

profession. In this area the collaboration of schools and associations is sought.

2. In-service is the responsibility of the employer who may offer it directly, contract to have it offered, or subsidize the individual in his own pursuit of the learning.

3. Continuing education is the responsibility of the individual, but making it possible is a responsibility shared by all interested parties.

To round out our discussion of the definitions of inservice education, let us consider finally the definition used by the committee which prepared the James Report, Teacher Education and Training, in England in 1972:⁽¹⁰⁾

The third cycle (inservice education) comprehends the whole range of activities by which teachers can extend their personal education, develop their professional competence and improve their understanding of educational principles and techniques.

Note that this English definition is comprehensive ("the whole range of activities") rather than restrictive in scope. Further, it recognizes three legitimate purposes: (1) extension of the teacher's personal education (whether or not this contributes to improvement of his performance); and two purposes for instructional improvement, (2) professional competence (academic field or subject matter) and (3) educational principles and techniques. These latter two happen to coincide with the two facets of what Howsam defines as "continuing professional education."

ISSUES RAISED BY THE DEFINITIONS

The purpose of comparing and contrasting various definitions of inservice teacher education is not so much to try to find one that is "correct" or even one that is more widely applicable than the rest. Each one is correct in its own way, and yet none is correct to the exclusion of the others. Obviously, different writers have different purposes in mind. A school administrator, for example, in charge of inservice programs for a district or a school needs a different definition from a university professor proposing new organizational structures for cooperative efforts in teacher education. The real purpose of the comparisons is to show that there are different points of view and to raise the issues implicit in them.

At this point it seems useful to review the definitions presented

above, with a view toward explicating the alternative answers to the questions they raise.

(1) WHEN? This is the one element in the definitions on which there are no substantive differences. The various ways of phrasing "inservice"--"following entry to the profession" (Howsam), "during service" (Hass), "after...certified and employed" (Cogan), or "after receiving... initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice" (Edelfelt and Johnson)--all mean the same thing. The other definitions do not even specify a time element.

(2) WHAT? There are two basic approaches to the scope of inservice education: comprehensive or restrictive. Either everything is included that in any way contributes to the continuing education of teachers (Hass, Edelfelt and Johnson, Harris and Bessent (broad), James Report); or else the range of activities is restricted in some way. The most common definitional restrictions are that the activity be part of a planned, systematic program (Harris and Bessent (narrow), Orrange and Van Ryn) or that the activity consist of either work or study (Cogan).

(3) WHERE? Here again the primary choice is between some restriction and no restriction. Most definitions do not restrict inservice education to any particular locations. Cogan specifies the school and the college as the two proper places for conducting inservice.

(4) BY WHOM? The question of who shall conduct inservice teacher education is one of the central issues in the field. The two extremes found in the definitions above both come from NEA publications: "administrative or supervisory officials" (NEA Research Division) and "a teacher... singly or with other teachers" (Edelfelt and Johnson). Most definitions decline to limit the "change agent" to any specific category of persons, thereby allowing a wide range of possible inservice trainers. This stance reflects the actual situation in inservice education: several different categories of persons do in fact conduct inservice teacher education--teachers themselves, administrators, supervisors, professors, consultants. This issue seems to be a factual one--depending on the circumstances in each situation--and not properly an a priori definitional one.

(5) FOR WHOM? The basic issue here is whether a scheme of inservice education should provide training for classroom teachers only

(Cogan, Edelfelt and Johnson, James Report); for teachers, supervisors, and administrators (Hass/NSSB 1957); or for some other, more broadly defined group. The latter category may be expressed as "educational personnel" (NEA Research Division), "professional staff members" (Harris and Bessent), or "school personnel" (Orange and Van Ryn). A broad definition of the recipients of inservice education is probably useful here, in light of the variety of new roles being explored in teaching, such as in differentiated staffing, team teaching, and the use of paraprofessionals.

(6) THROUGH WHOM? The question of who is responsible (and who pays) for inservice education is another central issue in the field. This issue is to be distinguished from the issue of who conducts inservice education, although the issues are related and the parties involved in the solutions to the two issues may often coincide. This is the political and fiscal issue--who initiates inservice teacher education programs, evaluates them, changes them, controls them? Most of the definitions considered in this paper do not address this question. Orange and Van Ryn include the vague requirement that inservice education "should be publicly supported." Howsam's set of categories here is probably the most useful, allocating the primary responsibilities among the interested parties: "pre-service" to the colleges; "in-service" to the employers (i.e., the schools); and "continuing professional" to the individual teacher. This issue is also among the most complex in inservice education and should perhaps not be settled a priori by a definition.

(7) WHY? The issue of what the purpose of inservice teacher education should be has more divergent answers than any other issue addressed by the definitions. Let us consider the various purposes envisaged:

- (a) "to contribute to improvement on the job" (Hass);
- (b) "to promote professional growth and development"
(NEA Research Division);
- (c) "improvement of professional staff members" (Harris and Bessent (broad));
- (d) "instructional improvement of professional staff members"
(Harris and Bessent (narrow));
- (e) "to increase the competencies--knowledge, skills, and attitudes--needed...in the performance of...assigned responsibilities" (Orange and Van Ryn);

- (f) "special preparation needed by virtue of being assigned to a situation" (Howsam--"in-service education");
- (g) "development of knowledge and skills which were not available at the time of pre-service preparation" (Howsam--"continuing professional education");
- (h) to "extend...personal education" (James Report);
- (i) to "develop...professional competence" (James Report);
- and
- (j) to "improve...understanding of educational principles and techniques" (James Report).

These various purposes can be summarized into three broad categories:

- (A) JOB-ORIENTED: This is education to meet the needs of the specific job situation in which the teacher finds himself. The priorities here are set presumably by the employer. They include--although this is not mentioned in any of the definitions --the specific educational needs of the children being taught. (Purposes (a), (d), (e), (f)).
- (B) PROFESSION-ORIENTED: This is education as a teaching professional, regardless of any specific job assignment. (Purposes (b), (g), (i), (j)).
- (C) PERSON-ORIENTED: This is education for the sake of the teacher as an individual, beyond the requirements of the job or even of the profession. (Purposes (c) and (h)).

Of course the purposes of inservice education and their inclusion in or omission from a definition of "inservice education" will vary according to the writer and his situation--what he needs his definition for.

(8) HOW? The issue of how inservice education should be conducted--what techniques, what media of instruction--has been, appropriately, omitted from the definitions given. The closest approach to the issue is the question-begging reference to "by appropriate means" in the NEA Research Division's paper. This issue is entirely a factual one.

DEFINITIONS AND ISSUES

A comparative analysis of eight definitions of "inservice teacher

education," drawn from various sources in two countries over the span of eighteen years, recapitulates a summary of the major issues today in the field of inservice education. This result is surprising, to this reviewer at least.

One would think that definitions (if not arguments or positions) would tend to converge, or that if they tended to diverge (as they in fact did), they would in any case not provide any hint of the substantive, factual problems in the field. Quite the contrary is true. The results of this analysis--a catalogue of issues and problems--are reproduced rather closely by the literature reviews of collaborative arrangements⁽¹¹⁾ and of the varieties and contexts⁽¹²⁾ of inservice teacher education which follow.

REFERENCE NOTES

- (1) That portion of the teacher's education which precedes his initial certification and employment is known as "preservice teacher education." "Preservice" generally corresponds in fact with college or university preparation for teaching, whereas "inservice" is often treated as a residual category and therefore is used to include everything else in a teacher's education thereafter.
- (2) This is, of course, a working definition. It is not meant to be uniformly precise or valid when applied to every possible variation in teacher preparation practices, such as student teaching or provisional certification.
- (3) C. Glen Hass, "In-service Education Today," Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators: The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, p. 13. Chicago: NSSE, 1957.
- (4) Morris L. Cogan, "Current Issues in the Education of Teachers," Kevin Ryan, ed., Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, p. 220. Chicago: NSSE, 1975.
- (5) Research Division, National Education Association, Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-S1, p. 3. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. ERIC ED 022 728.
- (6) Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, Introduction to Rethinking In-Service Education, p. 5. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- (7) Ben M. Harris and Willard Bessent, In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice, p. 2. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

- (8) Patricia A. Orrange and Mike Van Ryn, "Agency Roles and Responsibilities," Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, eds., Rethinking In-Service Education, p. 47. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- (9) Robert B. Howsam, "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium," John H. Hansen, ed., Governance by Consortium, p. 18. Syracuse: The Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1974.
- (10) Teacher Training and Education: A Report by a Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme, p. 5, para. 2.2. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.
- (11) See section on collaborative arrangements in inservice teacher education, elsewhere in this review.
- (12) See section on the varieties and contexts of inservice teacher education, elsewhere in this review.

OTHER ISSUES IN INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

A REVIEW OF THE REVIEW

This literature review has already raised and discussed the major contemporary issues in inservice teacher education. Definitions analyzed the various ways in which writers have differed in defining the term over the past two decades, and from these differences elicited a series of substantive issues concerning the subject. Varieties examined the full gamut of different activities actually being conducted as inservice teacher education, and suggested a typology of contexts within which to understand them as a whole. Varieties also reviewed the history and current state of the art of research on inservice teacher education. Collaborative Arrangements explored the possible interrelationships of the various entities concerned with inservice education--their interests, their responsibilities, and their limitations. This final section of the literature review will detail several remaining issues that have not been fully treated in the preceding sections.

EVALUATION

Perhaps no other single element in an inservice program is so important as evaluation. One writer has called evaluation "the most powerful tool and most significant variable"⁽¹⁾ in inservice education. Although it is doubtful that evaluation should be considered, strictly speaking, a variable, its importance is nonetheless undeniable. Evaluation is essential both for assessing the degree of success of past inservice programs and for guiding the direction of future programs. In the financial aspect of inservice education, evaluation "serves to give an account of the effectiveness of money spent and to justify future financing of inservice programs."⁽²⁾

Aside from the centrality of evaluation to any scheme of inservice education, the one point on which virtually all the literature agrees is the lack of adequate evaluation systems.⁽³⁾ One writer, who made a compre-

hensive survey of evaluation methods, concluded that there is no systematic, generally applicable method of evaluation yet developed.⁽⁴⁾ Almost all the studies reviewed were purely descriptive.⁽⁵⁾ Among the more common methods currently in use are the following: questionnaire, self-report, behavioral observation, comparative testing of teachers, and comparative testing of pupils.⁽⁶⁾

The problem here is one that strikes deep. First, all the assumptions underlying the purposes of inservice education must be made explicit; so far, they have not been. Once this has been done--the philosophical foundations laid, positing the existence of an agreed-upon, measurable quantity--then the technology of measurement must be developed and refined to the point where it is universally applicable.

INCENTIVES

An issue discussed in the literature almost as much as evaluation is that of incentives (or motivation or rewards). The problem of incentives is not so serious as that of evaluation, for which it is generally agreed that there is no existing solution and little hope for one in the near future. There are already many recognized, traditional methods of motivating teachers to continue their education.⁽⁷⁾ Most of these involve linking salary increments to a certain number of "units" or "credits" for inservice activities, in whatever form the teacher chooses (workshops, college courses, etc.).

The problem with incentives is basically this: inservice education in the past has not been effective enough, and it is going to become much more important in the near future.⁽⁸⁾ New incentive systems, therefore, are going to have to be developed in order for other inservice goals to be accomplished. It is not that the traditional formula (inservice units adding up to increased salary) will have to be discarded, but rather alternative methods of rewards must be added.

The essence of the new approaches to incentives is teacher participation. A major review of studies of inservice programs concluded that those with the best chance of being effective are "those that involve teachers in planning and managing their own professional development activities, pursuing personal and collective objectives, sharing, applying new learnings and receiving feedback."⁽⁹⁾

There are several different ways of structuring teacher participation into inservice programs. One route is through the teacher association. The NEA and the AFT are both advocating that inservice become a subject of collective bargaining and that certain guarantees and limitations concerning inservice be incorporated into the teacher's contract.⁽¹⁰⁾ Another approach is to provide the teacher with time plus resources: either released time during the school week or else a sabbatical leave; and resources in the form of a teacher center or library or other enabling facilities for independent work.

The basic flaw in the traditional incentive scheme is that the means accumulation of inservice work has replaced the end (improved professional performance).

ANCILLARY PROBLEMS

A review of the literature reveals that a considerable amount of thought and effort has been directed toward using inservice teacher education in conjunction with certain other problems in education. This is an interesting phenomenon. These are not problems internal to inservice education itself; these are problems to which inservice education is seen as a possible solution. We choose to call them ancillary problems, as they stand in a dependent relation to inservice education.

Another way of approaching these problems is to consider them as secondary purposes of inservice teacher education. The primary purposes of inservice teacher education have been discussed above: they relate to the job, to the profession, and to the individuality of teachers, and they are generally applicable in any inservice situation. Secondary purposes, on the other hand, are chosen on an ad hoc basis and are applicable only in particular situation within the context of a limited time and location.

Although these problems are not by their nature internal to inservice teacher education, the design of inservice teacher education programs with a view toward solving them does have serious implications for inservice teacher education itself. Several basic questions suggest themselves. What are the proper limits, if any, to the use of inservice teacher education for serving purposes other than its primary ones? To what extent, in the practical realm, can inservice teacher education be stretched to cover other

problem areas in the broader field of education? These questions should be kept in mind during the following brief recapitulation of the major ancillary problems to the solution of which inservice teacher education programs have been addressed.

As the political and social climate of the country changes, inservice education programs are often seen as the primary vehicle for reflecting these changes in the school. The most important historical example of this trend is the use of inservice teacher education to promote desegregation in the schools.⁽¹¹⁾ The trend continues today, although the terminology and the emphases are different. The heavy emphasis on desegregation in the literature of a few years ago has somewhat diminished in the last five years. Emphasis is shifting to "multi-cultural awareness" and teachers are being asked to modify their unconsciously racist attitudes toward minority children.⁽¹²⁾ If, as several studies have suggested,⁽¹⁵⁾ attitude change is the most difficult type of objective to achieve through inservice teacher education, this area will probably continue to receive quite a lot of attention in proportion to results achieved.

The next most important ancillary problem for inservice teacher education is curriculum change. Inservice programs are seen as necessary for installing new developments in the schools--new content in both traditional (e.g., "new math") and innovative (e.g., black history) subject areas, new teaching techniques (e.g., microteaching), and the use of new equipment (e.g., videotape recorders). In addition, there are two countervailing trends in curriculum theory, both of which seek to use inservice teacher education to accomplish their goals. The first is the trend toward systematic instruction, the creation of a national curriculum.⁽¹⁴⁾ The other is the trend toward individualizing curriculum to reflect the current and local needs of the immediate community.⁽¹⁵⁾

Several other ancillary problems deserve mention in passing. The professionalization of teaching is often viewed as dependent upon a strong program of continuing education, comparable to that found in medicine and law, and to that end inservice is indispensable. Various societal problems, such as preventing dropouts,⁽¹⁶⁾ have been addressed through inservice teacher education programs. Finally, the oversupply of both teachers and teacher educators has been sought to be relieved through increased emphasis on and utilization of inservice education.

REFERENCE NOTES

- (1) Paul W. Devore, Variables Affecting Change in Inservice Teacher Education, p. 58. ERIC ED 070 764, 1971.
- (2) Gordon Lawrence, et al., Patterns of Effective Inservice Education, p. 20. Tallahassee: Florida Dept. of Education, 1974.
- (3) See, e.g., Devore, op. cit.; Paul Mohr, Current Research and Development Efforts in Inservice Training and Curriculum Planning for Teacher Education, ERIC ED 083 148, 1971; William G. Ward, A Review of Literature and Research on Inservice Training for Teachers with Emphasis on Vocational and Technical Teachers, ERIC ED 075 244, 1972.
- (4) Lillian M. Wehmeyer, "Evaluation of In-Service Education: A Survey of Methods," California Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 2, no. 2, October 1974, pp. 102-10. ERIC EJ 108 318.
- (5) Ibid.
- (6) Ibid.; Research Division, National Education Association, Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-S1. ERIC ED 022 728, 1966.
- (7) For a thorough discussion of traditional incentives in inservice teacher education see N. Durward Cory, "Incentives Used in Motivating Professional Growth of Teachers." ERIC ED 027 254.
- (8) Roy A. Edelfelt, "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 25, no. 5, Fall 1974, pp. 350-52.
- (9) Lawrence, op. cit., p. 17.
- (10) See, e.g., Robert A. Luke, "Collective Bargaining and Inservice Education, to be published in late spring of 1975 in Phi Delta Kappan."

- (11) See, e.g., Effie N. Bynum, "Desegregation, Preservice and Inservice Training: An Annotated, Targeted Bibliography." ERIC ED 049 350, 1971.
- (12) See, e.g., Erwin Flaxman, "A Selected Bibliography on Teacher Attitudes. IC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged." ERIC 027 357, 1969.
- (13) See, e.g., Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- (14) See, e.g., Malvin G. Vilheme, "Promoting Systematic Instruction Through In-Service Education." ERIC ED 102 129.
- (15) John D. Haas, "Diffusion of Curriculum Products Through Inservice Education." ERIC ED 098 120, 1974.
- (16) Chicago Public Schools, Illinois, "Provisions for Potential Dropouts Through In-Service Education for Teachers." ERIC ED 015 769, 1964.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CORPS RECRUITMENT AND TECHNICAL RESOURCE CENTERS

Western RTR Center
William C. Hill, Director
University of Southern California
311 South Spring
Los Angeles, California 90015
(213) 625-7204

Midwestern RTR Center
Floyd T. Waterman, Director
University of Nebraska
Center for Urban Education
3805 North 16th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68110
(402) 554-2773

Great Lakes RTR Center
Barbara A. Vance, Director
Wayne State University
2978 W. Grand Boulevard, 2nd floor
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 577-1618

Northeastern RTR Center
Donald W. Parker, Director
Howard University
1411 K Street, N.W., Suite 420
Washington, D. C. 20005
(202) 757-7868

Southeastern RTR Center
Michael G. Baker, Director
University of Georgia
557 South Milledge Avenue, Room 209
Athens, Georgia 30601
(404) 542-5862

Chief of Center Operations:

Velma Robinson
Teacher Corps
U.S. Office of Education
100 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
(202) 245-8275

APPENDIX B

PROJECT CONSULTANT INTERVIEWERS

Ursula Anderson	Midwestern RTR Center
Boyd Bagley	Western RTR Center
Michael Baker	Southeastern RTR Center
Wilbert Bledsae	Great Lakes RTR Center
Eric Boyer	Kansas State University,
Elsa Brezina	University of Southern California
Carol Bryant	Wayne County Junior College, Detroit
Roger C. Bryant	Southeastern RTR Center
Donald Butler	Carroll County, Georgia School System
Francis Clemons	Washington, D. C. Public Schools
Earl Collins	New York Teacher Corps Network
Steve Collins	Pasadena Unified School District
Carol Coy	Southeastern RTR Center
Joyce Ellis	Boston Indian Council
Hood Eklund	Reinart College
Paul Fisher	University of Southern California
Eugene George	University of South Carolina
Eileen Goin	University of Seattle
Turner Goodlow	Houston Independent School District
John Green	University of South Alabama
Marilyn Harper	Stanford University
Edith Harrison	Portland COP Project
William C. Hill	Western RTR Center
Willie Hodge	University of Toledo
Janet Hunter	Compton Unified School District
Andrew Johnson	Wayne State University
Bruce Joyce	Stanford University
Mary Kelley	Consultant, Worcester, Mass.
Hal Knight	West Virginia Institute
Margaret Koch	Pasadena Unified School District

Reba Lassiter	Pasadena Unified School District
Billie Lipsey	Detroit Public Schools
Mary Logan	Federal City College
Patricia Matthews	Northeastern RTR Center
Donald Mims	Los Angeles City Schools
Barbara Ogletree	Southeastern RTR Center
Roger Pankratz	Western Kentucky University
Donald Parker	Northeastern RTR Center
Lucy Peck	Hofstra University
Lorenzo Reid	Consultant, Washington, D. C.
Lerry Rice	Stanford University
Joseph Romo	Western RTR Center
Richard Stroup	Costa Mesa School District
Beulah Tumpkin	Consultant, Detroit
Rupert Trujillo	University of New Mexico
Barbara Vance	Great Lakes RTR Center
Susan Vernand	Pasadena Unified School District
Floyd Waterman	Midwestern RTR Center
Doris Wilson	Southeastern RTR Center
James Wilson	Wayne State University
Roger Wilson	Northern Arizona University