) review guidelines for the staff development plan and make recommendations to the local board of education, (2) annually review the needs assessment data and make recommendations to the local board of education, (3) identify staff development resources and activities, (4) develop and recommend to the local board of education a staff development point system, (5) plan and write the local staff development plan to be submitted to the local board of education, and (6) make recommendations to the local board of education regarding the evaluation of the staff development program. The membership of the committee includes teachers, administrators, and parents of the local school district, with a majority of the membership being classroom teachers.

Staff Development Committee Chairperson: A person elected by the full committee to head the local staff development committee.

House Bill 1706: An omnibus education bill passed by the 37th Legislature (1979-80) of the State of Oklahoma. Contained within the bill were the funding and requirements for implementing the staff development programs in each school district in the state.

## Summary

Staff development has long been recognized as a vital part of the educational process for the classroom teacher. Some indications are that the 1980s will be the decade of staff development, just as the 1960s and 1970s were the decades of curriculum development. Oklahoma has taken a giant step forward in mandating and funding staff development programs in all school districts in Oklahoma.

The purpose of this study was to establish a data base by ascertaining current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs now in use throughout the state.

A sample of certificated staff members of school districts which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council was surveyed by use of a mailed questionnaire. The research involved the computation and analysis of data secured from this population.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Staff development has become an area of great concern for educators, especially in the last decade. For example, House Bill 1706, enacted in 1980 by the Oklahoma State Legislature, placed special emphasis on staff development for educators of Oklahoma. The bill contained requirements that each school district plan and implement staff development programs within guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education. This study was concerned with current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs in Oklahoma which have been implemented or revised as a result of that legislative mandate.

The efforts to provide a statewide, continuous program of quality staff development for educators is a somewhat new venture in the state of Oklahoma. As previously stated, the teacher in-service program has been conducted in a number of school districts for many years, but other school districts have not offered in-service sessions as a necessary part of teacher development.

Most who have published meaningful work on the subject of staff development have had some sort of direct involvement in a project or in efforts to organize a staff development program.

Raymond E. Hendee (1976), superintendent of an elementary school district in Illinois, wrote:

Staff development is the sum of all planned activities designed for the purpose of improving, expanding, and renewing the skills, knowledge and abilities of participants. This includes institutes, workshops, seminars, special purpose meetings in and out of school, as well as in and out of education (p. 163).

Brimm and Tollett (1974) noted:

The professional preparation of teachers is a continuing process, and self-renewal must occur if teachers are to stay in tune with the changing needs of their students. Effective in-service programs should be of assistance in helping the teacher to meet those ever-changing needs (pp. 521-522).

Rubin (1978, p. 7) stated, "A good teacher is rarely made or born. However, a combination of inborn qualities and good preparation can make a good teacher." Inherent in the whole notion of in-service education is the belief that all professional people can grow and develop; that they become professional adults and then do not, or should not, stand still (Harris, 1966). Three reasons for increased emphasis on staff development cited by Dillon (1976) were:

- (a) the declining birth rate and resultant decline in teacher turnover.
- (b) public dissatisfaction with the general achievement of many students.
- (c) general societal pressures that impinge on the schools (p. 165).

Moffitt (1966) wrote that the growing insistence for more effective teaching has paralleled the increasing complexity of our changing society. Howey (1976) indicated that the very real political and economic motivations exist to place in-service education front and center, before the public. "The greatly reduced number of preservice

students," Howey continued, "who are in teacher education . . . have forced higher education personnel personnel to refocus their priority on in-service education" (p. 101).

Contained in the literature are articles relating specifically to the various approaches taken by school districts in other states to provide effective activities for teacher in-service education. Some research studies also have been conducted to determine teachers' attitudes regarding these programs. A brief overview of literature relating to criteria administrators use in planning and implementing staff development programs is presented. Also examined is selected approaches to providing staff development for educators. This chapter concludes with a brief summary of literature relating to teachers' attitudes regarding staff development efforts which have been implemented to help them improve their job.

#### Criteria Administrators Use in Planning Staff Development Programs

"What criteria should guide in-service education at the lower level?" (Edelfelt, 1977, p. 10). This question is heard across the country these days from teachers, administrators, school board members, college professors, and others.

Criteria are more helpful than prescriptions to educators who want to design their own staff development program. Criteria do not dictate the substance and the essence of programs; they suggest standards and characteristics. They also set forth principles for decisions about conditions and circumstances of planning and operation (Edelfelt, 1977).

In past years, the major reason for the selection of a staff development program centered on which speaker was available on in-service day, or how much money was left over in the budget after salaries. The approach of today is very different, in that teachers are asked what they want in staff development, and the instructional and personal needs are taken into consideration by officials who are forming the program.

To provide adequately for the needs of instructional staff members, a program must be responsive. Arends, Hersh, and Turner (1978, p. 196) wrote that, "defining the needs of teachers and administrators requires a decision about what is good." Schiffer (1978) reminded us that most staff development efforts in the past have been biased toward fulfilling the goals of the organization, and now must take into consideration the need to make attitudinal changes as well. She also stated that programs must not be based on unrealistic assumptions about authority prerogatives.

Tyler (cited in Rubin, 1978) stated:

The view of the educational needs of a professional indicates that the initial step in establishing objectives is to select a small number of elements in each kind of inner resource. These elements, he says, should have wide applicability and serve as a guide for the beginning professional in his or her tasks (p. 138).

Cronin (cited in Rubin, 1978) pointed out that doctors, lawyers, and engineers attend annual seminars in their fields. "Teachers, however, are rewarded for advanced study even in fields other than those they teach" (p. 178). He continued by stating that, "short, concentrated workshops on matters related to the field taught would be far more effective than a one-day institute" (p. 178).



Jackson (cited in Rubin, 1971) saw the central goals of in-service education training from a growth perspective; that is, to help the teacher become progressively more sensitive to what is happening in his classroom and to support his efforts to make improvements on what he is doing. Mangieri and McWilliams (1976, p. 110) stated, "the success of any in-service program depends upon the commitment of the district's staff to the goals and objectives of the program." They emphasize that virtually every in-service program is based upon some type of needs assessment. Traditionally, needs assessment techniques have taken one of two forms:

- a. the administrator, responsible for planning the in-service bases the needs assessment upon personal perceptions of staff deficiencies or a combination of his or her views and those of other administrators.
- b. a needs assessment survey is sent to every teacher once per year, in an attempt to assess the felt professional needs of each district teacher (p. 111).

Results from this needs assessment purportedly are used to determine the shape and scope of the district's in-service program.

A "tri-level approach" utilized by the Ohio University Teacher Corps project combined needs assessments of teachers, instructional leaders, and university personnel to provide a broader picture of needs in a staff development program, according to Mangieri and McWilliams (1976). The writers further stated:

To fail to include the teacher in the decision making process lacked sense because . . . teachers are involved at the choice point when programs are successful in carrying out an objective and keeping their interest; it is not financially feasible to offer a program that is not relevant, and to make all of the decisions at the administrative level is little more than patronizing (p. 111).

Ingersoll (1976) noted that there are clear motivational reasons for including teachers in the planning stages of training, material selection, and development, since that inclusion will be more likely to lead to individual interest during actual training. "It is also," he noted, "financially unsound to invest funds in training that has little relevance to teacher needs" (p. 173).

#### Approaches to Providing Staff Development Programs for Educators

Gersten (1979) explained the "intervisitation" approach to staff development which promotes the use of fellow teachers for self-improvement. Each teacher was assigned his strongest area from which a lesson plan was to be developed. When one teacher presented lessons to a particular class on one subject, other faculty members who considered themselves weak in that particular area sat in on the class.

The Helping Teacher concept was explained by Rauh (1978). The concept, utilized widely in some urban/suburban districts for some time, is based on the use of a professional staff member who is charged with the responsibility of assisting other teachers in a peer-support role with emphasis on improving their performance in the classroom. "The role of the helping teacher has been defined," Rauh says, "as a person who 'helps the teacher help the children'" (p. 157). To accomplish this, the helping teacher works in a variety of ways. She visits the classroom, observing the students and the teacher at work; she brings new materials, resources, methods, and ideas to the attention of the teachers; she confers with the teacher and helps her plan effective ways to improve the educational program; she becomes a

trusted co-worker and friend to whom the teacher can go with any problem. All her efforts are aimed at providing conditions which encourage teachers to develop their competency.

The interinstitutional model utilized teams of teachers and administrators who worked with personnel from all levels of education to solve a particular problem. Fox and Griffin (1974) stated:

During the course of 16 four-hour, once-a-week sessions, the teams work on their problems, assisted by the staff members from the various universities, the state department of education, and the intermediate school district. General sessions are designed to support team activities and to promote inter-team communication. College credit of four semester hours is given at the university of the student's choice (p. 545).

Fox and Griffin further pointed out that participants in the workshop have responded to questionnaires, indicating that 90 percent have provided examples of improvements in their schools or in themselves resulting from involvement in the workshop.

Yeatts (1976) explained the Campbell County, Virginia, Teachers Center, which relies almost entirely on teacher suggestions for planning activities. Therefore, teachers have the major say in determining what their in-service program is to be. The Campbell County Teachers Center is based on the following beliefs:

- a. Teachers are key agents in effecting fundamental changes.
- b. Teachers are unlikely to change simply because administrators or outside experts tell them to.
- c. Teachers will take reform most seriously when they are, at least partially, responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs, and receiving help on their own terms (p. 417).

The Center is staffed by a director, a secretary, a media teacher, and

a resource teacher. The staff works as a team to implement the objectives of the program and each wears many hats as duties overlap.

Also included in the literature are essays on other models which are being or have been conducted. Goodlad (1972) focused on the program instituted by the Research Division of the Institute for Development of Education Activities. The initial assumption in starting this program was that the individual school is the largest organic unit feasible for organizational and educational change. Also assumed was that the individual school is not sufficiently strong to overcome the prevailing methods. A third assumption was that persons about to take risks are more willing to do so when some elements of success already are built into the structure. Another assumption was that some screening, legitimizing, and communication of ideas, beyond what individual schools might do informally, must be built in the new social system.

Bell and Peightel (1976) described a number of "teacher centers" which have become increasingly popular. A teacher center provides programs for educational personnel and allows participants to share human and materials resources. Champagne (1980) described a program in Pennsylvania which focused on instructing the professional teaching staff in high interest instructional techniques, which showed a dramatic effect in student scores on achievement tests. Larson (1974) discussed the program instituted in Portland, Oregon, which sought to involve all personnel in the planning and implementing of in-service projects which respond to the identified needs of schools and teachers.

Zenke (1976) discussed mandated staff development programs in the state of Florida. He stated:

It should be readily apparent that the legislatively mandated funding program for staff development activities in Florida is beginning to show some positive results in the state's schools and school systems. School-based staff development programs, which have been developed in many Florida school systems, are consistent with recommendations contained in the Governor's Citizens Committee on Education Report, from which the legislative mandate for funding staff development programs emanated (p. 181).

### Teachers' Attitudes Regarding Staff Development Efforts

With all of the legislative involvement, parental requests and administrative direction, where do teachers fit into the broad picture? And, how do they regard the staff development efforts which have been implemented to help them improve at their jobs? The verdict, so to speak, is still out on the staff development programs in Oklahoma. However, other programs which have been utilized across the country have brought responses and evaluation from teachers.

Ainsworth (1976) said teachers in Prince George's County, Maryland, were asked to share their feelings about in-service programs. Sixty percent of the 732 participating indicated a greater concern for quality in-service presentations than about the possibility of pay or credit for their attendance. To determine more closely what "quality" in-service education meant, 146 teachers were interviewed. The teachers most often mentioned these five qualities: practicality (79.5%); support and encouragement (56.2%); systematic program (48.6%); variety (45.9%); and teacher-sharing (42.5%). Least frequently mentioned by the interviewed teachers were choice and self-direction (Ainsworth, 1976).

Zigarmi, Beta, and Jensen (1977) reported on a research study conducted in the state of South Dakota. Their report analyzed the responses of teachers to questions dealing with the type and usefulness of various kinds of in-service activities. The trio said, "in order to determine the kinds of in-service education that teachers had engaged in, respondents were asked to react to a listing of 21 different types of in-service activities" (pp. 546-547). The most used type of workshop, the one-day regional workshop, was judged to be the least useful by respondents. Workshops and courses at a college or university campus were determined moderately useful. The "Current Trends" workshop and the summer workshops at the local school were judged to be very useful. "Current Trends" is a two-week workshop held each year at two sites in South Dakota (Zigarmi, Betz, and Jensen, 1977).

Brimm and Tollett (1974), in evaluating staff development programs, surveyed teachers who had participated in such programs. The study showed that teachers surveyed felt that in-service programs must include activities which allow for the different interests of teachers. Better planning and timing were also cited needs. Johnston and Yeakey (1977) concluded from a survey of teachers and administrators that any effective staff development program should be a collaborative effort of teachers and administrators. Wood and Thompson (1980) blamed inadequate funds and poor in-service course content for the failure of present staff development efforts, and contended that staff development must be redesigned if it is to benefit the educational system.

## Summary

If every staff development program which has been undertaken in this nation had produced tangible results, teaching would surely be regarded as the profession for professionals who are trained, re-trained, asked about what they need to learn, provided with instructors and resource materials in those areas, and then surveyed to determine whether the job was accomplished successfully. It is very apparent, through review of the literature, that every program is not successful, and that a panacea does not exist in staff development.

To insure that future efforts are more successful and more palatable to the instructional leaders who provide learning activities for children daily, the past efforts must be used as a learning tool for staff development practitioners. Olivero (1979) suggests an approach which includes a variety of different factors when designing staff development programs. Those factors deal with some attitudes, gathering information, improving human relations and school climate, and striving for personal growth and careful planning.

Ultimately, it must be concluded that the variety and number of staff development efforts equal the number of cities which have undertaken those programs as solutions to the problem of constantly assisting teaching staff members in professional improvement. One point appears to be universal. The involvement of persons participating in the programs is vital. And, those programs must be practical, convenient, and must reflect what teachers feel that they need.

This review of related literature presented various approaches taken by school districts in other states to provide effective activities for teacher in-service, several approaches school districts are

using to provide staff development for educators, and teachers' attitudes regarding development efforts. This review will assist the researcher in determining current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development in the state of Oklahoma.



## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish a data base describing current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs as mandated by House Bill 1706 for the state of Oklahoma. This chapter will be devoted to the methodology used and will be divided into the following sections: (1) Population, (2) Sample, (3) Instrumentation, (4) Data Collection, and (5) Analysis of Data.

#### Population

The population under examination consisted of certificated staff members of school districts which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council. The Oklahoma Public School Research Council is comprised of school districts interested in the study and research of public school administration, as well as the continuous improvement of Oklahoma schools. The member districts were identified from a membership list supplied by the Executive Secretary of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council. Ninety-nine names of member school districts and names and addresses of superintendents were obtained.

The selection of this group was based on several key points. First, the group was reasonably representative of districts across the state in relation to location and size. Secondly, the group had

previously expressed a willingness to participate in research studies of interest to public school administration. Further, it was felt the topic under study would be worthwhile to this group and, therefore, the council members would be more likely to insure that a response be given to the survey. It was expected that this action would result in a high percentage of respondents. Fourth, it was believed that superintendents of the council would more likely support the survey and instruct staff development committee chairpersons to follow through with the distribution of questionnaires, again resulting in a higher percentage of responses.

#### Sample

Important to the research effort is the selection of the sample. Van Dalen (1966, p. 298) had this to say regarding sampling: ". . . no specific rules on how to obtain an adequate sample have been formulated, for each situation presents its own problems. If the phenomena under study are homogeneous, a small sample is sufficient." He goes on to state:

. . . increasing the size of the sample is of little value if units are not chosen in a way that ensures representativeness of the sample. In general, three factors determine the size of an adequate sample: the nature of the population, the type of sample design, and the degree of precision desired. The researcher gives careful consideration to these factors and then selects the sampling design that will provide the desired precision at minimum cost (p. 298).

Bugher (1980) had the following to say regarding sampling:

The basic idea of sampling is relatively simple: It is an attempt to gain information about a given population by selecting a sample of persons who, in the aggregate, broadly represent that population.

In most cases, the sample constitutes a relatively small fraction of the total population. If a sample is carefully chosen--that is, if it is selected according to the formal rules of probability sampling--it can be remarkably accurate as a representation of the larger population (p. 3).

To identify a reasonable sample it was determined that two elementary and two secondary teachers from each district, in addition to the staff development committee chairperson, would be useful for this study. School district size and geographic location were not considered; hence, the sample is essentially a fortuitous one.

Superintendents of all 99 school districts were mailed packets which contained a letter describing the study and requested permission to conduct the study in their school district. Enclosed with the superintendent's letter were two items: questionnaires and introductory letters designated for the staff development committee chairperson and four teachers. The letters explained the study and asked their assistance in completing the questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, addressed envelopes which were also enclosed.

When the superintendent approved the study, the packet of materials was forwarded to the staff development committee chairperson. The chairperson was asked to assist in a sampling procedure to select schools and teachers from those schools to participate in the study.

#### Method of Selection of Schools and Teachers

Following are the directions used in selecting schools and teachers for the study:

"If there is more than one elementary school in your district, select the second school name from an alphabetized list of schools.

If there is more than one secondary school (Middle School or Junior High School and Senior High School) in your district, select the second school name from an alphabetized list of schools.

From an alphabetized list of all full-time classroom teachers in the elementary school which was selected for the study, choose the fourth and eighth name of teachers to complete the questionnaire.

From an alphabetized list of all full-time classroom teachers in the secondary school which was selected for the study, choose the fourth and eighth name of teachers to complete the questionnaire.

When selection of schools and teachers is completed, please distribute questionnaires to teachers with instructions to complete the questionnaire and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope provided."

The questionnaires were distributed as follows: one questionnaire to the staff development chairperson, two questionnaires to elementary teachers, and two questionnaires to secondary teachers. (See Appendix B for an example of the questionnaire.)

#### Instrumentation

Selection of the questionnaire in preference to other survey techniques is generally a matter of weighing its strengths and weaknesses against the interview approach. Speaking to this concept, Mouley (1963) pointed out that one of the major advantages of the questionnaire is that it permits a wide coverage with the least outlay of money and effort. Another advantage is that the replies may be more objective and accurate. If the respondent is permitted to remain anonymous, many times he will answer more candidly and objectively. A

third advantage is that the questionnaire permits the respondent to consider the responses longer and gives him a chance to check the information he gives. It provides a greater uniformity to the manner in which the questions are presented to the respondent and should insure a more comparable answer. These advantages would increase the validity of the data gathered.

There are three major disadvantages to the questionnaire approach. The questionnaire does not permit the investigator to note the reluctance or evasiveness of the respondent, or to follow through on misunderstood questions. There is also the problem of unreturned questionnaires, which decreases the size of the sample on which the results are based.

Since the subjects of the population were residing throughout Oklahoma, it appeared feasible to use a mail questionnaire for obtaining the necessary data.

To establish a data base describing current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development, a three-part questionnaire was developed. Part one contained questions of demographics; part two contained statements pertaining to teachers' attitudes regarding staff development; and part three related to current practices in staff development.

All participants were asked to respond to parts one and two. Only the staff development committee chairperson was to respond to part three. Part two of the questionnaire was developed primarily from a review of other questionnaire studies which were designed to access teachers' attitudes regarding staff development. Part three was designed to ascertain current practices of staff development with

regard to adherence to state guidelines and regulations and known practices within some school districts. Because of the nature of the position of staff development committee chairpersons, they were actively involved in evaluating current practices, whereas teachers were participants but not necessarily decision-making evaluators.

The questionnaire was revised and refined through recommendations from members of the doctoral committee and through recommendations obtained from a pilot study. The pilot study was conducted with the assistance of a graduate education extension class. The class contained both male and female teachers and administrators who represented seven different school districts. All persons were asked to study, adjust, and critique each item for clarity, possible bias, and double meaning. Thirty-nine responses were received and utilized in the pilot study to refine the instrument.

The questionnaire was organized and printed in four page, 8-1/2 x 11 inch sheets (see Appendix B). The participants were not asked to identify themselves unless they wanted to receive a copy of the results of this study. However, each envelope was numerically coded to allow for follow-up coverage of the non-responding school districts.

The first portion of the instrument was designed to secure demographic data on participants of the study. Items included were: sex, age, highest degree held, year last degree was obtained, present grade level taught, year(s) of teaching or administrative experience, year(s) of teaching or administrative work at present level, year(s) of teaching or administering at present school, school enrollment (school building worked in), and class size. Five items related to the individual's and school district's participation in staff

development. These items were: Number of staff development points earned within this school year? Does your school district participate in a multi-school district staff development cooperative? Are you a member of your local staff development committee? Are you chairperson or member? and Have you presented a staff development program for other educators this year?

The second section was designed to ascertain teacher attitudes regarding staff development. Through a process of consensus, a final list of 37 items was utilized. All 37 items related to some aspect of staff development. Respondents were asked to circle one of four responses which best described their attitude toward that specific item. The listed responses included: "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree" (see Appendix B).

The following statements are examples of survey items intended to establish attitudes of teachers regarding staff development:

"Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education where points are offered."

"A teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend."

"Teachers should receive some released time for staff development activities."

In addition to the attitude items, items were developed regarding current practices in staff development. Section three of the questionnaire contained 20 items relating to current practices which were to establish how school districts were actually implementing staff development programs. Staff Development Committee Chairpersons were asked

to respond to the items by circling "yes" or "no" as the item applied to current practices within the school district where they were employed. The following examples of survey items indicate typical statements pertaining to current practices:

"Staff development points are allowed to count toward advancement on our salary schedule."

"Teachers in our district have been involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs."

"Our district has used professional staff development consultants (persons from nationally recognized staff development consulting firms) to conduct workshops this year."

The questionnaire was not designed to allow for written comments. In the event a respondent failed to mark an item, it was assumed the item was not considered or was not applicable.

#### Data Collection

By membership in the Oklahoma Public School Research Council, school districts have indicated a willingness to participate in research projects. Therefore, no advance permission from the superintendents was sought to conduct the study.

Since no unused packets of material were returned, it was assumed all superintendents of the 99 member school districts within the population received packets.

The original 99 packets of material, mailed on April 15, 1982, included an explanatory letter to the superintendent, committee chairperson, and each of four teachers. Also included were five



questionnaires, five postage-paid return envelopes addressed to the researcher, and a sheet of instructions containing the sampling procedure to be used by the staff development chairperson in distributing questionnaires (see Appendixes A and B).

Questionnaires for teachers contained only parts one and two. One questionnaire, to be completed by the committee chairperson, contained parts one, two, and an additional third section.

On May 15, 1982, follow-up cards were sent to superintendents of the 36 remaining districts which had failed to respond to the original questionnaire mailing. Additional copies of the materials included in the packet were not provided (see Appendix A).

#### Analysis of Data

The data from these questionnaires were coded and punched on data cards and scoring was completed by computer, using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistical tools. Frequency distributions were established for the purpose of supplying an actual count and percentage of occurrence for each classification requested using the SPSS program "Frequencies." In addition, the SPSS program "Condescriptive" was accessed to generate the means and standard deviations of items included in the attitude scale.

The analysis of data procedures focused on three areas of concern: (1) demographic information; (2) the analysis of data for research questions one to eight; and (3) the analysis of data for research question nine. Procedures used to analyze the data are discussed below relative to the three areas outlined.

### Demographic Information

Tables were compiled for the review of frequencies involving the following classifications or categories of demographic data:

1. District size based on number of certificated teachers.  
(Information obtained from the Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1981 edition.)
2. Size of school enrollment (school building in which you work) (item 9).
3. Age classification of respondents (item 2).
4. Sex classification of respondents (item 1).
5. Distribution of respondents by highest degree held (item 3).
6. Distribution of respondents by year last degree was obtained (item 4).
7. Distribution of respondents by experience (including current year) (item 6).
8. Distribution of respondents by present grade level taught (item 5).
9. Distribution of respondents by class size (item 10).
10. Yes/no response concerning school district's participation in a staff development cooperative (item 12).
11. Distribution of respondents by role in local staff development committees (item 13).
12. Distribution of respondents by number of staff development points earned within the school year 1981-82 (item 11).
13. Yes/no response concerning whether respondents had presented a staff development program during the school year 1981-82 (item 14).

Demographic data were assessed for the purpose of accurately describing the sample used in the study and to examine possible attributes of respondents that could be contributing to their perceptions of current practices and attitudes.

Inherent within the design of the instrument were categories by which responses could be analyzed. A determination was made to focus specific attention toward specified categories which were within the design of Part II, pertaining to teachers' attitudes and also present in Part III regarding current practice.

The selection of categories was based, in part, on a review of the staff development section of House Bill 1706 and the State Department of Education regulations relating to staff development. Interviews with members of the doctoral committee also helped to establish categories of interest. The latter expressed concern of a need for specific information which a study of responses by teachers and chairpersons could provide. Statements contained in Part II and Part III of the questionnaire were grouped into specific categories as follows:

- (1) State Department of Education regulations for staff development;
- (2) Earning of staff development points;
- (3) Receiving monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities;
- (4) Individualization and flexibility of staff development programs;
- (5) New teacher orientation;
- (6) Relevancy of staff development programs; and
- (7) Scheduling of staff development activities, attendance, and involvement of staff.

Research questions were developed for each of the categories listed above. In addition to these categories, research question 8 was developed regarding staff development for administrators.

Based upon these eight categories which identify the first eight research questions in the study, the frequency tables (percentages) were examined for the purpose of comparing and contrasting respondents' attitudes and current practices.

#### Analysis of Data for Research Questions

##### One to Eight

The SPSS program "Frequencies" generated frequency tables, including rcf (relative cumulative frequencies) for both the attitude scale and the current practices instrument. Data gathered from the 37 items pertaining to teachers' attitudes regarding staff development were grouped according to the following procedure: agree and strongly agree percentages (rcf) were combined to create a general agree category--disagree and strongly disagree percentages (rcf) were treated similarly. Data gathered from the 20-item instrument pertaining to current staff development practices were coded and tallied by the "Frequencies" program to produce a table of yes/no relative cumulative frequencies (rcf). The two resulting frequency tables (agree/disagree for the attitude scale--Part II of the instrument--and yes/no for the current practices inventory--Part III of the instrument) were the basis for the analysis of data for the first eight research questions proposed by the study.

##### Analysis of Data for Research Question Nine

The SPSS program "Condescriptive" was used to generate means and standard deviations of items included in the attitude scale (Part II of the instrument) for the purpose of answering research question

nine, "What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?" The means were prioritized (rank ordered) according to the two groupings--chairpersons and teachers. Comparisons of the rank orderings of means were made to assess relationships between teachers' and chairpersons' views toward staff development.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to report the data gathered from the questionnaires sent to a sampling of certificated staff members of school districts which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council.

Data presented in this chapter were obtained from two sources: (1) the staff development committee chairpersons, who had been so designated by Boards of Education as a requirement of regulations of House Bill 1706, and (2) elementary and secondary certificated staff selected in a sampling procedure by the staff development committee chairperson to participate in the study.

The purpose of the instrument was to establish a data base by ascertaining current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs now in use throughout the state.

The questionnaires returned after the initial mailing containing parts one and two amounted to 264 replies (53.3%) of the 495 certificated staff members thought to have been contacted. The returns to the follow-up card resulted in 66 additional replies (13.3%). The total number of questionnaires containing parts one and two returned was 330, resulting in a 66.6 percent return.

Part three of the questionnaires returned by the staff development committee chairperson after the initial mailing amounted to 58 replies (58.5%) of the 99 committee chairpersons thought to have been contacted. The returns to the follow-up card resulted in 14 more replies (14.2%). The total number of questionnaires returned containing part three was 72, resulting in a 72.7 percent return.

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of data collected. The first section will present a description of the subjects. Demographic data will be assessed for the purpose of accurately describing the sample used in the study. The second section will analyze the first eight research questions presented in Chapter I. Frequency tables (percentages) will be examined for the purpose of comparing and contrasting respondents' attitudes and current practices regarding staff development. The final section, relating to research question nine, will analyze and compare the rankings of mean responses which allowed assessment of relationships between teachers' and chairpersons' attitudes regarding staff development.

#### Description of Subjects

In all, the respondents represented 79 districts of the 99 districts which comprised the population for this study. Of the 79 districts represented, 38 districts returned all five questionnaires sent to them. This represented 190 responses, or 57.6 percent. Twenty-three districts returned four questionnaires, representing 92 responses, or 27.9 percent. Twelve districts returned three questionnaires, representing 36 responses, or 10.9 percent. Five districts returned two questionnaires and two districts returned only one.

Comparison of School District Size  
and Enrollment

The school district size was examined from two aspects; the number of certificated teachers in the district and the school enrollment of the building in which the respondent taught.

The Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1981 edition, lists the number of certificated teachers in the districts included in the population as ranging from 16 to 1,106.

Data presented in Table I shows the distribution of respondents based on number of certificated teachers. The 0 to 39 category had the greatest representation of respondents, 117 (35.5%), while the 40 to 100 category had 111 (33.6%) and the 101 + category had 102 (30.9%).

TABLE I  
DISTRICT SIZE BASED ON NUMBER OF  
CERTIFICATED TEACHERS

Certificated Teachers	No. of Responses	Percentage
0-39	117	35.5
40-100	111	33.6
101 +	<u>102</u>	<u>30.9</u>
Total	330	100.0



Participants were asked to respond to size of school enrollment within the building where they taught. The categories listed were 0-400, 401-600, 601-800, and 801 +. Table II shows the distribution of respondents within these four categories.

TABLE II  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE  
OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Category	Respondents	Percentage
0-400	219	66.4
401-600	62	18.8
601-800	21	6.4
801 +	24	7.3
No Response	<u>4</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Total	330	100.0

#### Personal Information on Respondents

Data as to the age and sex of respondents are presented in this section.

Age. The age of the respondents indicated a wide distribution, with the 26 to 45 category constituting the largest portion of respondents by accounting for approximately 72 percent of the entire

sample. The 46-60 age group contained 18.2 percent of the respondents, making this the second largest category (Table III).

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age	Respondents	Percentage
21-25	23	7.0
26-45	235	71.2
46-60	60	18.2
61 +	<u>12</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Total	330	100.0

Sex. The sample consisted of 243 females (73.6%) and 87 males (26.4%) (Table IV).

TABLE IV  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Female	243	73.6
Male	<u>87</u>	<u>26.4</u>
Total	330	100.0

### Educational Background

Information gathered in regard to educational background was: highest degree held, year last degree was obtained, and years of teaching or administrative experience (not counting current year).

Information from respondents showed that all degree categories were represented with almost equal representation in the bachelor's and master's degree category, with 50.3 percent (166) and 46.1 percent (152), respectively. Other categories were sparsely represented.

Since level of degree attainment is a possible variable which can influence teachers' attitudes regarding staff development, response given by participants may be helpful to planners of future staff development programs (Table V).

TABLE V  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY  
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD

Degree	Respondents	Percentage
Bachelor	166	50.3
Master	152	46.1
Education Specialist	7	2.1
Doctorate	2	.6
No Response	3	.9
Total	330	100.0

The question in regard to year last degree was obtained was an open-ended question which asked for a definite year response rather than a category. The question was constructed in this manner with the intention of categorizing the answers once the two extremes were known. The extremes ranged from 1941 to 1982. The greater portion of respondents, 227 (69.0%), received their last degree between 1971 and 1982. Table VI shows the distribution of respondents by the year last degree was obtained.

TABLE VI  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEAR LAST  
DEGREE WAS OBTAINED

Year Degree Obtained	Respondents	Percentage
1941-50	6	1.8
1951-60	22	6.6
1961-70	63	19.0
1971-82	227	69.0
No Response	<u>12</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Total	330	100.0

Years of experience in the field of education could possibly affect a teacher's attitude toward staff development and programs in which they choose to participate. There was approximately an even distribution of respondents (33.6%) in the 0-5 year category compared

to 105 (31.8%) in the 6-10 year category. The 11-15 year category had the third largest category containing 63 (19.1%) of the respondents (Table VII).

TABLE VII  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY EXPERIENCE  
(INCLUDING CURRENT YEAR)

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percentage
0-5	111	33.6
6-10	105	31.8
11-15	63	19.1
16-20	20	6.1
21 +	30	9.1
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	330	100.0

Given in Table VIII is a summary of the distribution of respondents by present grade level taught. The categories were: elementary, junior high or middle school, senior high, and administrator.

The largest portion of respondents were found to be elementary teachers, 133 (40.3%), followed closely by senior high teachers, with 115 or 34.8 percent. Junior high or middle school had the third largest number, 57 (17.3%), with the administrator category having the smallest number 23 (7.0%).

TABLE VIII  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY PRESENT  
GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Elementary	133	40.3
Junior High or Middle School	57	17.3
Senior High	115	34.8
Administrator	23	7.0
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>0.6</u>
Total	330	100.0

Another question pertaining to average class size of participants was left open-ended on the instrument rather than categorized because of an uncertainty of how to determine the categories to best meet the needs of respondents. A categorization was made once the two extremes were known. The extremes ranged from 4 to 75 in a class. The greater number of respondents, 177 (53.6%), had class sizes in the 21-30 category. The 11-20 category had the next greatest number, with 90 respondents, or 27.3 percent. Table IX shows the distribution of respondents by class size.

#### Involvement With Staff Development

To develop a more complete profile describing the staff development participant and participant's school district, the demographic data included a segment concerning involvement with staff development.

TABLE IX  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CLASS SIZE

Class Size	Respondents	Percentage
0-10	30	9.1
11-20	90	27.3
21-30	177	53.6
30 +	12	3.6
No Response	<u>21*</u>	<u>6.4</u>
Total	330	100.1

\*The larger number of no response would have been indicative of responses by administrators who would not have classes to report.

Many school districts across the state were thought to have begun staff development cooperatives, which were legal and provided for in H.B. 1706 regulations. The purpose of the cooperatives was to allow several districts to pool state funds for staff development and present training for cooperating districts of perhaps a greater quality than one district could provide alone. Participants were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the question: "Does your school district participate in a multi-school district staff development cooperative?" Data in Table X indicates that 59.7 percent, or 197, respondents indicated "yes" to the question, and 114, or 34.5 percent, answered "no."

Respondents were asked if they were members of the local staff development committee. One hundred and forty-five, or 43.9 percent,

of the respondents answered "yes" to the question, and 185, or 56.1 percent answered "no" to the question. If they answered "yes," they were asked if they were chairpersons or members. The data in Table XI shows the distribution of participants by role in local staff development committees.

TABLE X  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SCHOOL  
DISTRICT PARTICIPATION IN STAFF  
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATIVE

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Yes	197	59.7
No	114	34.5
No Response	<u>19</u>	<u>5.8</u>
Total	330	100.0

TABLE XI  
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY ROLE IN  
LOCAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Chairperson	74	22.4
Member	71	22.4
Non-Member	<u>185</u>	<u>56.1</u>
Total	330	100.0



State regulations require that each certified and licensed teacher and administrator accrue at least 75 staff development points within a period of five years, with at least some points completed each year. Teacher attitude regarding staff development could possibly be perceived as positive if teachers were completing more than the required points in the first year of the program. The greater number of respondents, 138 (41.8%) had earned 15 to 30 points. The above 45 points category had 95 participants, or 28.8 percent, followed by the 30-45 point category, with 45 (13.6%) participants (Table XII).

TABLE XII  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER OF  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT POINTS EARNED WITHIN  
THE SCHOOL YEAR 1981-82

Category	Respondents	Percentage
0-15	45	13.6
16-30	138	41.8
31-45	48	14.5
46 +	95	28.8
No Response	4	1.3
Total	330	100.0

In order that an adequate amount of activities be offered at the local level for which staff development points may be offered,

teachers and administrators need to be active in presenting staff development programs within their areas of expertise. Most districts will not be able to rely totally on presenters from outside the district to adequately provide opportunities for staff to accrue the necessary points to meet the requirements of state regulations. Participants were asked to respond to the question: "Have you presented a staff development program for other educators this year?" Table XIII indicates the results of the question.

TABLE XIII  
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER OR  
 NOT THEY PRESENTED A STAFF DEVELOPMENT  
 PROGRAM DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR  
 1981-82

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Yes	60	18.2
No	264	80.0
No Response	<u>6</u>	<u>1.8</u>
Total	330	100.0

#### Analysis and Results of Research Questions

This section focuses on the analysis and results of the data. Data were collected for the purpose of answering the nine research questions posed in the study.

Questions one to eight relating to current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development, earning staff development points, receiving monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities, individualization and flexibility of staff development programs, new teacher orientation, relevancy, scheduling, and staff development programs for administrators were analyzed by means of frequency distributions (rcf-relative cumulative frequencies) depicting:

(1) percentages of whether or not existing staff development programs contain the eight elements listed above, and (2) percentages of agreement and disagreement of whether or not respondents feel that staff development programs "ought" to include the above eight concerns.

The analysis included synthesizing the resulting percentages for the purpose of drawing comparisons, examining practices versus attitudes, and exploring trends evidenced by the results.

Question nine, "What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?" was analyzed by using the descriptive statistical tool of rank ordering the means of both groups (teachers and chairpersons) on each item of concern in the attitude scale. Commonalities and discrepancies were ascertained from the results of the priority rankings.

The research questions and results are included in the following analysis.

#### Question One

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development?"

The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question one. The results are reported in Table XIV and XV, and in the discussion that follows.

Results. Although a high percentage of respondents (86.1%) reported that teachers in their systems do complete evaluation forms upon the completion of staff development workshops; respondents' attitudes were split with regard to the adequacy of evaluation efforts to determine the effects of staff development activities (57.0% of the respondents agreed that current evaluation efforts are adequate; whereas, 43.0% of the respondents did not).

Respondents generally agreed (87.8%) that the local staff development committee, as mandated by House Bill 1706, gives teachers fair representation within its designated membership. This attitude was exemplified by 98.6 percent of the respondents reporting that teachers do represent a majority of the membership of respective staff development committees.

A vast majority (95.8%) of the respondents indicated that a needs assessment was conducted to determine felt needs of teachers for staff development planning purposes. This current practice is consistent with over 91 percent (91.5%) of the respondents who agree that a needs assessment update should be conducted each year to determine interests of teachers in planning staff development activities.

In general, a majority of the respondents agree with the State Department of Education Regulations for staff development concerning teacher representation, use of needs assessments, specification of objectives, transferrability of staff development points, established

TABLE XIV  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO  
 TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO  
 STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
 REGULATIONS FOR STAFF  
 DEVELOPMENT

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
8. There is adequate evaluation to determine the effects of staff development activities.	57.0	43.0
24. The local staff development committee, as mandated by House Bill 1706, gives teachers fair representation within its designated membership.	87.8	10.0
37. A needs assessment update should be conducted each year to determine interests of teachers in planning staff development activities.	91.5	7.3
6. Most staff development programs arise from a study of the needs and problems of teachers.	86.9	12.7
32. The objectives of staff development programs in my system are specific.	80.9	18.2
33. Staff development points should be transferrable from one district to another when a teacher moves.	97.9	1.5
21. The requirement that all certified and licensed teachers and administrators accrue at least seventy-five (75) staff development points within a five-year period with at least some points completed each year is a fair and equitable requirement.	87.6	15.2

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
30. Staff development requirements by local boards of education for the individual teacher should be stringently enforced as provided for in House Bill No. 1706.	78.5	17.2
35. The local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program.	42.4	54.3

TABLE XV

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO  
SCHOOL DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES  
IN REGARD TO STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION REGULATIONS FOR  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
7. Teachers who attend a local staff development workshop complete an evaluation form at the end of the workshop.	86.1	12.5
11. A needs assessment was conducted to determine felt needs of teachers for staff development planning purposes.	98.6	1.4
14. Teachers represent a majority of members of our staff development committee.	95.8	2.8

staff development point requirement, and enforcement of staff development requirement.

Respondents were split (42.4% agreed and 54.3% disagreed) with regard to whether or not the local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program.

### Question Two

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding earning of staff development points?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question two. The results are reported in Tables XVI and XVII, and in the discussion which follows.

Results. Only one-third of the respondents agreed that teachers should receive staff development points for professional reading, whereas more than three-fourths of the respondents agreed that teachers should receive staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education (97.2%), for participating in graduate university courses (96.7%), for approved research efforts (90.0%), for professional writing (80.9%), and for approved educational travel (77.6%).

A large majority of respondents (81.9%) reported that teachers in their districts do receive staff development points for attending staff development activities scheduled during the regular teacher workday.

Respondents' attitudes and current practices are somewhat consistent with regard to teachers' receiving staff development points

TABLE XVI  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO  
 TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO  
 TEACHERS EARNING STAFF  
 DEVELOPMENT POINTS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
34. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional reading.	31.8	66.1
3. Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education where points are offered.	97.2	2.1
16. A teacher should receive staff development points for participation in a graduate course at a university.	96.7	3.0
25. A teacher should receive staff development points for research approved by the staff development committee.	90.0	9.4
31. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional writing approved by the staff development committee.	80.9	18.5
36. A teacher should receive staff development points for approved educational travel.	77.6	20.9



for attending local or state teacher organization meetings and/or sponsored by the State Department of Education, i.e., 97.2 percent of the respondents agreed that teachers should be allowed to count points accumulated from this source and 90.3 percent of the respondents reported that this method of attaining points is currently being utilized in their respective districts.

TABLE XVII  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO  
 SCHOOL DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES  
 IN REGARD TO TEACHERS EARNING  
 STAFF DEVELOPMENT POINTS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
17. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending staff development activities scheduled during the regular teacher workday.	81.9	18.1
16. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending local or state teacher organization meetings.	90.3	8.3
18. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for educational travel approved by the staff development committee.	34.7	65.3
20. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for published writing approved by the staff development committee.	22.9	71.1
19. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for professional reading approved by the staff development committee.	7.0	93.0

A definite inconsistency between "what is" and "what ought to be" (current practices and attitudes) concerning the methods for earning staff development points is evidenced in these findings:

1. Approximately two-thirds (65.3%) of the respondents reported that teachers in their districts do not receive staff development points for approved educational travel, whereas over three-fourths (77.6%) of the respondents agreed that travel should be considered as a viable method for attaining staff development points.

2. Only 22.9 percent of the respondents reported that teachers in their districts do receive staff development points for published writing, whereas 80.9 percent indicated that teachers should earn points for this method of staff development.

The small percent (31.8%) of respondents who agreed that professional reading should be a means for teachers to earn staff development points may be attributed to the very small percent (7.0%) of school districts that currently allow teachers to earn staff development points by this means.

### Question Three

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding receiving monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question three. The results are reported in Tables XVIII and XIX, and in the discussion which follows.

TABLE XVIII

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHERS'  
ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO TEACHERS RECEIVING MONE-  
TARY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
19. A teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend.	75.1	23.6
14. A teacher should receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	55.8	43.0
5. An allowance should be made for staff development points to apply toward advancement on the salary schedule	60.9	36.5

TABLE XIX

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL  
DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES IN REGARD TO  
TEACHERS RECEIVING MONETARY COMPENSA-  
TION FOR PARTICIPATION IN STAFF  
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
10. A teacher in our district is paid a stipend for presenting a staff development program to other staff members.	25.0	73.2
8. Teachers in our district receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	2.8	97.2
6. Staff development points are allowed to count toward advancement on our salary schedule.	5.6	94.4

Results. Considerable inconsistencies exist between respondents' attitudes and current practices concerning monetary compensation for staff development. These inconsistencies are discussed as follows:

1. Although over three-fourths (75.1%) of the respondents agreed that a teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend, only one-fourth (25.0%) of the responding districts reported that stipends are currently being given for this purpose.

2. A majority of the respondents (55.8%) agreed that teachers should receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year. However, less than three percent of the responding districts currently pay stipends for teachers completing staff development point requirements.

3. Likewise, presently less than six percent of the responding districts allow staff development points to count toward advancement on salary schedules, even though over 60 percent of the respondents agreed with this allowance practice.

#### Question Four

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding individualization and flexibility of staff development programs?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question four. The results are reported in Tables XX and XXI, and in the discussion which follows.

TABLE XX  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHERS'  
 ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO INDIVIDUALIZATION AND  
 FLEXIBILITY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
22. The primary purpose of staff development is to upgrade the teacher's classroom performance.	87.0	11.8
29. The teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence.	97.6	1.5
17. Teachers need to be involved in the developing of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	97.0	2.7
20. Staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.	98.2	1.5

Results. Respondents strongly agreed with factors that contribute to the individualization and flexibility of staff development programs, i.e.,

1. that the primary purpose of staff development is to upgrade the teacher's classroom performance (87.0% agreed);
2. that the teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which will strengthen his/her professional competence (97.6% agreed);

3. that teachers need to be involved in the developing of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs (97.0% agreed); and

4. that staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers (98.2% agreed).

TABLE XXI  
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL  
DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES IN REGARD TO  
INDIVIDUALIZATION AND FLEXIBILITY OF  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
1. A teacher has the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence.	93.1	5.6
3. Staff development programs offered in my district have included activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.	88.9	9.7
9. Teachers in our district have been involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	93.1	5.6

In addition, current practices reported in the survey indicate that existing individualization and flexibility practices of staff development programs are highly consistent with respondents' attitudes, i.e., teachers:

1. do have the opportunity to select staff development activities in 93.1 percent of the responding districts;
2. are offered staff development activities in different areas of interest in 88.9 percent of the responding districts; and
3. are involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs in 93.1 percent of the responding districts.

#### Question Five

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding new teacher orientation?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question five. The results are reported in Tables XXII and XXIII, and in the discussion which follows.

Results. The findings indicate two specific inconsistencies between respondents' attitudes and current practices regarding the inclusion of new teacher orientations within staff development programs:

1. Although 83.6 percent of the respondents agreed that staff development programs should include special orientation activities for the new teacher, only 20.2 percent of the reporting districts currently include new teacher orientations in their present staff development programs.

TABLE XXII  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHERS'  
 ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO NEW TEACHER  
 ORIENTATION

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
23. Staff development programs should include special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	83.6	13.6
1. Orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system are adequate.	66.7	31.9

TABLE XXIII  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL  
 DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES IN REGARD  
 TO NEW TEACHER ORIENTATION

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
5. Staff development programs have included special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	20.2	70.8



2. Over two-thirds of the respondents (66.7%) agreed that current new teacher orientation activities are adequate, while one-third (31.9%) responded that current orientation activities are inadequate.

### Question Six

"What are teachers' attitudes regarding relevancy of staff development programs?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question six. The results are reported in Table XXIV, and in the discussion which follows.

Results. In general, respondents agreed that staff development is relevant for professional growth. Specifically, a high majority of respondents agreed that:

1. most staff development programs seem well planned (89.7% agreed);
2. the real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with professional tasks (95.2% agreed);
3. a motivating staff development activity is one which offers an opportunity to become acquainted with new teaching practices of innovative programs (98.8% agreed);
4. an important way to judge the effectiveness of a staff development program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in the classroom (89.4% agreed); and
5. staff development should relate directly to problems encountered in classroom activities (76.4% agreed).

TABLE XXIV  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHERS'  
 ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO RELEVANCY OF  
 STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree / Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
2. Most staff development programs seem well planned.	89.7	9.7
26. The real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with his professional tasks.	95.2	3.6
28. One of the most motivating staff development activities is one which offers an opportunity to become acquainted with new teaching practices of innovative programs.	98.8	6.4
18. One of the most important ways to judge the effectiveness of a staff development program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in his classroom.	89.4	10.3
9. Staff development should relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom activities.	76.4	23.0
10. Most staff development programs are virtually useless.	13.6	85.5
13. Many staff development activities do not appear relevant to any felt needs of the teacher.	34.3	65.5
7. Most teachers like to attend staff development activities.	46.0	52.7

In addition, a majority of respondents disagreed with the notion that staff development programs are useless (85.5%), and that most staff development activities are not relevant to teachers' expressed needs (65.5% disagreed).

However, the findings indicate a definite split (52.0% disagreed and 46.0% agreed) concerning the statement, "Most teachers like to attend staff development activities."

#### Question Seven

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding scheduling of staff development activities, attendance, and involvement of staff?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question seven. The results are reported in Tables XXV and XXVI, and in the discussion which follows.

Results. The findings indicate a general consistency between respondents' attitudes and current practices regarding release time and required attendance for staff development activities. Specifically, 84.7 percent of the districts surveyed reported that teachers do receive release time to attend staff development programs, which is consistent with the 87.6 percent respondents who agreed that release time should be provided for staff development activities. Also, 72.2 percent of the districts reported that attendance is required at some of their system-wide staff development activities, which is somewhat consistent with the 69.7 percent respondents who agreed that some staff development activities should include required attendance.

TABLE XXV  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL  
 DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES IN REGARD TO  
 SCHEDULING OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT  
 ACTIVITIES, ATTENDANCE, AND  
 INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
4. Teachers have received some released time for attending staff development programs.	84.7	12.5
2. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities has been required of all teachers.	72.2	27.8
13. Our district has used professional staff development consultants (persons from nationally recognized staff development consulting firms) to conduct workshops this year.	56.9	41.7

An interesting result of the findings regarding respondents' attitudes toward scheduling and involvement indicate that, although respondents agree that staff development training seems to be more effective when the total school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity on the same day (70.3% agreed), or that there is a need for more small group activities at staff development meetings (57.6% agreed), more than half of the respondents (56.7%) disagreed with the statement that most staff development activities should be carried on within the school building in which the teacher works. Related to this is the finding that 56.9 percent of the responding districts reported the use of professional staff development

consultants to conduct workshops, while 41.7 percent did not utilize professional consultants.

TABLE XXVI  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHERS'  
 ATTITUDES IN REGARD TO SCHEDULING OF STAFF  
 DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES, ATTENDANCE, AND  
 INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %
Item No.		
27. Teachers should receive some re- lease time for staff development activities.	87.6	11.2
12. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities should be required of all teachers.	69.7	30.0
4. Staff development training seems to be more effective when the total school staff is simultan- eously engaged in a given activ- ity on the same day.	70.3	29.4
15. There is a need for more small group activities at staff devel- opment meetings.	57.6	41.2
11. Most staff development activities should be carried on within the school building in which the teacher works.	42.1	56.7

Question Eight

"What are current practices regarding staff development for administrators?" The SPSS program "Frequencies" was used to analyze question eight. The results are reported in Table XXVII, and in the discussion which follows.

TABLE XXVII  
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL  
DISTRICTS' CURRENT PRACTICES IN REGARD TO  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Current Practices	% Yes	% No
Item No.		
15. Administrators have attended staff development activities along with teachers in our district.	95.8	2.8
12. Staff development programs are planned specifically for administrators as well as teachers in our district.	62.5	37.5

Results. An overwhelming majority of districts (95.8%) reported that administrators attend staff development activities along with teachers.

In addition, a majority (62.5%) of the districts responded that current staff development programs are planned specifically for administrators as well as teachers.

### Question Nine

"What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?" The SPSS program "Condescriptive" was used to analyze question nine. The results are reported in Table XXVIII, and in the discussion which follows.

Results. Both teachers and chairpersons view Item 3 ("Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education") as the number one priority of staff development programs.

Likewise, both teachers and chairpersons are somewhat consistent in ranking Items 16, 17, 33, 20, 29, and 26 as high priorities for staff development programs, i.e., both groups view these statements as essential factors in staff development:

1. teachers should receive points for participation in a graduate course at a university;
2. staff development points should be transferable from one district to another;
3. teachers need to be involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs;
4. staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers;
5. the teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence; and

TABLE XXVIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATING TO ATTITUDES REGARDING  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT, PRIORITIZED ACCORDING TO  
MEAN FOR TEACHERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Priority Ranking		Mean	
	Tchrs.	Chps.	Tchrs.	Chps.
Item No.				
1. Orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system are adequate.	29	28	2.673	2.704
2. Most staff development programs seem well planned.	15	14	3.109	3.209
3. Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education where points are offered.	1	1	3.645	3.570
4. Staff development training seems to be more effective when the total school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity on the same day.	25	22	2.876	3.028
5. An allowance should be made for staff development points to apply toward advancement on the salary schedule.	26	30	2.826	2.586
6. Most staff development programs arise from a study of the needs and problems of teachers.	20	10	3.023	3.292
7. Most teachers like to attend staff development activities.	34	31	2.378	2.486
8. There is adequate evaluation to determine the effects of staff development activities.	31	27	2.519	2.847



TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Priority Ranking		Mean	
	Tchrs.	Chps.	Tchrs.	Chps.
Item No.				
9. Staff development should relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom activities.	21	24	3.016	2.986
10. Most staff development programs are virtually useless.	37	37	1.976	1.556
11. Most staff development activities should be carried on within the school building in which the teacher works.	32	35	2.469	2.214
12. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities should be required of all teachers.	27	25	2.817	2.987
13. Many staff development activities do not appear relevant to any felt needs of the teacher.	33	36	2.399	2.083
14. A teacher should receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	28	33	2.752	2.403
15. There is a need for more small group activities at staff development meetings.	30	29	2.647	2.676
16. A teacher should receive staff development points for participation in a graduate course at a university.	2	4	3.624	3.549
17. Teachers need to be involved in the developing of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	5	2	3.451	3.569

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Priority Ranking		Mean	
	Tchrs.	Chps.	Tchrs.	Chps.
Item No.				
18. One of the most important ways to judge the effectiveness of a staff development program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in his classroom.	11	12	3.230	3.222
19. A teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend.	17	21	3.062	3.029
20. Staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.	6	5	3.436	3.514
21. The requirement that all certified and licensed teachers and administrators accrue at least seventy-five (75) staff development points within a five-year period with at least some points completed each year is a fair and equitable requirement.	14	11	3.129	3.278
22. The primary purpose of staff development is to upgrade the teacher's classroom performance.	16	6	3.090	3.366
23. Staff development programs should include special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	12	17	3.163	3.157
24. The local staff development committee, as mandated by House Bill No. 1706, gives teachers fair representation within its designated membership.	18	9	3.052	3.319

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Priority Ranking		Mean	
	Tchrs.	Chps.	Tchrs.	Chps.
Item No.				
25. A teacher should receive staff development points for research approved by the staff development committee.	13	18	3.160	3.153
26. The real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with his professional tasks.	8	8	3.331	3.320
27. Teachers should receive some released time for staff development activities.	10	16	3.278	3.197
28. One of the most motivating staff development activities is one which offers an opportunity to become acquainted with new teaching practices of innovative programs.	9	13	3.314	3.208
29. The teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence.	4	7	3.545	3.347
30. Staff development requirements by local boards of education for the individual teacher should be stringently enforced as provided for in House Bill No. 1706.	22	20	3.008	3.058
31. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional writing approved by the staff development committee.	19	23	3.051	3.000
32. The objectives of staff development programs in my system are specific.	24	15	2.918	3.208

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Regarding Attitudes	Priority Ranking		Mean	
	Tchrs.	Chps.	Tchrs.	Chps.
Item No.				
33. Staff development points should be transferrable from one district to another when a teacher moves.	3	3	3.594	3.556
34. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional reading.	36	34	2.350	2.261
35. The local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program.	35	32	2.353	2.443
36. A teacher should receive staff development points for approved educational travel.	23	26	2.973	2.900
37. A needs assessment update should be conducted each year to determine interests of teachers in planning staff development activities.	7	19	3.369	3.127

6. the real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with his professional tasks.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

The purpose of this descriptive study was to establish a data base describing current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding staff development programs as mandated by House Bill 1706 for the state of Oklahoma. A sample of certificated staff members from 99 school districts which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council were asked to cooperate and support the study.

This study was designed to obtain data from two elementary and two secondary teachers in addition to the staff development committee chairperson in each of the 99 school districts of the population under study. The descriptive survey method was used for this study. The questionnaire which was mailed to the subjects consisted of three parts. The first part was designed to secure demographic information which included such areas as: sex, age, highest degree held, year last degree was obtained, present grade level taught, year(s) of teaching or administrative experience, and class size. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain teacher attitudes regarding staff development by listing 37 items pertaining to staff development to which teachers were asked to "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." The third part of the questionnaire was designed for staff development committee chairpersons to

answer yes or no to 20 items regarding current practices in staff development within the school district where they worked.

The data analysis involved frequency distributions for the purpose of supplying an actual count and percentage of occurrence for each classification requested using the SPSS program "Frequencies." The SPSS program "Condescriptive" was accessed to generate the means and standard deviation of items included in the attitude scale.

This chapter extends the purpose, to establish a data base, by bringing together the results of the study and the related literature. Conclusions and interpretations of the results are discussed relative to the review of the literature presented in Chapter II. The presentation focuses on the nine research questions posed in the study. Implications of the findings and considerations for further research are also included in the discussion.

#### Review, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Further Research Relative to the Nine Research Questions

The following section will deal with the individual research questions posed in Chapter I. A brief review of the findings will be presented, followed by conclusions and recommendations for further research.

##### Question One.

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development?" The findings reported in Chapter IV indicate that Oklahoma teachers'

attitudes in general are in agreement with the State Department of Education Regulations for staff development concerning teacher representation, use of needs assessments, specification of objectives, transferability of staff development points, the established staff development point requirement, and the enforcement of staff development requirements. Current practices reported in the study also indicate that state-wide efforts regarding staff development regulations are generally consistent with State Department of Education guidelines. This consistency corroborates Zenkes' (1976) findings in Florida schools, where consistency with legislative requirements were evidenced under a state mandated program (see Chapter II).

Two important findings that are upheld by the literature concern the use of needs assessments for staff development programs and fair teacher representation on planning committees for staff development programs. An overwhelming majority of teachers indicated positive attitudes for the inclusion of these two factors in staff development programs, and this same large majority reported that needs assessments and fair teacher representation are currently included in their Oklahoma school districts. The necessity of using needs assessments and including teachers in decisions regarding staff development programs is substantiated in the literature (Mangieri and Williams, 1976; Ingersoll, 1976; Yeatts, 1976) (see Chapter II).

An interesting finding in Question One regarding whether or not the local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program indicates that Oklahoma teachers do not feel that the responsibility should lie with the local school board. This attitude is alluded to



by Goodlad (1972) and Schiffer (1978), who recognized that it is the individual institution and the individuals within the institution rather than the organization that promotes the staff development process.

Therefore, in general, current practices and teachers' attitudes toward staff development in Oklahoma are consistent with State Department of Education Regulations and House Bill 1706 (see Chapter I). A general conclusion regarding Question One is that staff development programs should include appropriate teacher representation and input in planning staff development activities. Oklahoma staff development programs currently do include these factors, as mandated by House Bill 1706. However, the findings indicate that shifting the responsibility for staff development planning from teachers to local school boards would not be well received by teachers in Oklahoma. Thus, House Bill 1706 is meeting the felt needs of Oklahoma teachers by mandating fair teacher representation and input. Implications for changing this portion of the bill are not evidenced by the findings of the study nor the associated literature.

One concern evidenced in the findings that does have implications for further study is the concern of Oklahoma teachers regarding the adequacy of staff development evaluation efforts. Although a majority of districts do employ evaluation techniques, just under one-half of the respondents did not agree that current evaluation practices were adequate. These findings suggest that some consideration be given to examining the types of evaluations that are currently being used in the state for staff development, along with some determination of

whether current evaluation efforts are truly assessing staff development activities. This assessment is left for further study.

### Question Two

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding earning of staff development points?" The findings reported in Chapter IV concerning current practices and teachers' attitudes toward the accumulation of staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education, for participating in graduate university courses, for approved research efforts, for professional writing, and for approved educational travel indicate that Oklahoma teachers favor all of these activities for earning staff development points. Reported current practices are consistent with teachers' attitudes on all of the above activities, with the exception of educational travel and published writing. Less than one-third of the districts responded that teachers are currently attaining staff development points for these two activities. These results are not inconsistent with the literature, since most of the available literature in staff development focuses on in-service or university courses as programs for consideration. Future investigations that explore many types of professional growth activities are needed to enhance this area of concern.

Teachers' attitudes and practices were found to be highly consistent with regard to whether or not teachers should receive points for staff development activities. Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that points should be accumulated for attendance. These results are not inconsistent with Ainsworth's (1976) findings (see Chapter II), since

respondents also indicated great concern for the relevancy of the staff development program relative to attendance (see "Results of Question Six" in Chapter IV).

### Question Three

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding receiving monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities?" The results of the study indicate that there are noteworthy inconsistencies between teachers' attitudes and current practices concerning monetary compensation for staff development in Oklahoma (see Chapter IV). Although a majority of respondents agreed that monetary compensation should be allowed for teachers who present staff development programs for their peers, stipends for teachers who attend staff development activities and salary advancements for the accumulation of staff development points, only a small percentage of the responding districts reported that these methods of compensation were currently being utilized. Literature in this area is scarce, perhaps due to universal educational budget constraints in the United States. However, the available literature does emphasize the use of teachers for peer training or in-house staff development activities as an effective means for promoting professional growth (Gersten, 1979; Raugh, 1978) (see Chapter II).

Because of the scarcity of literature in the area of monetary compensation for staff development, and because of the great need for including this factor in staff development programs as indicated by the respondents in this study, further investigation into the

legislative and financial feasibility of including monetary compensation in staff development programs in Oklahoma is required.

#### Question Four

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding individualization and flexibility of staff development programs?" Results of the study are highly consistent with the literature concerning the individualization and flexibility of staff development programs. The literature clearly suggests that effective staff development programs should support the teacher to make improvements in the classroom (Rubin, 1971), and that teachers must be included in decisions and/or choices regarding staff development activities (Mangieri and McWilliams, 1976; Ingersoll, 1976; Yeatts, 1976) (see Chapter II). The findings indicate that Oklahoma teachers concur with the literature, i.e., an overwhelming majority agreed that staff development programs should be flexible enough to serve individual teachers in upgrading their classroom performance and that teachers should have the opportunity for choice in selecting appropriate staff development activities as well as some involvement in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs. Current practices reported in the study reflect the attitudes listed above. Thus, current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding individualization and flexibility of staff development programs are generally consistent in Oklahoma.

Possible implications of these results for further study would include examining current practices and attitudes toward

individualization and flexibility of staff development programs in private school systems in Oklahoma or in other states' public school systems.

#### Question Five

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding new teacher orientation?" The study assessed current practices and teachers' attitudes concerning the inclusion and adequacy of new teacher orientation within staff development programs. Although a majority of Oklahoma teachers indicated that new teacher orientations should be included in staff development plans, less than a fourth of the responding teachers reported that their districts currently include new teacher orientation efforts in their present staff development programs.

Literature in this area does not focus on the notion of new teacher orientation specifically, but alludes to the concept by describing staff development models that encourage teachers assisting teachers, teacher-administrator teams, and peer support (Gersten, 1979; Rauh, 1978; Fox and Griffin, 1974) (see Chapter II). Thus, Oklahoma teachers' attitudes are consistent with the "helping teacher" concept suggested by the literature.

Inconsistencies found between current practices and teachers' attitudes may be attributed to several factors, such as the sudden decrease in numbers of new teachers hired and the newness of the staff development concept concerning what to include in staff development programs. Future research efforts are needed to more clearly define staff development relative to its specific components.

### Question Six

"What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding relevancy of staff development programs?" Perhaps the most important component of staff development programs that is stressed in the literature is relevancy. The general agreement of writers in this area emphasize that the central goal of staff development programs is to support teachers in the classroom by providing training efforts that are relevant to their needs (Ingersoll, 1976; Jackson, 1971) (see Chapter II). The findings of this study suggest that Oklahoma teachers also consider relevancy to be an essential component of staff development. A majority of current staff development practices in Oklahoma were perceived to contain activities that are relevant to teachers' expressed needs. Oklahoma teachers' positive attitudes toward relevancy also reflected general notions that are consistent with the literature, i.e, staff development programs should provide opportunities for teachers to cope more successfully with professional tasks, to become acquainted with new teaching practices or innovative programs, and to implement results of their training into the classroom.

One inconsistency concerning research question six is evidenced in the results, that is, the general respondents' disagreement with the statement, "Most teachers like to attend staff development activities." This inconsistency does not necessarily contradict the findings that Oklahoma teachers are strongly concerned with relevancy because of the nature of the statement. A plausible explanation is that the item is poorly constructed, since the statement is requiring respondents to "speak for their peers." Revision or deletion of this

item is necessary for further research efforts that include the instrumentation used in this study.

#### Question Seven

"What are current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding scheduling of staff development activities; attendance and involvement of staff?" The literature review focusing on scheduling of staff development activities indicated that short, concentrated workshops were considered to be more effective in terms of usefulness to participants than the one-day workshops (Cronic, cited in Rubin, 1978; Zigarmi, Betz, and Jensen, 1977) (see Chapter II). The results of the study are somewhat inconsistent with the literature, that is, a majority of respondents felt that staff development training is more effective when the total school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity on the same day. However, the notion of total staff involvement may be contributing more to this result than the notion of a one-day workshop. Also, the finding that a majority of Oklahoma teachers prefer that most staff development activities be carried on outside the school building provides additional explanatory information, since the most feasible time limit for all staff simultaneously engaged in staff development activities away from the school building would probably be not more than one day in length.

The findings indicate a general consistency between respondents' attitudes and current practices regarding release time and required attendance for staff development activities. Both are considered by Oklahoma teachers to be positive components of staff development. Although the literature does not clearly define release time and

required attendance as components of staff development, both have been alluded to in particular studies and projects by the general model and implementation of several staff development programs in the United States (see "Approaches to Providing Staff Development Programs for Educators" section in Chapter II).

Because of the diversity of staff development programs across the country, there exists a wide range of alternatives concerning scheduling of staff development activities. Observational studies that will explore scheduling options are needed to determine optimum types of schedules for staff development activities such that proposed practices and perceived attitudes are consistent.

#### Question Eight

"What are current practices regarding staff development for administrators?" The results of the study indicate that school administrators are actively participating in staff development activities in Oklahoma. An overwhelming majority of districts reported that administrators are involved in staff development activities with teachers and that some staff development programs in Oklahoma are planned specifically for administrators as well as teachers. These findings corroborate literature considerations which suggest collaborative efforts between teachers and administrators, using teachers and administrators in teams, and asking teachers and administrators to define what is "good" for the purpose of developing staff development programs that will benefit all school personnel (Johnston and Yeakey, 1977; Fox and Griffin, 1974; Arends, Hersh, and Turner, 1978) (see Chapter II).



Implications of these findings for further research are twofold, that is, further examination and investigation into the interrelationships or possible interdependence between teachers and administrators in planning and implementing staff development programs is implied by the findings. Too, further explanations into types of staff development activities that will benefit administrators specifically are needed.

#### Question Nine

"What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?" Both teachers and chairpersons in Oklahoma assessed the statement, "Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education," as the number one priority of staff development programs. This strong consistency between teachers and chairpersons, as well as the strong emphasis both groups have placed on the statement, may be attributed to the fact that the State Department of Education is a governmental agency involved in implementing staff development as mandated by the State Legislature (by means of House Bill 1706). Therefore, teachers and chairpersons may desire some means (such as points) for accounting or representing their compliance to the governmental agency. This priority one statement is seemingly inconsistent with Ainsworth's (1976) findings that teachers are more concerned with quality in-service presentations than about the possibility of pay or credit for their attendance (see Chapter II). However, a closer examination of the findings for Question Nine reveals that a majority of the items considered to be high priorities by

Oklahoma teachers for staff development programs are concerned with "quality" rather than "credit."

Teachers and chairpersons in Oklahoma indicated these considerations as essential factors in staff development programs:

1. Credit for teachers in terms of points for attending State Department of Education meetings and for participating in graduate courses, as well as transferability of staff development points from one district to another.

2. Involvement and appropriate or fair representation of teachers in the planning and decision making relative to the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.

3. Choice, individuality, and flexibility to enable teachers opportunities to select the kind of staff development activities that are appropriate for enriching each individual's professional growth and that will allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.

4. Relevancy to enable teachers to cope more successfully in the classroom and with other professional tasks.

These four factors are, in general, upheld by the literature. Involvement, Choice, and Relevancy are factors that have been substantiated by previous research efforts (Jackson, 1971; Mangieri and McWilliams, 1976; Ingersoll, 1976; Fox and Griffin, 1974; Brimm and Tollett, 1974; Johnston and Yeakey, 1977; Ainsworth, 1976) (see Chapter II). However, studies are not yet available that have assessed the notion of credit points and/or compensation for staff development efforts.

Thus, one implication of the findings concerning Question Nine is the need for further investigation of staff development programs statewide as well as nationwide to ascertain the existence and/or types of compensation efforts in current staff development practices. Other implications for further research are presented in the next section.

### Summary

This chapter offers a final overview of the investigation and findings. A review of the study was presented in the first section. Implications of the findings and considerations for further research were discussed relative to each of the nine research questions. This summary will summarize the practical and educational implications of the findings by considering all nine research questions simultaneously.

The nine research questions posited in the study can be summarized according to two considerations: (1) consideration of state mandated staff development programs, and (2) consideration of what factors are essential ingredients for staff development programs. Thus, the findings and implications of the study relative to Question One, "What are the current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development?" provide information for the first consideration listed above. Due to the nature of the findings and implications relative to Question Nine, "What do teachers and chairpersons view as priority items with regard to staff development?" and based upon the factors that were generated to answer Question Nine as a result of the study, Question Nine will now encompass Questions Two through Nine and will serve as the

discussion mechanism for the second consideration listed above. Practical and educational implications will be discussed relative to the two summary considerations outlined.

Current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding State Department of Education Regulations for staff development in Oklahoma were found to be highly consistent regarding credit (established staff development point requirement and transferability of staff development points), involvement (fair teacher representation), and choice and relevancy (use of needs assessments, specification of objectives, and meeting the interest and relevancy needs of teachers) as factors that are basic to a state-mandated staff development program. These findings suggest the feasibility of establishing a workable staff development program framework from a legislative mandate. The positive outcomes in terms of consistent attitudes and practices that were found in Oklahoma have positive implications for states that are investigating the state mandate notion.

The four factors that were determined by Oklahoma teachers to be essential ingredients in staff development programs include credit, involvement, choice, and relevancy for teachers. (An interesting observation of these results is that these priority factors coincide with the staff development program components previously mandated by the state.) A summary of the findings of the study relative to these four factors will also summarize the resulting answers to Research Questions Two through Nine.

Credit for teachers in terms of staff development points was considered to be the number one priority of teachers and chairpersons in Oklahoma (see Question Nine discussion in the previous section).

The findings of the study indicate general consistency between Oklahoma teachers' attitudes and current practices concerning methods for obtaining credit or points for staff development (see Question One discussion in the previous section). However, inconsistencies presently exist in Oklahoma between current practices and teachers' attitudes regarding monetary compensation for participation in staff development activities (see Question Two discussion in the previous section). Implications of these findings for school systems initiating staff development programs include establishing some means of credit, acknowledgment, recognition, or commendations with or without monetary compensation.

Involvement and appropriate or fair representation in the planning and decision making for staff development activities was considered to be the next highest priority for staff development programs in Oklahoma (see Question Nine in previous section). Results of the study that were directed toward answering Research Questions Seven and Eight (see discussions in this chapter) summarize the current practices and expressed attitudes of Oklahoma teachers regarding involvement. The findings indicate that the involvement of teachers and administrators in planning as well as participation in activities is a beneficial element for promoting successful staff development activities. The results of this study as well as the literature in this area emphasize the need for school districts to involve teachers and administrators in all aspects of staff development.

Choice, individuality, and flexibility of staff development programs to enable participants the opportunity to select activities to meet their own needs and interests was also listed as a high priority

for staff development programs by Oklahoma teachers (see discussion of Question Nine in the previous section). Results of the study answering Research Question Four indicate that Oklahoma teachers do have choice and individualization in existing staff development programs in the state. Implications for further research in this area include exploring alternatives for increased flexibility in scheduling and providing options for teachers and administrators.

Relevancy of staff development activities was also listed as an essential ingredient for staff development programs (see discussion of Question Nine in the previous section) in Oklahoma. Enabling teachers to cope more successfully in the classroom and to strengthen their professional competence was considered by Oklahoma teachers as well as the related literature to be a basic requirement for all staff development programs (see discussion of Research Questions Four, Five, and Six in the previous section; also in Chapter II).

Thus, Olivero's (1979) suggestion that factors essential for staff development programs must include those elements that are conducive to promoting the personal and professional growth of educators is supported by the results of this study. School systems concerned with establishing staff development programs should consider including these factors: credit, involvement, choice, and relevancy. Future research efforts to further examine these elements are needed to discover optimum factors for promoting highly successful staff development programs.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainsworth, B. A. "Teachers Talk About Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education, XXVII(2), Summer, 1976, pp. 107-109.
- Arends, R., Hersh, R., and Turner, J. "Inservice Education and the Six O'Clock News." Theory Into Practice, XVII(3), June, 1978, pp. 196-204.
- Beegle, C. W. and Edelfelt, R. A., eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Bell, H. H., Jr. and Peightel, J. W. Teacher Centers and Inservice Education. Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.
- Brimm, J. L. and Tollett, D. J. "How Do Teachers Feel About Inservice Education?" Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXXV(3), June, 1978, pp. 521-525.
- Bugher, W. Polling Attitudes of Community on Education. Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980.
- Castetter, W. B. and Heisler, R. S. Developing and Defending a Dissertation Proposal. Philadelphia: Center for Field Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1980.
- Champagne, D. W. "Does Staff Development Do Any Good?" Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXXVII(37), February, 1980, pp. 400-403.
- Dillon, E. A. "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise?" Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXXIV(3), December, 1976, pp. 165-170.
- Drummond, W. "Components of an Effective Inservice Delivery System." National Council of States on Inservice Education, April, 1979, p. 2.
- Edelfelt, R. A. Inservice Education, Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington State College, 1977.
- Ehrenberg, L. M. and Brandt, R. S. "Improved Student Learning: A Necessary Goal of Staff Development." Educational Leadership,

- Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXXIV(3), December, 1976, pp. 156-157.
- Finnegan, H. "Into Thy Hands . . . Staff Development!" Theory Into Practice, XI(4), 1972, pp. 215-224.
- Fox, R. S. and Griffin, D. A. "A New Model for In-Service: When Clients and Resources Cooperate for Growth." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 31(6), March, 1974, pp. 545-547.
- Gersten, L. "Intervisitation: A Process of Growth and Enrichment." Phi Delta Kappan, 60, March, 1979, pp. 532-534.
- Goodlad, J. I. "Staff Development: The League Model." Theory Into Practice, XI(4), 1972, pp. 207-214.
- Graduate College. Thesis Writing Manual, revised. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1979.
- Griffin, G. A. "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Staff-Development Programs." Teacher College Record, 80, September, 1978, pp. 126-129.
- Harris, B. M. "In-Service Growth--the Essential Requirement." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXIV(3), December, 1966, pp. 257-260.
- Harris, B. M., Bessent, W., and McIntyre, K. E. In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Hendee, R. E. "Toward Effective Staff Development Plans and Programs." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XXXIV(3), December, 1976, pp. 163-164.
- Howey, K. R. "Putting In-Service Teacher Education Into Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education, XXVII(2), Summer, 1976, pp. 101-105.
- Howey, K. and Bruce, J. "A Data Base for Future Directions in In-Service Education." Theory Into Practice, XVII(3), June, 1978, pp. 206-211.
- Hughes, C. S. "Staff Development for Building Student Thinking Skills." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 39(1), October, 1981, p. 48.
- Ingersoll, G. M. "Assisting In-Service Training Needs Through Teacher Responses." Journal of Teacher Education, XXVII(2), Summer, 1976, pp. 169-173.



- Johnston, G. S. and Yeakey, C. C. "Administrators' and Teachers' Preferences for Staff Development." Planning and Changing, VIII(4), Winter, 1977, pp. 230-238.
- Kersh, B. Y. Faculty Development for Inservice Education in the Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1978.
- Larson, V. M. "Portland's In-Service Involves All Professional Personnel." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 31(6), March, 1974, pp. 502-505.
- Liddle, W. "Feedback Can Help In-Service Growth." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 31(6), March, 1974, pp. 537-540.
- Mangieri, J. N. and McWilliams, D. R. "Designing an Effective Inservice Program." Journal of Teacher Education, XXVII(2), Summer, 1976, pp. 110-112.
- Mann, D. "The Politics of Inservice." Theory Into Practice, XVII(3), June, 1978, pp. 212-217.
- Moffitt, J. C. In-Service Education for Teachers. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
- Mouley, G. J. The Science of Educational Research. New York: American Book Co., 1963.
- Nadler, L. "Learning From Non-School Staff Development Activities." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 34(3), December, 1976, pp. 201-204.
- Oklahoma Educational Directory. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Education, State Capitol, 1981.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1980.
- Olivero, J. L. "Helping Teachers Grow Professionally." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 34(3), December, 1976, pp. 194-200.
- Rauh, P. S. "Helping Teacher: A Model for Staff Development." Teachers College Record, 80(1), September, 1978, pp. 157-171.
- Rhodes, D. and Hounsell, D., eds. Staff Development for the 1980s: International Perspectives. Normal, Illinois: Illinois State University Foundaton, 1980.
- Rubin, L. J. Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

- Rubin, L. J. The In-Service Education of Teachers: Trends, Processes, and Prescriptions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.
- Rubin, L. J. Perspectives on Preservice and Inservice Education. New York: National Dissemination Center, 1978.
- Sax, G. Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation, 2nd ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1980.
- Schiffer, J. "A Framework for Staff Development." Teachers College Record, 80(1), September, 1978, pp. 4-22.
- Taylor, B. L. "Factors Influencing In-Service Teacher Education Program." Journal of Educational Research, 52(9), May, 1959, pp. 337-338.
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Wood, F. H. and Thompson, S. R. "Guidelines for Better Staff Development." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 37(5), February, 1980, pp. 374-379.
- Yeatts, E. H. "Staff Development: A Teacher-Centered In-Service Design." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 33(6), March, 1976, pp. 417-421.
- Zenke, L. L. "Staff Development in Florida." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 34(3), December, 1976, pp. 177-181.
- Zigarmi, P., Betz, L., and Jensen, D. "Teachers' Preferences in and Perceptions of In-Service Education." Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 34(7), April, 1977, pp. 545-551.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A  
CORRESPONDENCE



## OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SCHOOL RESEARCH COUNCIL

AFFILIATED UNIVERSITIES  
The University of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State University

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
74074

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
Gundersen Hall, Room 309  
Phone 624-7244

April 15, 1982

Dear Superintendent:

The state of Oklahoma does not have a data base of current practices and teachers' attitudes toward staff development programs. Since the implementation of House Bill 1706, a data base is needed in order to effectively revise and improve statewide development efforts.

A study is now being conducted to ascertain current practices and teacher attitudes toward staff development. All member districts of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council are asked to participate in the study. The results of this study will help provide criteria to be used by those desiring to improve staff development efforts within the state. If you desire, results will be made available to you to assist in planning your own staff development program.

Your approval to conduct this study in your district is requested. If you approve of the study, please forward the packet of materials to your staff development committee chairperson. We are asking that the chairperson distribute the questionnaire to a selected sampling of elementary and secondary teachers. These teachers will be asked to complete Part I and II of the questionnaire. Each teacher may complete the questionnaire and return it by mail in the stamped, addressed envelope provided. The estimated time to complete the questionnaire is fifteen to thirty minutes. In addition to completion of Parts I and II, each chairperson is being asked to complete Part III of the questionnaire pertaining to current staff development practices within the district.

All returns will be treated as confidential. Individual responses will not be identified. If you desire a copy of the study when completed, please return the attached card. My sincere thanks to you for consideration given to conducting this study.

Sincerely

*Horace Don Hall*

Horace Don Hall  
Research Associate  
Oklahoma State University

*Kenneth St. Clair*

Kenneth St. Clair  
Professor of Educational  
Administration and Higher Education  
Oklahoma State University



## OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SCHOOL RESEARCH COUNCIL

AFFILIATED UNIVERSITIES  
The University of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State University

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
74074

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
Gundersen Hall, Room 309  
Phone 624-7244

April 15, 1982

Dear Committee Chairperson:

The state of Oklahoma does not have a data base of current practices and teachers' attitudes toward staff development programs. Since the implementation of House Bill 1706, a data base is needed in order to effectively revise and improve statewide staff development efforts.

A study is now being conducted to ascertain current practices and teacher attitudes toward staff development. All member districts of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council are asked to participate in the study. The results of this study will help provide criteria to be used by those desiring to improve staff development efforts within the state. If you desire, results will be made available to you.

The superintendent has forwarded this packet of materials to you for help with the distribution. Please use the procedure outlined on a separate sheet to select the sample. Please distribute the questionnaire at both elementary and secondary level. Each teacher has been provided a separate stamped, addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire. Please see that questionnaires have been completed and returned.

Each committee chairperson is asked to complete Parts I and II of the questionnaire, in addition to Part III, which pertains to current staff development practices within the district. Teachers will complete only Parts I and II.

I realize this requires time which is very important to you at this time of the year. However, it is felt that a study of this type needs to be conducted to help determine the direction of future staff development legislation, and perhaps to help revise existing regulations.

All returns will be treated as confidential and individual responses will not be identified. My sincere thanks to you for your help in conducting this study.

Sincerely,

*Horace Don Hall*

Horace Don Hall  
Research Associate  
Oklahoma State University

*Kenneth St. Clair*

Kenneth St. Clair  
Professor of Educational  
Administration and Higher Education  
Oklahoma State University

710 West Vandever Blvd.  
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma  
April 15, 1982

Dear Teacher:

The attached questionnaire concerned with staff development practices conducted in your school district is part of a statewide study. This project is concerned specifically with determining teachers' attitudes toward staff development practices in our state. You have been selected by your staff development chairperson to participate in this study, and your responses are very important to the completion of the study. The results of this study will help provide criteria to be used by those desiring to improve staff development activities within the state.

We are interested in obtaining your responses because your district's staff development practices and your attitude toward them will contribute to our understanding of the status of staff development in this area. In reporting the results of the study, the names of the participating teachers will not be used. All answers will be kept confidential. The time required for you to complete the questionnaire should be fifteen to thirty minutes.

Please complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we complete analysis of the questionnaire data. We will welcome any comments that you may have concerning any aspect of staff development practices not covered in the questionnaire.

My sincere thanks to you for your help in conducting this study.

Sincerely,

*Horace Don Hall*

Horace Don Hall  
Research Associate  
Oklahoma State University

*Kenneth St. Clair*

Kenneth St. Clair  
Professor of Educational  
Administrative and Higher Education  
Oklahoma State University

Sampling Procedure to be Used by Staff Development  
Chairperson in Distributing Questionnaires

Directions: When selection of schools and teachers is completed please distribute questionnaires to teachers with instructions to complete the questionnaire and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Distribution:

- 1 questionnaire - Staff Development Chairperson
- 2 questionnaires - Elementary Teachers
- 2 questionnaires - Secondary Teachers

Method of Selection of Schools

If there is more than one elementary school in your district, select the second school name from an alphabetized list of schools.

If there is more than one secondary school (Middle School or Junior High School and Senior High School) in your district, select the second school name from an alphabetized list of schools.

Method of Selection of Teachers

From an alphabetized list of all full-time classroom teachers in the elementary school which was selected for the study, choose the fourth and eighth name of teachers to complete the questionnaire.

From an alphabetized list of all full-time classroom teachers in the secondary school which was selected for the study, choose the fourth and eighth name of teachers to complete the questionnaire.



710 W. Vandever Blvd.  
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012

Dear Superintendent:

Recently you received a very important packet of materials approved for distribution by the Oklahoma Public School Research Council. The packet contained questionnaires regarding "Current Practices and Teacher Attitudes Toward Staff Development". If you approved of the study the packet was to be given to the staff development committee chairperson for distribution. I recognize this is a busy time of year. However, the data bank to be established as a result of this study will be important to those planning future staff development activities.

I would appreciate any help you can give in passing along the packet of materials and asking the staff development chairperson to complete the distribution. I hope to receive responses from your district soon so they can be included as part of the study.

Sincerely,

*Horace Don Hall*

Horace Don Hall

O.S.U. Research Associate

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES  
REGARDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS  
AS MANDATED BY HOUSE BILL 1706  
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## PART 1

**DIRECTIONS:** Please enter one check mark for each numbered information statement. When you have finished all of the statements on this questionnaire, please return the forms in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope to Don Hall, 710 West Vandever Blvd., Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012. ALL REPLIES WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.

1. Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
2. Age 21-25 \_\_\_\_\_ 26-45 \_\_\_\_\_ 46-60 \_\_\_\_\_ 61 plus \_\_\_\_\_
3. Highest degree held: Bachelor's \_\_\_\_\_ Master's \_\_\_\_\_ Ed. Spec. \_\_\_\_\_ Doctorate \_\_\_\_\_
4. Year last degree was obtained \_\_\_\_\_
5. Present grade level (s) taught  
Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ Junior High or Middle School \_\_\_\_\_ Senior High \_\_\_\_\_ Adm. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Year (s) of teaching or administrative work at present level. (including current year)  
0-5 \_\_\_\_\_ 6-10 \_\_\_\_\_ 11-15 \_\_\_\_\_ 16-20 \_\_\_\_\_ More than 20 \_\_\_\_\_
7. Year (s) of teaching or administrative experience (not counting this year)  
0-5 \_\_\_\_\_ 6-10 \_\_\_\_\_ 11-15 \_\_\_\_\_ 16-20 \_\_\_\_\_ More than 20 \_\_\_\_\_
8. Year (s) of teaching or administrator at present school. (including current year)  
0-5 \_\_\_\_\_ 6-10 \_\_\_\_\_ 11-15 \_\_\_\_\_ 16-20 \_\_\_\_\_ More than 20 \_\_\_\_\_
9. School enrollment (school building in which you work)  
0-400 \_\_\_\_\_ 400-600 \_\_\_\_\_ 600-800 \_\_\_\_\_ Above 800 \_\_\_\_\_
10. Your class size \_\_\_\_\_ or average class size \_\_\_\_\_
11. Number of staff development points you will have earned within this school year  
0-15 \_\_\_\_\_ 15-30 \_\_\_\_\_ 30-45 \_\_\_\_\_ Above 45 \_\_\_\_\_
12. Does your school district participate in a multi-school district staff development cooperative? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
13. Are you a member of your local staff development committee: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, are you: Chairperson \_\_\_\_\_ Member \_\_\_\_\_
14. Have you presented a staff development program for other educators this year? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
15. If you desire to have a copy of the results of this study, please include your name and address below.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## PART II

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to each of the statements by circling one of the four responses that best describes your attitude toward that specific item. This circling of the response will indicate whether you (SA) strongly agree, (A) agree, (D) disagree, or (SD) strongly disagree with that particular statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system are adequate.	SA	A	D	SD
2. Most staff development programs seem well planned.	SA	A	D	SD
3. Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education where points are offered.	SA	A	D	SD
4. Staff development training seems to be more effective when the total school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity on the same day.	SA	A	D	SD
5. An allowance should be made for staff development points to apply toward advancement on the salary schedule.	SA	A	D	SD
6. Most staff development programs arise from a study of the needs and problems of teachers.	SA	A	D	SD
7. Most teachers like to attend staff development activities.	SA	A	D	SD
8. There is adequate evaluation to determine the effects of staff development activities.	SA	A	D	SD
9. Staff development should relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom activities.	SA	A	D	SD
10. Most staff development programs are virtually useless.	SA	A	D	SD
11. Most staff development activities should be carried on within the school building in which the teacher works.	SA	A	D	SD
12. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities should be required of all teachers.	SA	A	D	SD
13. Many staff development activities do not appear relevant to any felt needs of the teacher.	SA	A	D	SD
14. A teacher should receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	SA	A	D	SD
15. There is a need for more small group activities at staff development meetings.	SA	A	D	SD
16. A teacher should receive staff development points for participation in a graduate course at a university.	SA	A	D	SD
17. Teachers need to be involved in the developing of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	SA	A	D	SD
18. One of the most important ways to judge the effectiveness of a staff development program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in his classroom.	SA	A	D	SD
19. A teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend.	SA	A	D	SD
20. Staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.	SA	A	D	SD

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21. The requirement that all certified and licensed teachers and administrators accrue at least seventh-five (75) staff development points within a five-year period with at least some points completed each year is a fair and equitable requirement.	SA	A	D	SD
22. The primary purpose of staff development is to upgrade the teacher's classroom performance.	SA	A	D	SD
23. Staff development programs should include special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	SA	A	D	SD
24. The local staff development committee, as mandated by House Bill No. 1706, gives teachers fair representation within its designated membership.	SA	A	D	SD
25. A teacher should receive staff development points for research approved by the staff development committee.	SA	A	D	SD
26. The real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with his professional tasks.	SA	A	D	SD
27. Teachers should receive some released time for staff development activities.	SA	A	D	SD
28. One of the most motivating staff development activities is one which offers an opportunity to become acquainted with new teaching practices of innovative programs.	SA	A	D	SD
29. The teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence.	SA	A	D	SD
30. Staff development requirements by local boards of education for the individual teacher should be stringently enforced as provided for in House Bill No. 1706.	SA	A	D	SD
31. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional writing approved by the staff development committee.	SA	A	D	SD
32. The objectives of staff development programs in my system are specific.	SA	A	D	SD
33. Staff development points should be transferrable from one district to another when a teacher moves.	SA	A	D	SD
34. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional reading.	SA	A	D	SD
35. The local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program.	SA	A	D	SD
36. A teacher should receive staff development points for approved educational travel.	SA	A	D	SD
37. A needs assessment update should be conducted each year to determine interests of teachers in planning staff development activities.	SA	A	D	SD

## PART III

DIRECTIONS: For each of the following statements please circle YES or NO as it applies to current practices within the school district where you are employed.

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. A teacher has the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he or she feels will strengthen her/her professional competence.                   | YES | NO |
| 2. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities has been required of all teachers.  | YES | NO |
| 3. Staff development programs offered in my district have included activities which allow for the different interests which exists among individual teachers.                | YES | NO |
| 4. Teachers have received some released time for attending staff development programs.   | YES | NO |
| 5. Staff development programs have included special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.  | YES | NO |
| 6. Staff development points are allowed to count toward advancement on our salary schedule.  | YES | NO |
| 7. Teachers who attend a local staff development workshop complete an evaluation form at the end of the workshop.  | YES | NO |
| 8. Teachers in our district receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.   | YES | NO |
| 9. Teachers in our district have been involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.                         | YES | NO |
| 10. A teacher in our district is paid a stipend for presenting a staff development program to other staff members.   | YES | NO |
| 11. A needs assessment was conducted to determine felt needs of teachers for staff development planning purposes.  | YES | NO |
| 12. Staff development programs are planned specifically for administrators as well as teachers in our district.  | YES | NO |
| 13. Our district has used professional staff development consultants (persons from nationally recognized staff development consulting firms) to conduct workshops this year. | YES | NO |
| 14. Teachers represent a majority of members of our staff development committee.   | YES | NO |
| 15. Administrators have attended staff development activities along with teachers in our district.   | YES | NO |
| 16. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending local or state teacher organization meetings.  | YES | NO |
| 17. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending staff development activities scheduled during the regular teacher workday.                 | YES | NO |
| 18. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for educational travel approved by the staff development committee.                                      | YES | NO |
| 19. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for professional reading approved by the staff development committee.                                    | YES | NO |
| 20. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for published writing approved by the staff development committee.                                       | YES | NO |

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS PER ATTITUDE AND  
CURRENT PRACTICES INSTRUMENTS

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES  
TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS PERTAINING TO TEACHERS'  
ATTITUDES TOWARD STAFF DEVELOPMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS		STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system are adequate.	T	15	5.8	155	60.1	70	27.1	14	5.4	4	1.6
	C	5	6.9	45	62.5	16	22.2	5	6.9	1	1.4
	TC	20	6.1	200	60.6	86	26.1	19	5.8	5	1.5
2. Most staff development programs seem well planned.	T	56	21.7	174	67.4	24	9.3	2	0.8	2	0.8
	C	21	29.2	45	62.5	6	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	77	23.3	219	66.4	30	9.1	2	0.6	2	0.6
3. Teachers should be allowed to count staff development points for attending meetings sponsored by the State Department of Education where points are offered.	T	169	65.5	83	32.2	4	1.6	0	0.0	2	0.8
	C	44	61.1	25	34.7	3	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	213	64.5	108	32.7	7	2.1	0	0.0	2	0.6
4. Staff development training seems to be more effective when the total school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity on the same day.	T	55	21.3	123	47.7	73	28.3	7	2.7	0	0.0
	C	20	27.8	34	47.2	16	22.2	1	1.4	1	1.4
	TC	75	22.7	157	47.6	89	27.0	8	2.4	1	0.3
5. An allowance should be made for staff development points to apply toward advancement on the salary schedule.	T	62	24.0	104	40.3	68	26.4	19	7.4	5	1.9
	C	18	25.0	17	23.6	23	31.9	12	16.7	2	2.8
	TC	80	24.2	121	36.7	91	27.6	31	9.4	7	2.1
6. Most staff development programs arise from a study of the needs and problems of teachers.	T	49	19.0	169	65.5	35	13.6	4	1.6	1	0.4
	C	25	34.7	44	61.1	2	2.8	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	74	22.4	213	64.5	37	11.2	5	1.5	1	0.3
7. Most teachers like to attend staff development activities.	T	4	1.6	109	42.2	120	46.5	21	8.1	4	1.6
	C	2	2.8	37	51.4	27	37.5	6	8.3	0	0.0
	TC	6	1.8	146	44.2	147	44.5	27	8.2	4	1.2
8. There is adequate evaluation to determine the effects of staff development activities.	T	11	4.3	124	48.1	111	43.0	12	4.7	0	0.0
	C	10	13.9	43	59.7	17	23.6	2	2.8	0	0.0
	TC	21	6.4	167	50.6	128	38.8	14	4.2	0	0.0

T - Teacher  
C - Chairperson  
TC- Combined-Teacher and Chairperson



QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS		STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
9. Staff development should relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom activities.	T	64	24.8	138	53.5	48	18.6	6	2.3	2	0.8
	C	23	31.9	27	37.5	20	27.8	2	2.8	0	0.0
	TC	87	26.4	165	50.0	68	20.6	8	2.4	2	0.6
10. Most staff development programs are virtually useless.	T	9	3.5	34	13.2	154	59.7	58	22.5	3	1.2
	C	0	0.0	2	2.8	36	50.0	34	47.2	0	0.0
	TC	9	2.7	36	10.9	190	57.6	92	27.9	3	0.9
11. Most staff development activities should be carried on within the school building in which the teacher works.	T	13	5.0	104	40.3	129	50.0	10	3.9	2	0.8
	C	1	1.4	21	29.2	40	55.6	8	11.1	2	2.8
	TC	14	4.2	125	37.9	169	51.2	18	5.5	4	1.2
12. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities should be required of all teachers.	T	43	16.7	133	51.6	72	27.9	9	3.5	1	0.4
	C	18	25.0	36	50.0	17	23.6	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	61	18.5	169	51.2	89	27.0	10	3.0	1	0.3
13. Many staff development activities do not appear relevant to any felt needs of the teacher.	T	20	7.8	79	30.6	139	53.9	19	7.4	1	0.4
	C	1	1.4	13	18.1	49	68.1	9	12.5	0	0.0
	TC	21	6.4	92	27.9	188	57.0	28	8.5	1	0.3
14. A teacher should receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	T	53	20.5	100	38.8	86	33.3	15	5.8	4	1.6
	C	11	15.3	20	27.8	28	38.9	13	18.1	0	0.0
	TC	64	19.4	120	36.4	114	34.5	28	8.5	4	1.2
15. There is a need for more small group activities at staff development meetings.	T	22	8.5	125	48.4	104	40.3	4	1.6	3	1.2
	C	5	6.9	38	52.8	28	38.9	0	0.0	1	1.4
	TC	27	8.2	163	49.4	132	40.0	4	1.2	4	1.2
16. A teacher should receive staff development points for participation in a graduate course at a university.	T	176	68.2	73	28.3	3	1.2	6	2.3	0	0.0
	C	41	56.9	29	40.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4
	TC	217	65.8	102	30.9	3	0.9	7	2.1	1	0.3

T - Teacher  
C - Chairperson  
TC- Combined-Teacher and Chairperson

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS		STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
17. Teachers need to be involved in the developing of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	T	127	49.2	121	46.9	7	2.7	2	0.8	1	0.4
	C	41	56.9	31	43.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	168	50.9	152	46.1	7	2.1	2	0.6	1	0.3
18. One of the most important ways to judge the effectiveness of a staff development program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in his classroom.	T	90	34.9	139	53.9	25	9.7	3	1.2	1	0.4
	C	22	30.6	44	61.1	6	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	112	33.9	183	55.5	31	9.4	3	0.9	1	0.3
19. A teacher who presents a staff development program to other staff members should be paid a stipend.	T	79	30.6	118	45.7	55	21.3	4	1.6	2	0.8
	C	23	31.9	28	38.9	17	23.6	2	2.8	2	2.8
	TC	102	30.9	146	44.2	72	21.8	6	1.8	4	1.2
20. Staff development programs should include activities which allow for the different interests which exist among individual teachers.	T	118	45.7	134	51.9	4	1.6	1	0.4	1	0.4
	C	37	51.4	35	48.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	155	47.0	169	51.2	4	1.2	1	0.3	1	0.3
21. The requirement that all certified and licensed teachers and administrators accrue at least seventy-five (75) staff development points within in a five-year period with at least some points completed each year is a fair and equitable requirement.	T	75	29.1	148	57.4	24	9.3	9	3.5	2	0.8
	C	28	38.9	38	52.8	4	5.6	2	2.8	0	0.0
	TC	103	31.2	186	56.4	28	8.5	11	3.3	2	0.6
22. The primary purpose of staff development is to upgrade the teacher's classroom performance.	T	70	27.1	149	57.8	25	9.7	11	4.3	3	1.2
	C	32	44.4	36	50.0	0	0.0	3	4.2	1	1.4
	TC	102	30.9	185	56.1	25	7.6	14	4.2	4	1.2
23. Staff development programs should include special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	T	80	31.0	134	51.9	35	13.6	2	0.8	7	2.7
	C	19	26.4	43	59.7	8	11.1	0	0.0	2	2.8
	TC	99	30.0	177	53.6	43	13.0	2	0.6	9	2.7
24. The local staff development committee, as mandated by House Bill No. 1706, gives teachers fair representation within its designated membership.	T	49	19.0	172	66.7	24	9.3	6	2.3	7	2.7
	C	27	37.5	42	58.3	2	2.8	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	76	23.0	214	64.8	26	7.9	7	2.1	7	2.1

T - Teacher  
C - Chairperson  
TC- Combined-Teacher and Chairperson

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS		STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		25. A teacher should receive staff development points for Research approved by the staff development committee.	T	66	25.6	168	65.1	19	7.4	3	1.2
	C	21	29.2	42	58.3	8	11.1	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	87	26.4	210	63.6	27	8.2	4	1.2	2	0.6
26. The real test of a staff development program is whether or not it helps the teacher cope more successfully with his professional tasks.	T	95	36.8	150	58.1	7	2.7	2	0.8	4	1.6
	C	27	37.5	42	58.3	2	2.8	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	122	37.0	192	58.2	9	2.7	3	0.9	4	1.2
27. Teachers should receive some released time for staff development activities.	T	105	40.7	121	46.9	24	9.3	5	1.9	3	1.2
	C	22	30.6	41	56.9	8	11.1	0	0.0	1	1.4
	TC	127	38.5	162	49.1	32	9.7	5	1.5	4	1.2
28. One of the most motivating staff development activities is one which offers an opportunity to become acquainted with new teaching practices of innovative programs.	T	97	37.6	142	55.0	15	5.8	1	0.4	3	1.2
	C	20	27.8	47	65.3	5	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	117	35.5	189	57.3	20	6.1	1	0.3	3	0.9
29. The teacher should have the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he/she will strengthen his/her professional competence.	T	143	55.4	108	41.9	4	1.6	0	0.0	3	1.2
	C	26	36.1	45	62.5	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	169	51.2	153	46.4	5	1.5	0	0.0	3	0.9
30. Staff development requirements by local boards of education for the individual teacher should be stringently enforced as provided for in House Bill No. 1706.	T	54	20.9	149	57.8	36	14.0	8	3.1	11	4.3
	C	20	27.8	36	50.0	10	13.9	3	4.2	3	4.2
	TC	74	22.4	185	56.1	46	13.9	11	3.3	14	4.2
31. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional writing approved by the staff development committee.	T	61	23.6	150	58.1	42	16.3	3	1.2	2	0.8
	C	18	25.0	38	52.8	14	19.4	2	2.8	0	0.0
	TC	79	23.9	188	57.0	56	17.0	5	1.5	2	0.6
32. The objectives of staff development programs in my system are specific.	T	33	12.8	169	65.5	52	20.2	1	0.4	3	1.2
	C	22	30.6	43	59.7	7	9.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TC	55	16.7	212	64.2	59	17.9	1	0.3	3	0.9

T - Teacher  
C - Chairperson  
TC- Combined-Teacher and Chairperson

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS		STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
33. Staff development points should be transferrable from one district to another when a teacher moves.	T	155	60.1	98	38.0	3	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.8
	C	43	59.7	27	37.5	1	1.4	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TC	198	60.0	125	37.9	4	1.2	1	0.3	2	0.6
34. A teacher should receive staff development points for professional reading.	T	25	9.7	60	23.3	148	57.4	21	8.1	4	1.6
	C	5	6.9	15	20.8	42	58.3	7	9.7	3	4.2
	TC	30	9.1	75	22.7	190	57.6	28	8.5	7	2.1
35. The local board of education should be responsible for the organization and implementation of the local staff development program.	T	22	8.5	86	33.3	99	38.4	42	16.3	9	3.5
	C	11	15.3	21	29.2	26	36.1	12	16.7	2	2.8
	TC	33	10.0	107	32.4	125	37.9	54	16.4	11	3.3
36. A teacher should receive staff development points for approved educational travel.	T	54	20.9	149	57.8	43	16.7	9	3.5	3	1.2
	C	12	16.7	41	56.9	15	20.8	2	2.8	2	2.8
	TC	66	20.0	190	57.6	58	17.6	11	3.3	5	1.5
37. A needs assessment update should be conducted each year to determine interests of teachers in planning staff development activities.	T	110	42.6	131	50.8	12	4.7	2	0.8	3	1.2
	C	20	27.8	41	56.9	9	12.5	1	1.4	1	1.4
	TC	130	39.4	172	52.1	21	6.4	3	0.9	4	1.2
	T										
	C										
	TC										
	T										
	C										
	TC										
	T										
	C										
	TC										

T - Teacher  
C - Chairperson  
TC- Combined-Teacher and Chairperson

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRPERSONS'  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS PERTAINING TO  
 CURRENT PRACTICES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
 RELATING TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. A teacher has the opportunity to select the kind of staff development activities which he or she feels will strengthen his/her professional competence.	67	93.1	4	5.6	1	1.4
2. Attendance at some system-wide staff development activities has been required of all teachers.	52	72.2	20	27.8	0	0.0
3. Staff development programs offered in my district have included activities which allow for the different interests which exists among individual teachers.	64	88.9	7	9.7	1	1.4
4. Teachers have received some released time for attending staff development programs.	61	84.7	9	12.5	2	2.8
5. Staff development programs have included special orientation activities for the classroom teacher new to our system.	21	20.2	51	70.8	0	0.0
6. Staff development points are allowed to count toward advancement on our salary schedule.	4	5.6	68	94.4	0	0.0
7. Teachers who attend a local staff development workshop complete an evaluation form at the end of the workshop.	62	86.1	9	12.5	1	1.4
8. Teachers in our district receive a stipend for completing local staff development points as required each year.	2	2.8	70	97.2	0	0.0
9. Teachers in our district have been involved in the development of purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for staff development programs.	67	93.1	4	5.6	1	1.4
10. A teacher in our district is paid a stipend for presenting a staff development program to other staff members.	18	25.0	52	73.2	1	1.4
11. A needs assessment was conducted to determine felt needs of teachers for staff development planning purposes.	69	95.8	2	2.8	1	1.4
12. Staff development programs are planned specifically for administrators as well as teachers in our district.	45	62.5	27	37.5	0	0.0
13. Our district has used professional staff development consultants (persons from nationally recognized staff development consulting firms) to conduct workshops this year.	41	56.9	30	41.7	1	1.4
14. Teachers represent a majority of members of our staff development committee.	71	98.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
15. Administrators have attended staff development activities along with teachers in our district.	69	95.8	2	2.8	1	1.4
16. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending local or state teacher organization meetings.	65	90.3	6	8.3	1	1.4

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
	17. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for attending staff development activities scheduled during the regular teacher workday.	59	81.9	13	18.1	0
18. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for educational travel approved by the staff development committee.	25	34.7	47	65.3	0	0.0
19. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for professional reading approved by the staff development committee.	5	7.0	66	93.0	1	1.4
20. Teachers in our district have received staff development points for published writing approved by the staff development committee.	16	22.9	54	71.1	2	2.8

2  
VITA

Horace Don Hall

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES  
REGARDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AS MANDATED BY  
HOUSE BILL 1706 FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Hulbert, Oklahoma, December 14, 1939, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin E. Hall.

Education: Graduated from Hulbert High School, Hulbert, Oklahoma, in May, 1957; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education from Northeastern Oklahoma State University in May, 1961; received the Master of Teaching degree from Northeastern Oklahoma State University in July, 1964, with a major in administration; received the Specialist in Education degree from Emporia State University in May, 1969, with a major in administration; enrolled in doctoral program at Oklahoma State University in 1980; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Teacher, Lincoln Elementary School, Augusta, Kansas, 1961-64; Principal, Robinson Elementary School, Augusta, Kansas, 1964-73; Principal, Oak Crest Elementary School, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, 1974-77; Administrative Assistant for Instruction, Broken Arrow Public Schools, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, 1977-83.