A comparison of perceptions of needs on inservice teacher education by teachers, teacher educators, and local school administrators
by Patrick Clement Cormier

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Montana State University
© Copyright by Patrick Clement Cormier (1981)

Abstract:
The problem of this study was to determine if the three agencies having the most involvement in determining the direction of inservice education of teachers share the same perception of needs for inservice education.

An opinionnaire of generally recognized areas in which teachers could be helped through inservice training was administered to a sample of teachers and local school administrators in Montana and to all teacher educators in the state. The chi-square test for independence was applied to determine if the perceptions of these needs by the three agencies were the same. If the null hypothesis — that the perceptions were the same — was rejected, comparisons were made bivariately using the chi-square test for independence to determine the area of rejection.

Of forty-five statements tested, significant differences were found on twenty. Bivariate comparisons on the rejected statements showed that teachers and administrators had significant differences on four of the statements. Teachers and professors had significant differences on fourteen of the statements. Administrators and professors had signficant differences on fourteen of the statements.

To determine if any one agency saw a clear need for skill training, the investigator selected those items that had the majority of responses in the strongly agree category. Teachers identified six such items. Professors identified sixteen items. Administrators did not identify any items. If, however, items receiving the largest number of responses in the strongly agree category were considered, four areas were identified. They were all student centered concerns dealing with attitude.

The investigator concluded' that general agreement does not exist among the three agencies tested. Bivariate testing demonstrated that teachers and administrators are in general agreement while professors do not agree with teachers or administrators. No clear areas for inservice instruction were identified.

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF NEEDS ON INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION BY TEACHERS, TEACHER EDUCATORS, AND LOCAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

by

PATRICK CLEMENT CORMIER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved:

Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Head, Major Department

Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December, 1981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to express his sincere appreciation to his wife Angie for her patience and support in writing this thesis.

PCC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Vita	ii
	Acknowledgements	iii
	Table of Contents	iv
	List of Tables	vi
	Abstract	xvi
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Purpose of the Study	2
	Need for the Study	2
	Questions to be Answered	5
	Limitations	6
	Definition of Terms	7
	General Procedures	7
	Summary	8
2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	Demand for Teachers	10
	Shifting Emphasis	11
	Criticism of Inservie	13
	Forces for Change in Inservice	15
	Resistance to Change	16
	The Future of Inservice Education	17
	Summary	19
3	PROCEDURES	23
	Description of Population	23
	Method of Collecting Data	24
	Method of Organizing the Data	25
	Null Hypothesis	26
	Analysis of the Data	32
	Summary	34
4	PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	36
5	SUMMARY, ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
	Summary	89
	Analysis	91
	Conclusions	99
	Recommendations	100

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.	103
	APPENDICES.	108
	Appendix A - Opinionnaire From National Center for the Development of Training Materials in Teacher Education	109
	Appendix B - Permission Letter to Use Opinionnaire	113
	Appendix C - Opinionnaire Used in the Study.	114
	Appendix D - Letter of Explanation to Accompany Opinionnaire	118

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Diagnosing Basic Learning Difficulties.	36
2	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructing and Using Tests for Evaluating Academic Progress (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators). . . .	36
3	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructing and Using Tests for Evaluating Academic Progress (Professors and Administrators)	37
4	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructing and Using Tests for Evaluating Academic Progress (Teachers and Administrators)	37
5	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructing and Using Tests for Evaluating Academic Progress (Teachers and Professors)	38
6	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Identifying Student Disabilities That Need Referral or Special Remedial Work	38
7	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Identifying Student Attitudes in Order to Better Relate to Problems	39
8	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Establishing Appropriate Performance Standards	39
9	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Involving Students in Self-evaluation (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	40
10	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Involving Students in Self-evaluation (Professors and Administrators)	40

Table		Page
11	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Involving Students in Self-evaluation (Teachers and Administrators)	41
12	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Involving Students in Self-evaluation (Teachers and Professors)	41
13	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Teacher-pupil Verbal Interaction (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	42
14	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Teacher-pupil Verbal Interaction (Professors and Administrators)	42
15	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Teacher-pupil Verbal Interaction (Teachers and Administrators)	43
16	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Teacher-pupil Verbal Interaction (Teachers and Professors)	43
17	There is a Need for Skill Training in Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Intended Outcome (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	44
18	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Intended Outcome (Professors and Administrators)	44
19	There Is a Need for Skill Trining in Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Intended Outcome (Teachers and Administrators). .	45
20	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Intended Outcome (Teachers and Professors). . . .	45

Table		Page
21	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals and Objectives (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	46
22	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals and Objectives (Professors and Administrators)	46
23	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals and Objectives (Teachers and Administrators)	47
24	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals and Objectives (Teachers and Professors)	47
25	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	48
26	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators (Professors and Administrators)	48
27	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators (Teachers and Administrators)	49
28	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators (Teachers and Professors)	49
29	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Creating Useful Remedial Materials	50
30	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Evaluating Instruction/Instructional Design	50
31	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Motivating Students to Learn on Their Own	51

Table		Page
32	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Career Education	51
33	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Keeping Abreast of Developments in Your Own Subject Matter Area	52
34	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	52
35	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction (Professors and Administrators)	53
36	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction (Teachers and Administrators)	53
37	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction (Teachers and Professors)	54
38	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	54
39	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction (Professors and Administrators)	55
40	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction (Teachers and Administrators)	55
41	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction (Teachers and Professors)	56

Table		Page
42	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Using Questioning Procedures That Promote Discussion (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	56
43	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Using Questioning Procedures That Promote Discussion (Professors and Administrators)	57
44	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Using Questioning Procedures That Promote Discussion (Teachers and Administrators)	57
45	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Using Questioning Procedures That Promote Discussion (Teachers and Professors)	58
46	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Sex Education (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	58
47	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Sex Education (Professors and Administrators)	59
48	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Sex Education (Teachers and Administrators)	59
49	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Sex Education (Teachers and Professors)	60
50	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	60
51	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids (Professors and Administrators)	61
52	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids (Teachers and Administrators)	61

Table		Page
53	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids (Teachers and Professors).	62
54	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Gearing Instruction to Problem Solving (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	62
55	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Gearing Instruction to Problem Solving (Professors and Administrators)	63
56	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Gearing Instruction to Problem Solving (Teachers and Administrators)	63
57	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Gearing Instruction to Problem Solving (Teachers and Professors)	64
58	There Is a Need for Skill Training in General Presentation of Information and Directions. . . .	64
59	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Providing for Reinforcement	65
60	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Deciding on Appropriate Pupil Grouping Procedures for Instruction	65
61	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructively Using Evaluation in Helping Student Progress (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators).	66
62	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructively Using Evaluation in Helping Student Progress (Professors and Administrators).	66
63	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Constructively Using Evaluation in Helping Student Progress (Teachers and Administrators).	67

Table		Page
64	There is a Need for Skill Training in Constructively Using Evaluation in Helping Student Progress (Teachers and Professors).	67
65	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Managing Classroom Affairs in Order to Get Maximum Benefit from Supervising, Aids, Tutors, etc.. . .	68
66	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Knowing Where to Refer Student Problems Beyond What Can Be Handled by the Teacher	68
67	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco (Teachers, Professors and Administrators)	69
68	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco (Professors and Administrators)	69
69	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco (Teachers and Administrators)	70
70	There is a Need for Skill Training in Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco (Teachers and Professors). .	70
71	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Useful Methods of Classroom Discipline and When to Use Them	71
72	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Maintaining Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to the Students (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	71
73	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Maintaining Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to the Students (Professors and Administrators). .	72

Table		Page
74	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Maintaining Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to the Students (Teachers and Administrators) . . .	72
75	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Maintaining Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to the Students (Teachers and Professors)	73
76	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Communicating and Interacting With Parents.	73
77	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Counseling and Conferring With Students (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	74
78	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Counseling and Conferring With Students (Professors and Administrators)	74
79	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Counseling and Conferring With Students (Teachers and Administrators)	75
80	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Counseling and Conferring With Students (Teachers and Professors)	75
81	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Involving Others in the School Program.	76
82	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Personal Self-evaluation Method (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	76
83	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Personal Self-evaluation Method (Professors and Administrators)	77
84	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Personal Self-evaluation Method (Teachers and Administrators)	77

Table		Page
85	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Personal Self-evaluation Method (Teachers and Professors)	78
86	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Broad Acceptance of Self (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	78
87	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Broad Acceptance of Self (Professors and Administrators)	79
88	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Broad Acceptance of Self (Teachers and Administrators)	79
89	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Broad Acceptance of Self (Teachers and Professors)	80
90	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Native American History and Culture.	80
91	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing a Capacity of Accepting Others' Feelings.	81
92	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Pupil Self-concept and Worth (Teachers, Professors and Administrators)	81
93	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Pupil Self-concept and Worth (Professors and Administrators)	82
94	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Pupil Self-concept and Worth (Teachers and Administrators)	82
95	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Pupil Self-concept and Worth (Teachers and Professors)	83

Table		Page
96	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Pupil Social Interaction.	83
97	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures to Suit Your Own Strengths (Teachers, Professors, and Administrators)	84
98	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures to Suit Your Own Strengths (Professors and Administrators).	84
99	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures to Suit Your Own Strengths (Teachers and Administrators). .	85
100	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures to Suit Your Own Strengths (Teachers and Professors). . .	85
101	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Facilitating Development of Pupil Responsibility	86
102	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Identifying the Gifted and Talented Students.	86
103	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Stimulating Growth of Pupil Attitudes and Values.	87
104	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Instilling in the Student the Will to Learn on His Own Initiative	87
105	There Is a Need for Skill Training in Teaching Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom . . .	88

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to determine if the three agencies having the most involvement in determining the direction of inservice education of teachers share the same perception of needs for inservice education.

An opinionnaire of generally recognized areas in which teachers could be helped through inservice training was administered to a sample of teachers and local school administrators in Montana and to all teacher educators in the state. The chi-square test for independence was applied to determine if the perceptions of these needs by the three agencies were the same. If the null hypothesis -- that the perceptions were the same -- was rejected, comparisons were made bivariately using the chi-square test for independence to determine the area of rejection.

Of forty-five statements tested, significant differences were found on twenty. Bivariate comparisons on the rejected statements showed that teachers and administrators had significant differences on four of the statements. Teachers and professors had significant differences on fourteen of the statements. Administrators and professors had signficant differences on fourteen of the statements.

To determine if any one agency saw a clear need for skill training, the investigator selected those items that had the majority of responses in the strongly agree category. Teachers identified six such items. Professors identified sixteen items. Administrators did not identify any items. If, however, items receiving the largest number of responses in the strongly agree category were considered, four areas were identified. They were all student centered concerns dealing with attitude.

The investigator concluded that general agreement does not exist among the three agencies tested. Bivariate testing demonstrated that teachers and administrators are in general agreement while professors do not agree with teachers or administrators. No clear areas for inservice instruction were identified.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The primary responsibility for the preservice training of teachers in Montana belongs to the Colleges of Education of the Montana University System. In 1975, 1,111 students completed preparation for teacher certification. In 1974, 341 students received graduate degrees in education (Wright, 1976). The responsibility for inservice teacher education has not been established. Indeed, some see inservice teacher education as "a stepchild of the educational process" with the result that it has received little attention until the educational revolution of the 1960's (Davies, 1975:5). As a result of that revolution, three agencies, and perhaps a fourth, are involved in determining direction for inservice teacher education. They are teacher educators, local school administrators, teachers, and, to a lesser extent, the state departments of education (Letson, 1971).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if the three agencies having the most involvement in determining the direction of inservice education of teachers share the same perception of needs for inservice education. To accomplish this end, it was necessary to determine the perception of needs by teachers, professors and teacher educators.

Then those perceptions were compared to determine if they were independent among the three agencies. The Department of Education was not included in the study because of the lesser extent of its involvement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to collect data that might demonstrate the degree of agreement or disagreement among the agencies involved in inservice teacher education on previously established needs for inservice education. With agreement established among the three agencies, they then might be able to work together to implement programs that might meet these needs. For those items where no agreement existed, the three agencies might be able to examine their differences and hopefully arrive at some common needs. Once these common needs were established, the probability that new programs of an inservice nature being based on these needs is increased.

Need for the Study

In 1976, the Board of Regents of the Montana University System authorized a study of teacher education programs at the individual units of the Montana University System. The purpose of the study was to develop "a more rationally integrated system of higher education in Montana" (Wright, 1976:2). Since teacher education does not end with the granting of a teacher certificate, it is necessary to establish

the role that Colleges of Education should have in inservice teacher education, even when this inservice education is not related to graduate programs but rather to school district programs.

The review of the literature revealed that dissatisfaction is prevalent with the kind of inservice programs that are being conducted in the United States. Most of the criticism comes from the consumers of inservice programs--the teachers. They believe that the programs are not pertinent to the problems that they encounter in the classroom. Most teachers view inservice programs as being mandated from above by administrators who are not interested in what the teacher offers by way of expertise or need. Teachers contend that these programs have no clear purpose and, consequently, are haphazard and ineffective. Further, they see no one agency as being responsible for seeing that objectives, if there are any, are being achieved (Edelfetl, 1973).

Some critics indicated the need for fundamental change in the structure of the entire educational system. The following quotation by Sizer (1973:52) indicated the scope of the change that might be required:

> Thus teacher education must proceed both toward incremental reform, through strong disciplinary training and professional preparation and continual retraining in teacher centers and complexes, and toward comprehensive reform, through systematic inquiry into teaching and learning and through a network of devoted schoolmen and scholars who can create the conditions for fundamental change in the education of children.

Others feared that change in education was not likely. If change did occur, it might be in "the most routine and innocuous ways" (Koerner, 1973:100). Koerner further stated that improvement in education was a political problem that required that those in control of education be dealt with, that their minds be changed, before educational change could take place.

Several factors point to a reduced need for new teachers and a resultant reduction in the enrollment in teacher education programs. The wave of war babies, for the most part, is out of the public school system. Much of the slack was adjusted by reduced student-teacher ratios. However, a declining birthrate will also mean a reduced need for new teachers. The problem might not be too severe for elementary teachers, but almost 93,000 fewer secondary teachers will be needed in the late 1970's than were needed in 1974 (Simon, 1976). Recent projections by Dearman place this figure at 91,000 teachers (Dearman, 1980). No doubt there will be some reduction in force, but normal attrition could account for most of the reduced requirement for teachers. Thus, a reduction in, or even a termination of, some undergraduate programs in education with a resultant shift toward graduate programs or inservice teacher education programs might occur (Hodges, 1975).

Cooperation among the agencies involved in inservice teacher education was shown to have a high payoff in that the effectiveness of such programs was directly proportional to the involvement of the

teachers to be affected (Moody, 1974). In discussing reform at the College of Education, Ohio State University, Cunningham (1973:144) noted that the reform might have been "less dramatic, less focused on genuine needs of those who practiced" had not both teachers and school administrators been involved.

Teacher education in Montana came under careful scrutiny in the Wright study of 1976. The future of education, whether at the undergraduate, graduate, or inservice level, will not be left to chance. It needs to be planned; and the "cornerstone" of educational planning, the tool to open the future to the present, is that of needs assessment (Sipes, 1974:14).

Questions to be Answered

Needs must be agreed upon in order to implement a program of inservice education based upon sound principles of learning theory. This study focused on the perception of needs for inservice teacher education by three separate agencies. Through a comparison of responses, questions which related to those needs were answered. Questions considered were:

1. What do teachers perceive as their needs for inservice education?
2. What do teacher educators perceive as the teacher needs for inservice education?

3. What do school administrators perceive as the teacher needs for inservice education?
4. Are any needs perceived by all three agencies, and, if so, which ones?
5. Are any needs perceived by one agency and not by others and, if so, which ones?
6. Is there general agreement among the three agencies as to the needs for inservice education?

Limitations

This study was limited to the three agencies which were the most involved in inservice teacher education. They were teachers, school administrators, and teacher educators. Each agency was in turn limited to some extent. The teachers in the study were limited to the public school teachers in Montana. The school administrators were limited to the superintendents and principals in the 627 school districts in Montana. The teacher educators were limited to those professionals in the colleges of education who were staff members on the following campuses:

1. The University of Montana, Missoula
2. Montana State University, Bozeman
3. Eastern Montana College, Billings
4. Northern Montana College, Havre

5. Western Montana College, Dillon

Definition of Terms

The definition of terms was adapted from the Dictionary of Education by Good (1973).

Inservice education: Efforts to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of teachers while on the job.

Local school district: The smallest unit within any type of legal hierarchical structure for school organization.

Preservice education: The academic and professional work in college, teachers' college, or university that a person has done before employment as a teacher.

School administrators: Those individuals responsible for managing the schools, here restricted to the superintendent and the principals.

Teacher: A person employed in any official capacity for the purpose of guiding and directing the learning experience of pupils or students in a public educational institution.

Teacher educator: A qualified professional in the college of education responsible for the preparation and inservice training of teachers. For brevity, the term professor is used interchangeably with the term teacher educator.

General Procedures

Three agencies were selected for participation in this study. They

were teachers, teacher educators, and school administrators. Each of the agencies was sampled by the use of an opinionnaire to determine perceptions of the needs for inservice teacher education. These perceptions were compared for independence by the chi-square test for independence.

Summary

Three agencies were involved primarily in determining the direction for inservice teacher education--teachers, teacher educators, and school administrators. The problem of this study was to determine if these three groups perceived the same needs of inservice education. Knowing the results of this study might help to establish cooperation among these three agencies; thus, new programs more likely might be based on perceptions of actual needs. Knowledge that this study produced could reduce effectively the criticism that many teachers have toward inservice education. Reduced enrollments in elementary and secondary schools indicated a reduced demand for teachers and, thus, preservice teacher education. Staff at the colleges of education might shift their attention to graduate programs or to inservice teacher education to offset any decreases in undergraduate programs. This study answered questions about the needs for inservice education as seen by three different agencies. The study was limited to the geographical area of Montana and to the public schools in Montana. The term inservice

was defined to include only professional development of teachers while on the job. Data for the study were collected by using random samples of the agencies involved with the exception of the teacher educators. In this group, the entire population was surveyed. The data were tested to determine if the responses of the three agencies were independent.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Educational institutions in the United States have focused primarily on the preservice training of teachers (Brown, 1975). The objective was to train a sufficient number of teachers to supply the needs of the nation. This objective has been met and a shortage of 625,000 teachers in 1955 has been replaced by a surplus of 500,000 teachers (Brown, 1975). This surplus of teachers will have an effect on the enrollment in teacher education institutions. Simon (1976) predicted that 34,000 fewer teachers would be needed in public elementary and secondary schools by 1984 as compared to previous estimations of the need for teachers for 1976.

Demand for Teachers

In the eight years since 1970, the number of public elementary and secondary students has decreased by 3,000,000. During the same period, the number of teachers has increased by 44,000 (Dearman, 1980). The disparity in these two figures has resulted in reduced student teacher ratios. Since 1970, Montana has experienced a decrease of over 12,000 public elementary and secondary students (Grant, 1980). Although the decline in Montana is slower than the national rate, it roughly follows the national trend.

With fewer students to educate, the demand for teachers will

certainly fall. Projections show a reduction in the requirements for teachers by 91,000 with a decrease of over 4,000,000 students (Dearman, 1980). Trends are already showing in educational institutions. In 1970, 20.4 percent of all bachelor degrees granted were in education. By 1978, 14.8 percent of the bachelor degrees was in education. The projection for 1980 is 13.6 percent (Dearman, 1980). A recent survey of schools, colleges, and departments of education indicates a 12.2 percent decrease in undergraduate programs in education (Zerkel, 1980).

Dearman finds that the oversupply of teachers will continue through 1984. He found the supply of teachers in 1970 to be 136.5 percent of demand and in 1978, his latest figures, 136.7 percent of demand (Dearman, 1980). If the national figures serve as a rough guide for Montana, there will be a similar oversupply of teachers in the state through 1984.

Shifting Emphasis

The composition of the teaching force is expected to remain stable for the next decade and beyond. Several factors point to this stability. The general economic outlook for the immediate future is poor. Proposition 13 in California, proposition 2-1/2 in Massachusetts, and other such mandates by the public throughout the country suggest a retrenchment in public education and not expansion. Furthermore, the achievement of a near zero growth rate in the population of the United States

indicates that there will be fewer school age children to educate (Brown, 1975). This is in addition to the fact that the surge of war babies has largely completed their education in the elementary and secondary schools (Dearman, 1980). Since the alltime high enrollment in 1971 of 46,081,000 students, there has been a decrease of over 3,000,000 students to a total of 42,731,000 in 1978 (Grant, 1980). In 1975, Brown predicted that there would be a decline in the number of students by as much as 25 percent. Current projections for 1984 are for 38,548,000 students in the public elementary and secondary schools (Dearman, 1980). This represents a 16 percent decrease in enrollment over the alltime high in 1971. Brown may have been too pessimistic. From 1971 to 1978 there was a decrease of 7.4 percent with 2.2 percent accounted for in the last two years alone. In Montana, the figures are similar with a 7 percent decrease over the period from 1970 to 1978 (Dearman, 1980).

The result of these trends is likely to be a stable teaching force in the 80's. Indeed, such a prediction was made in 1973 (Howe, 1973). This predicted stability has been called the "aging teacher syndrome" by Corregon (1974). In general, teachers are staying on the same job for longer periods of time. In 1978, male teachers had been on their current job for 6.5 years compared to 4.8 years in 1973. Female teachers had been on their current job for 4.7 years compared to 3.6 years in 1973. The 1973 figure for teachers was the same as for

professional workers whose figures remained unchanged over the same period of time (Dearman, 1980).

The entry level proportion of teachers to the total also points to the stability of teachers. In 1968, 16.4 percent of all teachers was below 25 years of age. By 1978, only 9.8 percent of all teachers was of entry level age. The only age group to expand was the group from 25 to 34 (Dearman, 1980).

If the aging teacher syndrome is a fact, and fewer new teachers enter the profession, stagnation will be the result unless an effort is made to reach the practicing teacher. Indeed, "a massive re-education process is in order" (McCarty, 1973), and the future of teacher education is with inservice education and no with preservice education.

Criticism of Inservice

The present state of inservice education is the subject of a great deal of criticism. Much of this criticism stems from the fact that several agencies conduct inservice programs and that there is no coordination of effort. Thus, no broad scheme exists which can help to establish overall purpose (Edelfelt, 1975). Brown found that inservice programs were modeled after preservice programs and that the main purpose was to extend knowledge rather than to deal with the application of knowledge already gained. Some find preservice lacking, thus shifting additional burden onto an already overburdened inservice system. Howsam (1980) states that efforts on inservice are "...almost

universally inadequate and ineffective..." (1980). Much of the criticism comes from the consumers of inservice programs, the teachers. They feel that the programs have no clear purpose (Edelfelt, 1973). The National Education Association (1973) stated a number of criticisms of inservice education: Programs of inservice are often designed by school officials without input by teachers. Attendance is often required even when these programs are offered beyond the regular school hours. The content is dominated by theory with little attention to practical application. In a time when individualization of instruction is stressed for the classroom, little individualization is used with the teachers themselves. Programs tend to be one-shot propositions with little coordination and no follow-through to determine if the programs have the desired results (NEA, 1973). Both Smith (1980) and Drummond (1980) note that great strides in knowledge have been made in the past 50 years but that the program in teacher education remains basically unchanged. Smith (1980) feels that the burden placed on the schools of education can no longer be solved by simply adding courses or by inservice programs but require a complete retooling of the system.

In his 1981 president's address, Max A Sobel of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics calls for increased funding for continuous inservice education of mathematics teachers. He advocated changes in preservice programs which would place fully trained and certified mathematics teachers in the third grade classroom (Sobel,

1981). These recommendations represent major changes in the sytem of education.

Forces for Change in Inservice

Aside from the criticism of inservice education, a number of other factors indicate that new directions are being explored. One of the prime forces for change in inservice teacher education is that of governance in teacher education (Pomeroy, 1975). Although the colleges of education are still in command, they are being challenged by state agencies and by teacher organizations. Pomeroy noted that by 1975, California and Oregon had teacher dominated boards on the preparation and licensing of teachers which have absolute power to set and administer standards. These forces for change are primarily at the state level and are a result of actions of state legislatures.

Efforts at the national level are also apparent. Two papers published by the NEA (1973) dealing with inservice education--"A Negotiations Strategy" and "A Conference Design"--indicate a broad commitment over the entire country toward teacher involvement in inservice education. According to Luke (1973), matters of inservice should be determined through negotiations. Indeed, an NEA briefing memo states that teachers need a "preeminent voice" in the governance of teacher education (NEA, 1973).

Teachers have actively worked to achieve changes in governance of

teacher education. They have participated in lobbying efforts at state legislatures and have worked for the election of candidates who support strong teacher participation in teacher education. Lobbying at the national level resulted in a cabinet level Department of Education. This was in no small way related to the fact that the NEA endorsed Carter in the 1976 elections. Teachers strongly supported the amendment to the teacher corps act which created a system of teacher centers funded by the federal government. The teacher center bill was extended in 1980.

Resistance to Change

A certain amount of resistance to change can be expected simply because of the nature of change itself, as opposed to the nature of changes being proposed. The greatest resistance to change in the educational system comes from those who have the most to lose, in this case, the colleges of education (Smith, 1980). Generally, the control of the governance of teacher education and inservice education rest with the colleges of education, if not directly, indirectly.

If left to themselves, the colleges of education will probably not overhaul their own programs. Smith cites a number of reasons why this is true. Internal obstacles relate to tenure, absence of common beliefs, lack of educational research of a clincial nature, and self-centered interest of professors. External obstacles to change are

primarily financial in that colleges of education are underfunded and the reward system for professors is directed away from the clinical instructor to the professor involved in the more scholarly work of research (Smith, 1980).

Perhaps the reason there is an absence of common beliefs is because there is an absence of leadership. When educators were asked to name an individual as an educational force, local figures were named over national figures. Often these figures were not people directly involved in education (Lock, 1980). Even now, efforts are being made to dismantle the Department of Education, which is the only visible national leadership in education.

Colleges of education are often involved in change, not of their own schools, but of the public schools. This involvement with the change in public schools is such that they do not have the time for introspection into the need their own schools have for change (Cunningham, 1973).

The Future of Inservice Education

The potential for change in inservice education is almost without limit. It is evident, however, that lack of leadership and introspection has left a void that is subject to outside intervention (Smith, 1980). This, coupled with deteriorating economic conditions and the second recession in 15 months (Byron, 1981), has lead to direct

intervention by the public in the form of statewide referendums. Proposition 13 in California, which started the trend, forced local school districts to increase their share of school funding from 46 percent to 80 percent (Newsnotes, 1980). A similar referendum in Massachusetts was passed in November, 1980 which limits property taxes to 2-1/2 percent of assessed value is likely to have substantial effects on public education and, thus, teacher education. Estimates indicate a large cutback in public school teachers will be necessary because of the referendum with as many as 12,000 positions or 17 percent of the state teachers being terminated. In one local school district, the budget was cut by 15 percent over the previous year. This represents a 20 percent cut when inflation is considered (Bumstead, 1980). According to Zerkel (1981), teacher educators may be too optomistic in their assessment of future enrollments and programs. In a survey of schools, colleges and departments of education, only 16 percent of the respondents saw program reductions as likely even though 22 percent of them experienced program cutbacks in the five years ending in 1980 (Zerkel, 1981).

There are some indications of change in inservice education in a more positive direction. The thirteenth annual Gallop poll conducted during May, 1981, showed that the public supported President Reagan's position of dismantling the Department of Education by a margin of 49 percent to 29 percent. However, a more recent poll released October

20, 1981, indicated that 60 percent of the public now opposes the plan (ABC News - Washington Post, 1981). This may allow the Secretary of Education to become the missing national leader for education. A commission has been appointed by Secretary Bell to investigate all aspects of education in the United States and is to report directly to the Secretary of Education.

Teacher centers received continued federal funding in 1981 in the face of substantial cuts in other social programs along with attempts to terminate teacher center funding. These teacher centers are seen by Curry (1980) as a means to provide the necessary collaboration between teacher training institutions and school systems. Although these programs tend to decentralize graduate programs, they broaden the base of involvement (Bruce, 1976). Thus, teachers are included in program development and, as Cross points out (1981), teachers know their own inservice needs. Further, there is a joint responsibility in establishing programs of preservice and inservice teacher education (Van Fleet, 1975). This joint responsibility is seen to extend beyond the educational community and should include community members in general (Corrigan, 1975).

Summary

The focus of educational institutions in the United States has been to turn out a sufficient number of teachers to supply the needs

of the nation. This objective has been met and a shortage of teachers in 1955 has been translated into a surplus of 5,000,000 teachers in 1975. Although the number of students has decreased, the number of teachers has not.

With fewer students to educate and a surplus of teachers, educational institutions are bound to be affected. Some trends are already developing. The proportion of bachelor degrees in education is decreasing. Schools of education are cutting back in their programs. Similar problems are to be expected in Montana.

The composition of the teaching force is expected to be stable during the 80's. The period of time a teacher has been on the present job is increasing while it is remaining the same for other professionals. The proportion of teachers in the entry level age is decreasing. All of this indicates that fewer new teachers will be entering the profession and that educational institutions will have to redirect their attention to the practicing teacher.

The present state is subject to a great deal of criticism. Much of the criticism is from teachers who feel that they have little to say about inservice but some is from those involved in teacher education. They feel that requirements placed on inservice cannot be met because of an already lacking preservice program.

There are some indications that new directions are in the offing. For one thing, teachers are demanding a share of the governance of

teacher education. In some states, they have been given control of licensing and standards for licensing. Teachers, through the national teachers organizations, have been actively lobbying for legislation favorable to teachers and have supported and helped elect candidates that will support their positions.

There has been resistance to these changes, much by the colleges of education. However, the colleges of education are not likely to change on their own. Resistance to change is both from within, fear of upsetting the status quo, and from outside, primarily in the form of finance. Another reason why change is not likely is because of the absence of common beliefs. This may stem from the fact that there is no one individual who is seen as an educational leader. This lack of leadership has left a void which may be filled by outside intervention.

Current economic conditions have brought about a number of referendums which have forced cutbacks in public elementary and secondary programs in a number of states, thus, affecting both preservice and inservice programs in education. With teachers being let go, there will be fewer teachers returning to inservice programs offered by the colleges of education and there will likely be temporary reductions in the number of programs offered for inservice teachers. Reductions in preservice programs will, however, be greater.

There are some indications of positive direction in inservice education and education in general. The public has, in the recent past,

demonstrated a change in attitude about the Department of Education. A majority of the public now favors the Department. This may give the Secretary of Education the opportunity to become the national leader that education is lacking. In addition, teacher centers, which were slated to be cut, have been funded. It is these centers which might provide a joint responsibility for preservice and inservice education. This shared responsibility could lead to the development of common beliefs in education, an overall purpose in both preservice and in-service education, and, in general, significant improvement in pedagogical education.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

The responsibility for inservice teacher education clearly does not belong to any educational agency. However, three agencies have influenced recent developments in inservice education. They are teachers, professors or teacher educators, and administrators. The problem of this study was to determine the needs for inservice teacher education as perceived by these three agencies and to determine if these needs were independent among the three agencies. The purpose of the study was to provide information which might help to formulate common areas of concern so that new programs in inservice teacher education could be based on these common concerns.

Description of Populations

Three populations were included in this study. They were teachers, professors or teacher educators, and administrators. The teachers in the study consisted of all teachers in Montana in 1978 who were listed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction as holding teaching positions. Professors were teachers in the colleges and schools of education of the units of the Montana University System. Units included were the University of Montana, Montana State University, Eastern Montana College, Northern Montana College, and Western Montana

College. The list of professors was supplied by the respective deans of education in May of 1978. Administrators included in the study were superintendents and principals in the 627 school districts in the state. The list of administrators was compiled from the Montana Educational Directory, 1977-1978, as published by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Montana.

Random samples were collected from the list of teachers and administrators. The entire population of professors received an opinionnaire.

Method of Collecting Data

A written opinionnaire developed by the National Center for the Development of Training Materials in Teacher Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, was used for this study. (See Appendix A.) The opinionnaire which was used widely by the Center had reliability estimates in the low 90's (Ingersoll, undated). Dr. Gary Ingersoll, designer of the instrument, gave permission for its use. (See Appendix B.) The opinionnaire was modified by dropping the undecided response, thus forcing a decision on each statement. Items of local interest were added to the instrument: sex education, career education, mainstreaming, Native American studies, and drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. (See Appendix C.) A letter of explanation accompanied each opinionnaire.

(See Appendix D.)

The opinionnaire was mailed to a random sampling of every thirty-fifth teacher on a list of state teachers. As a consequence, 323 teachers were included in the study. The return included 172 surveys or 53.2 percent. Opinionnaires were mailed to a random sampling of every tenth administrator on the list of administrators; as a result, 99 administrators were included in the study. The return included 64 surveys or 64.6 percent. Opinionnaires were administered to 142 professors. Due to a clerical error, no follow-through was possible. The return included 69 surveys or 48.6 percent.

Method of Organizing the Data

The data from each statement were collected into a 3 x 4 contingency table which represented the response of the teachers, professors, and administrators. The responses for each statement were strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD).

Contingency Table Format

Responses	SA	A	D	SD	Total
Teachers					
Professors					
Administrators					

Critical value X^2 = α =
Computed value X^2 = DF =

For the presentation of the data, the following format was used:

1. The statement as it appeared on the opinionnaire.
2. The contingency table which contained the data from each agency.
3. The comparison statistics including the critical value of chi-square X^2, the computed value of chi-square X^2, alpha α, and the degrees of freedom DF.
4. The null hypothesis and the decision to accept or reject.

If the decision were to reject the null hypothesis, bivariate comparisons through the use of three contingency tables were presented in order to determine the area of rejection.

Null Hypotheses

The independence or association of perceptions on inservice teacher education was established by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress.
3. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that

teachers need skill training in identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work.

4. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to problems.
5. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in establishing appropriate performance standards.
6. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in involving students in self-evaluation.
7. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction.
8. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.
9. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives.
10. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in planning teaching

activities with other teachers or administrators.

11. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in creating useful remedial materials.
12. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in evaluating instruction/ instructional design.
13. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in motivating students to learn on their own.
14. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in career education.
15. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area.
16. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in individualized instruction.
17. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction.
18. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in using questioning

procedures that promote discussion.

19. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in sex education.
20. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids.
21. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in gearing instruction to problem solving.
22. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in general presentation of information and directions.
23. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in providing for reinforcement.
24. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction.
25. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefits from supervising aids, tutors, etc.
26. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that

teachers need skill training in knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher.

27. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in knowing when to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher.
28. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.
29. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.
30. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.
31. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in communicating and interacting with parents.
32. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in counseling and conferring with students.
33. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that

teachers need skill training in involving others in the school program.

34. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a personal self-evaluation method.
35. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self.
36. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in Native American history and culture.
37. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings.
38. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.
39. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil social interaction.
40. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths.

41. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in identifying the gifted and talented students.
42. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
43. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values.
44. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.
45. Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom.

Analysis of the Data

The chi-square test for independence was used to test for areas of significant difference regarding the perception of teachers, professors, and administrators on generally recognized areas in which teachers could be helped through inservice training. The chi-square test is used to determine if differences between observed and theoretical frequencies are significant (Ferguson, 1959). The test was used

in this study to determine if responses by the three agencies were significantly different from theoretical expectations. The level of significance selected for was .05 which means that there is a 5 percent probability of a type I error, finding a difference when one does not in fact exist. Reducing α to .01 increases the probability of not finding a difference when a fairly large difference does exist (Ferguson, 1959).

The degrees of freedom (DF) depend on the number of frequencies which are allowed to vary. Testing the hypothesis among three agencies will result in DF = 6. Bivariate testing will result in DF = 3. However, if the expected frequency is less than 5, it is permissible to combine columns, in this case, strongly disagree with disagree to make the data conform to the X^2 curve (Ferguson, 1959).

The test was applied to each null hypothesis and if it were rejected, was applied bivariately to determine the area of rejection. Computation was accomplished by introducing the data into a TRS 80 computer. The formula used was $X^2 = ((O - E)^2/E)$, where E = expected frequencies and O = observed frequencies (Ferguson, 1959). Manual computation was performed on several items for verification.

To determine if any one agency saw a clear need for skill training, items which had the largest number of responses in the strongly agree scale were examined. Comparisons were made to determine if there were any common needs perceived by all three agencies.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine if the three agencies having the most involvement in determining the direction of inservice education of teachers share the same perception of needs for inservice education. The purpose of the study was to provide information which might help formulate common areas of concern so that new programs in inservice education could be based on these concerns.

The study was conducted in May of 1978 by administering an opinionnaire to teachers, professors, and administrators in Montana. Statements on the opinionnaire pertained to generally recognized areas in which teachers might be helped through inservice training. Responses required the participant to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement. The data were collected into a 3 x 4 contingency table. A null hypothesis was formulated for each statement and was tested using the chi-square test for independence. If the null hypotheses were rejected, the chi-square test for independence was applied bivariately to determine the area of rejection. The level of significance was .05.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Three agencies have influenced recent developments in the field of inservice education. These three agencies--teachers, professors, and administrators--were administered an opinionnaire of generally recognized areas in which teachers could be helped through the medium of inservice training. The purpose of this chapter is to present the analysis of those data which were collected from that opinionnaire.

For the presentation of the data, the following format was used:

1. The statement as it appeared on the opinionnaire.
2. The contingency table which contained the data from each agency.
3. The comparison statistics including the critical value of chi-square X^2, the computed value of chi-square X^2, alpha α, and the degrees of freedom (DF). Combined columns are indicated by including D and SD in parenthesis.
4. The null hypothesis and the decision either to accept or to reject.

If the decision were to reject the null hypothesis, bivariate comparisons which used three contingency tables were presented in order to determine the area of rejection. The previous format was used for

these comparisons.

QUESTION 1: There is a need for skill training in diagnosing basic learning difficulties.

Table 1

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	84	76	(6	)	166
Professors	43	20	(3	1)	67
Administrators	31	33	(4	)	68

Critical value $X^2 = 9.49$ $\alpha = .05$

Computed value $X^2 = 6.81631$ DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in diagnosing basic learning difficulties. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 2: There is a need for skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress.

Table 2

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	96	(31	2)	164
Professors	30	31	(5	1)	67
Administrators	10	47	(9	2)	68

Critical value $X^2 = 9.49$ $\alpha = .05$

Computed value $X^2 = 20.7911$ DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 3

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	30	31	(5	1)	67
Administrators	10	47	(9	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.746 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	96	(31	2)	164
Administrators	10	47	(9	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.35886 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	96	(31	2)	164
Professors	30	31	(5	1)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.0991 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 3: There is a need for skill training in identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work.

Table 6

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	80	77	(10	)	167
Professors	32	33	(2	)	67
Administrators	22	38	(8	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.95524 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 4: There is a need for skill training in identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to problems.

Table 7

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	54	89	(19	)	162
Professors	26	31	(3	2)	62
Administrators	15	44	(7	)	66

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.94048 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to problems. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 5: There is a need for skill training in establishing appropriate performance standards.

Table 8

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	51	84	(23	5)	163
Professors	25	39	(3	)	67
Administrators	15	43	(7	3)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.53918 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in establishing appropriate performance standards. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 6: There is a need for skill training in involving students in self-evaluation.

Table 9

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	45	95	(23	3)	166
Professors	26	35	(4	2)	67
Administrators	11	41	(14	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.257 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professor, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in involving students in self-evaluation. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 10

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	26	35	(4	2)	67
Administrators	11	41	(14	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.0934 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in involving students in self-evaluation. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 11

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	45	95	(23	3)	166
Administrators	11	41	(14	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 4.15018 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in involving students in self-evaluation. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 12

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	45	95	(23	3)	166
Professors	26	35	(4	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.92016 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in involving students in self-evaluation. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 7: There is a need for skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction.

Table 13

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	87	(28	)	165
Professors	30	33	(4	)	67
Administrators	11	45	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 16.2109 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 14

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	30	33	(4	)	67
Administrators	11	47	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 13.8197 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 15

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	87	(28	)	165
Administrators	11	47	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 6.0713 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 16

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	87	(23	)	165
Professors	30	33	(4	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.1856 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in teacher-pupil verbal interaction. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 8: There is a need for skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.

Table 17

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	43	91	(26	4)	164
Professors	34	26	(5	3)	68
Administrators	16	41	(11	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 15.2954 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 18

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	34	26	(5	3)	68
Administrators	16	41	(11	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.3119 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 19

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	43	91	(26	4)	164
Administrators	16	41	(11	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = .453762 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 20

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	43	91	(26	4)	164
Professors	34	26	(5	3)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 - 12.2781 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 9: There is a need for skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives.

Table 21

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	27	99	(32	3)	161
Professors	26	37	(2	2)	67
Administrators	19	37	(10	1)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 17.4125 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 22

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	26	37	(2	2)	67
Administrators	19	37	(10	1)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 4.35556 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 23

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	27	99	(32	3)	161
Administrators	19	37	(10	1)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 4.12441 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 24

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	27	99	(32	3)	161
Professors	26	37	(2	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 17.072 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 10: There is a need for skill training in planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators.

Table 25

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	42	81	(39	3)	165
Professors	22	37	(5	3)	67
Administrators	13	45	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.6642 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 26

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	22	37	(8	)	67
Administrators	13	45	(10	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.20931 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 27

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	42	81	(42	)	165
Administrators	13	45	(10	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.90147 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 28

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	42	81	(42	)	165
Professors	22	37	(8	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.3144 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 11: There is a need for skill training in creating useful remedial materials.

Table 29

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	51	95	(20	)	166
Professors	13	38	(8	2)	66
Administrators	11	47	(8	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.52 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in creating useful remedial materials. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 12: There is a need for skill training in evaluating instruction/instructional design.

Table 30

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	27	103	(31	1)	162
Professors	19	43	(3	2)	67
Administrators	9	44	(12	1)	66

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.29156 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in evaluating instruction/instructional design. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 13: There is a need for skill training in motivating students to learn on their own.

Table 31

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	92	67	(7	1)	167
Professors	38	23	(	)	66
Administrators	31	32	(4	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 6.01799 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in motivating students to learn on their own. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 14: There is a need for skill training in career education.

Table 32

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	36	91	(36	3)	166
Professors	15	40	(9	)	64
Administrators	13	44	(9	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.95408 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in career education. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 15: There is a need for skill training in keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area.

Table 33

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	77	75	(14	1)	167
Professors	36	29	(2	1)	68
Administrators	20	40	(6	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.32295 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 16: There is a need for skill training in selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction.

Table 34

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	86	(28	2)	165
Professors	34	30	(3	1)	68
Administrators	17	38	(12	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.1036 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 35

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	34	30	(3	1)	68
Administrators	17	38	(12	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.3726 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 36

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	86	(28	2)	165
Administrators	17	38	(12	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = .525898 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 37

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	86	(28	2)	165
Professors	34	30	(3	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.1841 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 17: There is a need for skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction.

Table 38

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	44	90	(28	2)	165
Professors	35	25	(7	)	67
Administrators	15	42	(10	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 18.5876 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 39

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	35	25	(7	)	67
Administrators	15	42	(10	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 13.1956 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 40

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	44	90	(28	3)	165
Administrators	15	42	(10	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 1.02895 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 41

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	44	90	(28	3)	165
Professors	35	25	(7	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.029 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in implementing and supervising individualized instruction. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 18: There is a need for skill training in using questioning procedures that promote discussion.

Table 42

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(21	1)	164
Professors	32	29	(6	1)	68
Administrators	14	45	(7	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.5354 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in using questioning procedures that promote discussion. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 43

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	32	29	(6	1)	68
Administrators	14	45	(7	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.7529 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in using questioning procedures that promote discussion. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 44

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(21	1)	164
Administrators	14	45	(7	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.53575 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in using questioning procedures that promote discussion. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 45

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(21	1)	164
Professors	32	29	(6	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.77643 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in using questioning procedures that promote discussion. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 19: There is a need for skill training in sex education.

Table 46

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	37	89	(36	3)	165
Professors	16	33	(12	4)	65
Administrators	1	41	(18	8)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 18.1699 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professor, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in sex education. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 47

Responses	SA	A	D	SD	Total
Professors	16	33	12	4	65
Administrators	1	41	18	8	68

Critical value X^2 = 7.82 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 16.5742 DF = 3

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in sex education. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 48

Responses	SA	A	S	SD	Total
Teachers	37	89	36	3	165
Administrators	1	41	18	8	68

Critical value X^2 = 7.82 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 23.8531 DF = 3

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in sex education. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 49

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	37	89	(36	3)	165
Professors	16	33	(12	4)	65

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = .204194 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in sex education. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 20: There is a need for skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids.

Table 50

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	25	88	(51	1)	165
Professors	19	42	(6	1)	68
Administrators	10	37	(19	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.3095 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 51

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	19	41	(6	1)	68
Administrators	10	37	(19	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.1096 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 52

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	25	88	(51	1)	165
Administrators	10	37	(19	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = .02296 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 53

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	25	88	(51	1)	165
Professors	19	42	(6	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 13.3487 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 21: There is a need for skill training in gearing instruction to problem solving.

Table 54

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	39	104	(21	)	164
Professors	25	27	(2	2)	67
Administrators	12	43	(11	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.5579 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in gearing instruction to problem solving. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 55

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	25	27	(3	2)	67
Administrators	12	43	(11	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.8967 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in gearing insturction in problem solving. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 56

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	39	104	(21	)	164
Administrators	12	43	(11	2)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.12996 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in gearing instruction to problem solving. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 57

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	39	104	(21	)	164
Professors	35	27	(3	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 17.7137 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in gearing instruction to problem solving. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 22: There is a need for skill training in general presentation of information and directions.

Table 58

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	30	82	(40	4)	164
Professors	12	34	(16	3)	65
Administrators	5	46	(14	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.02198 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in general presentation of information and directions. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 23: There is a need for skill training in providing for reinforcement.

Table 59

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	27	99	(31	)	167
Professors	19	41	(5	2)	67
Administrators	12	49	(6	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 8.90888 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in providing for reinforcement. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 24: There is a need for skill training in deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction

Table 60

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	37	84	(43	1)	165
Professors	18	38	(10	1)	67
Administrators	7	45	(12	3)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.30321 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 25: There is a need for skill training in constructively using evaluation in helping student progress.

Table 61

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	93	(23	1)	166
Professors	33	35	(	)	68
Administrators	18	44	(5	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 18.4562 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructively using evaluation in helping student progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 62

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	33	35	(	)	68
Administrators	18	44	(5	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.4371 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructively using evaluation in helping student progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 63

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	93	(23	1)	166
Administrators	18	44	(5	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 1.97197 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in constructively using evaluation in helping student progress. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 64

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	93	(23	1)	166
Professors	33	35	(	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.9896 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in constructively using evaluation in helping student progress. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTIONS 26: There is a need for skill training in managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefit from supervising, aids, tutors, etc.

Table 65

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	54	81	(30	1)	166
Professors	28	34	(4	)	66
Administrators	28	28	(11	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.51852 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefit from supervising, aids, tutors, etc. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 27: There is a need for skill training in knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher.

Table 66

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	64	71	(30	)	165
Professors	24	38	(5	)	67
Administrators	18	40	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 8.65034 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 28: There is a need for skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.

Table 67

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	48	83	(33	2)	166
Professors	16	41	(6	2)	65
Administrators	8	43	(13	3)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.6919 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 68

Responses	SA	A	(d	SD)	Total
Professors	16	41	(8	)	65
Administrators	8	43	(16	)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.35185 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 69

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	48	83	(35	)	166
Administrators	8	43	(16	)	67

Critical value X^2 - 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.68017 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 70

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	48	83	(35	)	166
Professors	16	41	(8	)	65

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.73267 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 29: There is a need for skill training in useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.

Table 71

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	74	74	(17	1)	166
Professors	34	30	(2	)	66
Administrators	26	29	(2	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 6.22818 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in useful methods of classroom disciplines and when to use them. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 30: There is a need for skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.

Table 72

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	70	71	(25	1)	167
Professors	34	32	(2	)	68
Administrators	25	39	(3	)	66

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 14.1438 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 73

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	34	32	(2	)	68
Administrators	25	38	(3	)	65

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.05777 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 74

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	70	71	(25	1)	167
Administrators	25	38	(3	)	66

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.10121 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 75

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	70	71	(25	1)	167
Professors	34	32	(2	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.40837 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 31: There is a need for skill training in communicating and interacting with parents.

Table 76

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	61	79	(26	)	166
Professors	27	36	(3	)	66
Administrators	26	37	(5	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.28995 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in communicating and interacting with parents. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 32: There is a need for skill training in counseling and conferring with students.

Table 77

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(24	)	166
Professors	29	25	(3	)	57
Administrators	19	42	(6	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 11.3747 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in counseling and conferring with students. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 78

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	29	25	(3	)	57
Administrators	19	42	(6	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.08362 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that there is a need for skill training in counseling and conferring with students. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 79

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(24	)	166
Administrators	19	42	(6	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 1.0479 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that there is a need for skill training in counseling and conferring with students. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 80

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	50	92	(24	)	166
Professors	29	25	(3	)	57

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.20411 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that there is a need for skill training in counseling and conferring with students. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 33: There is a need for skill training in involving others in the school program.

Table 81

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	33	88	(41	)	162
Professors	18	37	(8	2)	65
Administrators	10	41	(15	1)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.06641 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in involving others in the school program. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 34: There is a need for skill training in developing a personal self-evaluation method.

Table 82

Responses	SA	A	(S	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	110	(16	5)	166
Professors	31	29	(5	2)	67
Administrators	18	42	(5	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 15.4184 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a personal self-eavluation method. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 83

Responses	SA	A	(S	SD)	Total
Professors	31	29	(5	2)	67
Administrators	18	42	(5	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.82926 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a personal self-evaluation method. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 84

Responses	SA	A	(S	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	110	(16	5)	166
Administrators	18	42	(5	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.97 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = .9997844 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a personal self-evaluation method. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 85

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	110	(16	5)	166
Professors	31	29	(5	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 15,1068 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in developing a personal self-evaluation method. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 35: There is a need for skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self.

Table 86

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	31	98	(30	4)	163
Professors	30	26	(7	3)	66
Administrators	20	32	(13	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 17.4544 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 87

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	30	26	(7	3)	66
Administrators	20	32	(12	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.28736 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 88

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	31	98	(30	4)	163
Administrators	20	32	(13	2)	67

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.84849 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 89

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	31	98	(30	4)	163
Professors	30	26	(7	3)	66

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 16.8496 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in developing a broad acceptance of self. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 36: There is a need for skill training in Native American history and culture.

Table 90

Responses	(SA	A)	D	SD	Total
Teachers	(11	75)	58	22	166
Professors	(7	33)	15	10	67
Administrators	(3	23)	29	11	66

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 7.78346 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers do not need skill training in Native American history and culture. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 37: There is a need for skill training in developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings.

Table 91

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	49	97	(20	1)	167
Professors	27	38	(3	)	68
Administrators	13	45	(9	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.44107 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 38: There is a need for skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.

Table 92

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	67	89	(8	)	164
Professors	36	31	(1	)	68
Administrators	23	37	(7	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 10.5917 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 93

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	36	31	(1	)	68
Administrators	23	37	(8	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 8.83824 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 94

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	67	89	(8	)	164
Administrators	23	37	(8	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.24195 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 95

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	67	89	(8	)	164
Professors	36	31	(1	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.72080 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil self-concept and worth. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 39: There is a need for skill training in facilitating pupil social interaction.

Table 96

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	37	100	(26	)	162
Professors	20	38	(7	1)	66
Administrators	11	45	(11	1)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 4.04181 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating pupil social interaction. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 40: There is a need for skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths.

Table 97

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	25	92	(32	1)	160
Professors	26	33	(3	3)	65
Administrators	9	42	(14	1)	66

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 19.4774 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 98

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Professors	26	33	(3	3)	65
Administrators	9	42	(14	1)	66

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 13.1874 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Professors and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths. The hypothesis is rejected.

Table 99

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	92	(32	1)	160
Administrators	9	42	(14	1)	66

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.02298 DF - 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 100

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	35	92	(32	1)	160
Professors	26	33	(3	3)	65

Critical value X^2 = 5.99 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 9.43994 DF = 2

Null Hypothesis: Teachers and professors agree that teachers need skill training in developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths. The hypothesis is rejected.

QUESTION 41: There is a need for skill training in facilitating development of pupil responsibility.

Table 101

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	82	79	(5	1)	167
Professors	37	29	(	1)	67
Administrators	27	38	(3	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 3.87482 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in facilitating development of pupil responsibility. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 42: There is a need for skill training in identifying the gifted and talented students.

Table 102

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	69	80	(17	1)	167
Professors	33	28	(5	1)	67
Administrators	19	38	(7	3)	67

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 6.4676 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in identifying the gifted and talented students. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 43: There is a need for skill training in stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values.

Table 103

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	77	84	(6	)	167
Professors	29	35	(2	)	66
Administrators	24	40	(4	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 2.8141 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 44: There is a need for skill training in instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.

Table 104

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	99	62	(4	)	165
Professors	42	23	(1	)	67
Administrators	31	26	(1	)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 1.62734 DF = 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative. The hypothesis is accepted.

QUESTION 45: There is a need for skill training in teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom.

Table 105

Responses	SA	A	(D	SD)	Total
Teachers	57	63	(36	9)	165
Professors	24	31	(7	3)	65
Administrators	19	34	(12	3)	68

Critical value X^2 = 9.49 α = .05

Computed value X^2 = 5.78947 DF - 4

Null Hypothesis: Teachers, professors, and administrators agree that teachers need skill training in teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom. The hypothesis is accepted.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary responsibility for preservice training of teachers in Montana belongs to the colleges and schools of education of the Montana University System. The responsibility for inservice teacher education is not clearly defined. Three agencies, and to a lesser extent, a fourth, are involved in determining the direction of inservice teacher education. They are teachers, teacher educators, local school administrators, and to a lesser extent, state departments of education. This study focused on the first three of these agencies.

The review of the literature pointed out the existence of a surplus of teachers and, at the same time, a reduced demand for teachers brought about by declining enrollments in public schools. As a result, individuals presently teaching are expected to hold onto their present positions. Enrollments in undergraduate teacher training programs will probably decline. However, there will be an increased requirement for inservice training of the practicing teacher.

The present state of inservice education is the subject of much criticism by teachers. Teachers believe that inservice programs are mandated from above without their input. They contend that existing

programs do not take advantage of teacher expertise and, in fact, do not have any clear purpose. Criticism from others involved in the training of teachers centers on the demands being made on inservice training and the inadequate training provided in preservice programs. Inservice programs are seen as being haphazard and ineffective.

For these reasons, some critics are looking for fundamental change in the entire structure of the educational system. Others contend that if change does occur, it will be in routine and innocuous ways.

Several factors point to the likelihood of change. The number of school-age children is down. The wave of war babies is, for the most part, out of the public school system. The demand for teachers throughout the country is expected to decrease. No doubt, such a situation will affect some undergraduate programs in education and trends do some reduction in the number of programs being offered.

The problem of this study was to determine if the three agencies most involved in determining the direction of inservice education of teachers share the same perception of needs for inservice education. To this end, the three agencies selected for the study were administered an opinionnaire of previously established areas where teachers might benefit from inservice education. A sampling of teachers and administrators was identified and surveyed in May of 1978. The entire population of professors identified as belonging to the schools or colleges of education of the Montana University System received an

opinionnaire, also in May of 1978. Responses to the opinionnaire were collected into 3 x 4 contingency tables. The chi-square test for independence was used to determine if the perceptions of needs were independent among the three agencies. The value of α was .05 which is common for a study of this type. The degree of freedom was dependent upon the number of frequencies allowed to vary. If the three agencies failed to show agreement, bivariate comparisons were made to determine the area of rejection.

Analysis

The null hypothesis was accepted in twenty-five of the forty-five statements from the opinionnaire. The null hypothesis was rejected in the twenty remaining statements. Rejection did not mean that teachers do not need skill training in the area under question, but rather that the three agencies had differing perceptions as to the degree of need. In fact, the majority of all responses were in the strongly agree or agree scales with the only exception being the item on Native American history and culture.

The null hypothesis was accepted in the following questions:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work.
3. Identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to

problems.

4. Establishing appropriate performance standards.
5. Creating useful remedial materials.
6. Evaluation instruction/instruction related materials.
7. Motivating students to learn on their own.
8. Career education.
9. Keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area.
10. General presentation of information and directions.
11. Providing for reinforcement.
12. Deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction.
13. Managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefit from supervising, aids, tutors, etc.
14. Knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher.
15. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.
16. Communicating and interacting with parents.
17. Involving others in the school program.
18. Native American history and culture.
19. Developing the capacity of accepting others' feelings.

20. Facilitating pupil social interactions.
21. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
22. Identifying the gifted and talented students.
23. Stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values.
24. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.
25. Teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom.

The null hypothesis was rejected in the following questions:

1. Constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress.
2. Involving students in self-evaluation.
3. Teacher-pupil verbal interaction.
4. Deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.
5. Selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives.
6. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction.
7. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators.
8. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction.
9. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion.
10. Sex education.

11. Utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids.
12. Gearing instruction to problem solving.
13. Constructively using evaluation in helping students progress.
14. Drugs, alcohol, tobacco.
15. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.
16. Counseling and conferring with students.
17. Developing a personal self-evaluation method.
18. Developing a broad acceptance of self.
19. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.
20. Developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths.

Bivariate testing demonstrated that teachers and professors agreed on six of the twenty items. They were:

1. Involving students in self-evaluation.
2. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators.
3. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion.
4. Sex education.
5. Drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.

6. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.

Bivariate testing demonstrated that professors and administrators agreed on six of the twenty items. They were:

1. Selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives.
2. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators.
3. Drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.
4. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.
5. Developing a personal self-evaluation method.
6. Developing a broad acceptance of self.

On the other hand, bivariate testing demonstrated that teachers and administrators agreed on all but four of the items. The items that they did not agree on were:

1. Teacher-pupil verbal interaction.
2. Sex education.
3. Drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.
4. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.

In determining if any one agency saw a clear need for skill training, the investigator selected those items that had the largest

number of responses in the strongly agree scale. Using this method, the investigator found that teachers identified six items. They were:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Identifying student disabilities that used referral or special remedial work.
3. Motivating students to learn on their own.
4. Keeping abreast of developments in your own subject area.
5. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
6. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.

Administrators failed to identify any items by placing the largest number of responses in the strongly agree category. One items was rejected by a combined negative response in the majority -- Native American history and culture.

Professors identified sixteen items with the largest number of responses in the strongly agree category. They were:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.
3. Motivating students to learn on their own.
4. Keeping abreast of developments in your own subject area.
5. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction.

6. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction.
7. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion.
8. Gearing instruction to problem solving.
9. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.
10. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.
11. Developing a personal self-evaluation method.
12. Developing a broad acceptance of self.
13. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.
14. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
15. Identifying the gifted and talented students.
16. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.

Since administrators did not identify any of the items as a clear need, no items were commonly identified. However, if the five items receiving the largest number of responses by administrators were considered a clear need, four of these items were identified by the others as a clear need. They were:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Motivating students to learn on their own.
3. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
4. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own

initiative.

These items are primarily student centered concerns.

Teachers were the only agency to select "identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work" as an item of clear need.

Professors identified eleven items which were not selected by teachers or administrators as an item of clear need. They were:

1. Deciding which teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.
2. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction.
3. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction.
4. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion.
5. Gearing instruction to problem solving.
6. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.
7. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.
8. Developing a personal self-evaluation method.
9. Developing a broad acceptance of self.
10. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.
11. Identifying the gifted and talented students.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine if a general agreement existed as to the needs for inservice teacher education among those agencies most involved in inservice teacher training. Examination of the perceptions of needs for inservice teacher education by using the chi-square test for independence revealed that twenty-five areas of agreement were present from a total of forty-five items. Although there was agreement in a majority of the items, it was concluded that a general agreement does not exist among the three agencies. Fully, forty-four percent of the items tested were not agreed upon by the three agencies.

Bivariate comparisons of areas of disagreement revealed that teachers and administrators agreed on sixteen of the items in question. It was, therefore, concluded that teachers and administrators are in general agreement. It is likely that such agreement is the result of the relationship that has developed between teachers and administrators working in a practical setting.

On the other hand, teachers and professors agreed on six items and administrators and professors also agreed on six items. It is, therefore, concluded that professors are not in general agreement with teachers or administrators. This may be a result of the absence of a close working relationship between professors and the others,

particularly in the public school setting, failure of communication, lack of dissemination of research, particularly up-to-date research, and lack of feedback from the public schools.

In selecting items which received the majority response in the strongly agree category as being a clear need for inservice education, the investigator found that no items were selected in common by all three agencies. The conclusion was that no clear areas for inservice instruction were identified. However, if the top five items listed by administrators were considered a "clear need", four of those items were also listed by teachers and professors. They are:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Motivating students to learn on their own.
3. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.
4. Instilling in the students the will to learn on their own initiative.

These items are related in that they are all student centered concerns.

Recommendations

If general agreement does not exist on perceptions of needs for inservice education of teachers, it is not likely that programs of inservice developed by any of the three agencies will be well received by any of the others or that these programs will be effective. The investigator, therefore, recommends that the chairman of the joint

meeting of the Board of Regents and the Board of Public Education call for the establishment and funding of a permanent staff position responsible to the joint board. The responsibility of this staff person, initially, would be to familiarize himself with the responsibility of the two boards so that common concerns could be identified. The primary function of this person would be to investigate these concerns and make recommendations to the joint board. One concern which could be immediately investigated is inservice education of teachers.

Although the focus of this study was on perceptions of needs for inservice education of teachers, an attempt was made to identify clear needs for inservice education. Since no clear needs were identified, the investigator recommends that a study be initiated to determine if there are such needs.

While there was general agreement betwen teachers and administrators, professors did not agree with either. The investigator, therefore, recommends that the colleges of education provide more opportunity for professors to work with teachers and administrators in the public school setting.

Four possible areas were identified for possible inservice programs. Three of the areas were student centered, one teacher centered. The student centered items are:

1. Motivating students to learn on their own.

2. Facilitating developing of pupil responsibility.

3. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative.

The teacher centered item was:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABC. Washington Post Survey. Chilton Research Services. Radnor, Pennsylvania, 1981.

Ainsworth, B.A. Teachers talk about inservice education. Journal of Education, 1976, 27, 107-109.

Brown, F. B. Teacher education and adolescents and the youth subculture. Paper presented at the Office of Education's Regional Conference. Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1975.

Bruce, W. C., and others. Decentralizing graduate education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57, 7.

Bumstead, Richard S. One Massachusetts school system adapts to Proposition 2-1/2. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, 721-725.

Burdin, J. L. Directions in teaching concepts. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 99-100.

Byron, Christopher. Policy - Testing Time. Time, 1981, 118, 68.

Corrigan, D. C. The future: Implications for the preparation of educational personnel. Journal of Teacher Education, 1974, 32, 66-68.

Cross, Ray. Teachers Know Their Own Inservice Needs. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 62, 525.

Cunningham, L. L. Effecting reform in a college of education. In New perspectives on teacher education. ed. D. J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Curry, Lynn. Teacher centers as university/district collaboratives. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 485-87.

Dearman, Nancy D. The Condition of Education, 1980. ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Governing Printing Office, 1980.

Drummond, William H. and Andrews, Theodore E. The influence of federal and state governments on teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, 97.

Edelfelt, R. and Lawrence, G. Inservice education: The state of the art. In Rethinking inservice education. eds. R. A. Edelfelt and

M. Johnson. Washington: National Education Association, 1975.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Good, C. V. (Ed.). Dictionary of education. (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959.

Hodges, L., and Hodges, R. Schools of education and inservice training of teachers. Educational Technology, 1976, 15, 69-70.

Howe, H. Improving teacher education through exposure to reality. In New perspectives on teacher education. ed. D. J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Howey, K. R. Putting inservice teacher education into perspective. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 101-105.

Howsam, Robert B. The Workplace: Does It Hamper Professionalization of Pedagogy? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, 93-96.

Ingersoll, G. M. Assessing inservice training needs through teacher responses. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 169-173.

Ingersoll, G. M. Perceived inservice needs among elementary school teachers. Unpublished paper. Indiana University.

Koerner, J. D. Governance of teacher education. In New Perspectives on teacher education. ed. D. J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Letson, J. W. Inservice training. In Encyclopedia of education, IX. New York: McMillan, 1971.

Lock, Cory R. Who is providing leadership in education today? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 645.

Luke, R. A. Collective bargaining and inservice education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57, 7.

Mangieri, J. N., and McWilliams, D. R. Designing an effective in-service program. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 110-112.

McCarty, D. J. Responsibilities of the dean for reform. In New perspectives on teacher education. ed. D. J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Moody, C. D. (Ed.). A look at the education of teachers: Preservice and inservice. Conference Proceedings, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, 1974.

National Education Association. Inservice instruction. Washington: National Education Association, 1973.

Newsnotes. PDK, 1980, 61, 654.

Pomeroy, E. C. What's going on in teacher education: The view from Washington. Paper presented at the Leadership Training Institute, American Association of Classroom Teachers. Annapolis, Maryland, 1975.

Simon, K. A., and Frankel, M. M. Projection of education statistics to 1984-85. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.

Sipes, D. K. Improving school staffing: An administrator's guide to staff development. AASA executive handbook, series 3. Washington: National Education Association, 1974.

Sizer, T. R. Teacher education for the 1980's. In New perspectives on teacher education. ed. D. J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Smith, B. Orthanel. Pedagogical Education: How About Reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, 87-91.

Sobel, Max A. Recipe for Revival: Recommendations for the Twenty-first Century. Mathematics Teacher, 1981, 74, 485-87.

Van Fleet, A. Florida's teacher education center: A new state policy for Florida Teaching Education. Paper presented at the Florida State Teacher Association Conference. Florida University, Gainesville, Florida, 1975.

Vanderpool, J. A. Relationships between certification and inservice education. In Rethinking inservice education. Eds. R. A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson. Washington: National Education Association, 1975.

Wright, Freeman J. Final Report on Education. A paper presented to the Board of Regents, State of Montana, 1976.

Zerkel, Perry A. and Ralph T. Cyr. Are Teachers Educators Seeing the Future Through Rose-Colored Glasses? Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 62, 524.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OPINIONNAIRE FROM NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

SD - Strongly Disagree D - Disagree U - Undecided A - Agree SA - Strongly Agree

	SD	D	U	A	SA
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAININ IN					
1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties					
2. Constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress					
3. Identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work					
4. Identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to problems					
5. Establishing appropriate performance standards					
6. Involving students in self-evaluation					
7. Teacher-pupil verbal interaction					
8 Deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome					
9. Selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives					
10. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators					
11. Creating useful remedial materials					
12. Evaluating instruction/instructional design					

APPENDIX A (continued)

	SD	D	U	A	SA
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN					
13. Motivating students to learn on their own					
14. Keeping abreast of developments in you own subject matter area					
15. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction					
16. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction					
17. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion					
18. Utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids					
19. Gearing instruction to problem solving					
20. General presentation of information and directions					
21. Providing for reinforcement					
22. Deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction					
23. Constructively using evaluation in helping student progress					
24. Managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefits from supervising, aids, tutors, etc.					

APPENDIX A (continued)

	SD	D	U	A	SA
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN					
25. Knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher					
26. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them					
27. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students					
28. Communicating and interacting with parents					
29. Counseling and conferring with students					
30. Involving others in the school program					
31. Developing a personal self-evaluation method					
32. Developing a broad acceptance of self					
33. Developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings					
34. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth					
35. Facilitating pupil social interaction					
36. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility					
37. Stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values					
38. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative					
39. Developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths					

APPENDIX A (continued)

	SD	D	U	A	SA
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN					
40. Identifying the gifted and talented students					

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION LETTER TO USE OPINIONNAIRE

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
School of Education
2805 East Tenth Street
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

TEL NO 812—337-8927

July 26, 1977

Mr. Patrick C. Cormier
2115 11th St. W.
Billings, Montana 59102

Dear Mr. Cormier:

We'll try again to get this material to you. The reason you didn't get the package was due to an error on our part in addressing the envelope.

I have attached a copy of the revised instrument (Item 33 was removed as not clear after the first administration). Reliability estimates usually run in the low 90's for the instrument and we have used it is Massachusetts, New York, and Indiana. Some others have used it elsewhere.

I wish you well in your pursuit of your degree and if you use the instrument please inform me of your results.

Cordially,

Gary M. Ingersoll, PhD
Associate Professor of Education

GMI/njs

APPENDIX C

OPINIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY

To aid in the interpretation of the data, please provide the following information, if applicable:

POSITION	LEVEL ENDORSEMENT	YEARS EXPERIENCE		SIZE SCHOOL	HIGHEST LEVEL EDUCATION
__Teacher	__Elementary	__0-3	__10-12	__AA	__BA
__Administrator	__Secondary	__4-6	__13-15	__A	__BA+
__College faculty	__Administrative	__7-9	__16+	__B	__MA
				__C	__MA+
					__Doctorate
					__Post-doctorate

SA = strongly agree A = agree D = disagree SA = strongly agree

	SA	A	D	SD
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN				
1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties				
2. Constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress				
3. Identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work				
4. Identifying student attitudes in order to better relate to problems				
5. Establishing appropriate performance standards				
6. Involving students in self-evaluation				
7. Teacher-pupil verbal interaction				
8. Deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome				

APPENDIX C (continued)

	SA	A	D	SD
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN				
9. Selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives				
10. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators				
11. Creating useful remedial materials				
12. Evaluating instruction/instructional design				
13. Motivating students to learn on their own				
14. Career education				
15. Keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area				
16. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction				
17. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction				
18. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion				
19. Sex education				
20. Utilization of audio-visual equipment and other mechanical aids				
21. Gearing instruction to problem solving				
22. General presentation of information and directions				

APPENDIX C (continued)

	SA	A	D	SD
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN				
23. Providing for reinforcement				
24. Deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction				
25. Constructively using evaluation in helping student progress				
26. Managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefit from supervising, aids, tutors, etc.				
27. Knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handed by the teacher				
28. Drugs, alcohol, and tobacco				
29. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them				
30. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students				
31. Communicating and interacting with parents				
32. Counseling and conferring with students				
33. Involving others in the school program				
34. Developing a personal self-evaluation method				
35. Developing a broad acceptance of self				

APPENDIX C (continued)

	SA	A	D	SD
THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN				
36. Native American history and culture				
37. Developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings				
38. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth				
39. Facilitating pupil social interaction				
40. Developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths				
41. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility				
42. Identifying the gifted and talented students				
43. Stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values				
44. Instilling in the student the will to learn on his own initiative				
45. Teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom				

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF EXPLANATION TO ACCOMPANY OPINIONNAIRE

May 1978

Dear Educator,

Inservice education is playing an increasingly important role in teacher education today. The boom of war babies has finished school. The birth rate has declined, so fewer children will be entering schools. Economic conditions point to a tighter hold on tax dollars. All this means that there will be fewer teaching positions and a greater competition for the existing jobs. There is every likelihood that teachers in a position will remain where they are rather than compete for the few jobs.

Inservice education is intended to service teachers in the profession. In order to better understand the present attitudes toward inservice education, I am conducting a study of generally recognized problem areas in which teachers could be helped through inservice training. This study will be included in a dissertation being prepared under the direction of Dr. Douglas Herbster, Chairman of the Graduate Committee, Montana State University.

To get an accurate picture, it is very important that a high percentage of responses be obtained. Your support and cooperation are asked in helping make this study a success. I realize that the demands on your time, particularly at this time of year, are heavy. However, if you would take 10 minutes and answer the enclosed opinionnaire, I will be very grateful.

Your responses will be treated in a confidential and professional manner. No attempt will be made to identify or compare responses of individuals or individual schools. The number appearing on the opinionnaire will be used only in the event that you indicate an interest in obtaining a brief summary of the results, and/or to send you a reminder to return your completed opinionnaire.

Please answer the opinionnaire by marking one of the responses (SA= strongly agree, A=agree, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree) as it applies to the statement, "There is a need for skill training in ... ." Additional information at the top of the opinionnaire should be indicated as it applies.

APPENDIX D (continued)

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for returning the opinionnaire within ten days.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Patrick C. Cormier

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
stks D378.C813@Theses RL
A comparison of perceptions of needs on
3 1762 00118066 8

[redacted]

D378
C813
cop.2

Cormier, P. C.
A comparison of perceptions of needs on inservice teacher...

DATE	ISSUED TO
(5)	[redacted]
2 WEEKS USE	INTERLIBRARY LOAN
2 WEEKS USE	INTERLIBRARY LOAN
2 WEEKS USE	INTERLIBRARY LOAN
2 WEEKS USE	[redacted]
10/9/86 3 WKS USE	INTERLIBRARY
3/3/87 3 WKS USE	INTERLIBR
3 WKS USE	[redacted]

GAYLOP

D378
C813
cop2