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This Note contains a literature review for the first national study of inservice training programs—i.e., programs for staff development—in desegregated school districts. The research is being conducted at The Rand Corporation under sponsorship by the National Institute of Education (Contract 400-78-0068-HEW). It is anticipated that this study will have three distinct uses:

1. It will be useful to federal and state policymakers in determining how program funds for inservice education should be allocated.
2. It will be helpful to school districts in planning desegregation-related inservice programs.
3. It will establish a conceptual basis for further study of the role of inservice education in changing institutional environments.

The review draws together the literature from several different content areas as background for the study: desegregation-related inservice training, current approaches to inservice training in general, school desegregation effects, and the implementation of educational change. The relationship of the available literature to the concepts under consideration in the study is made in Section I of the final report on the study (King et al., forthcoming).

There is no cohesive body of literature on staff development or on the specialized staff development needs of desegregating school districts. This review pulls together some of the threads that have not been commonly thought of as contributing to the knowledge of staff development and its relationship to school desegregation.
INTRODUCTION

This literature review was prepared as background for the first national study of inservice training programs in desegregated school districts. The study will examine the role and delivery of inservice training in desegregated school districts, and so must develop a conceptual framework which relates desegregation to the provision of inservice training. The study is important for two reasons: First, on theoretical grounds, the provision of inservice training for desegregation presumes that there are approaches to the nonsegregated education of children which are more "effective" than others, and that educators can be taught to adopt these approaches. Second, on a more operational level, federal, state and local agencies spend enormous sums of money annually in the development and delivery of inservice training programs for desegregated schools. The research represents an exploratory first step in understanding the relationships between desegregation theory and educational practice as well as an opportunity to develop substantive descriptions of what services local education agencies mean when they request special inservice training resources for desegregation.

Before undertaking the field work phase of the study, it was important to see what the literature said about past practice in staff development, the theories concerning it and the apparent effectiveness of various approaches. The literature on staff development in general and on the specialized staff development needs of desegregating school districts is sparse. In the past, staff development has been accepted without question and generally without controversy; only now is it becoming the subject of intensive research.† As a result, information on the role of staff development in

*There has been some discussion in recent years over the distinction between inservice training and staff development, but the distinction is mostly conceptual rather than operational. In this review, the terms "inservice" and "staff development" are used interchangeably.

†In 1978, two major journals, Theory Into Practice and Teachers College Record, devoted an entire issue to staff development.
desegregated settings must be inferred from several sources rather than reviewed as a body. Content areas from which this information can be derived include desegregation-related inservice training, current approaches to inservice training in general, school desegregation effects and the implementation of educational change. Each of these areas is discussed in this review.

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR DESEGREGATION

The earliest body of literature linking inservice and desegregation dates to the second half of the 1960s. With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, there was a rash of Title IV-funded workshops and summer training institutes, all purporting to deal with the problems occasioned by school desegregation. Written reports of these programs were required by the U.S. Office of Education as a condition of the grants.

Well over 300 Title IV workshop reports are available. Mosley and Flaxman (1972) reviewed 80 such reports and gave an overview of the workshops in terms of planning, selection of participants, clarity of objectives, design, evaluation, follow-up and dissemination. The authors found that the average summer workshop was sponsored, planned and conducted by local university personnel, with little or no input from participants. There were few criteria for workshop attendance and little systematic screening of participants. The majority of the programs that they reviewed had objectives that were too general to be translated into cognitive or behavioral goals. Most programs relied heavily on lectures followed by small-group discussions, regardless of the original objectives; and evaluation of the workshops was difficult. Pre-post attitude testing occurred infrequently; when it did, instruments

*Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the Office of Education to provide technical and training assistance to school districts which have desegregated or are in the process of doing so.
†Reports can be found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and in the document collections of the Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged and the National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity, both housed at Teachers College, Columbia University.
were rarely included in the reports, so no judgment as to instrument or evaluation quality can be made. Most reports indicate a one-time follow-up several months after the workshop. The issue of dissemination was ignored in half of the reports reviewed.

Our own review of approximately 50 reports from this era corroborates the findings of Mosley and Flaxman. The Title IV institutes and workshops appear to have made some contributions to particular communities during the late 1960s. The lack of effort to disseminate these programs supports the notion that the outcomes were difficult to substantiate and/or to relate to specific learnings. The written accounts say little about inservice or desegregation per se and are important primarily from an historical viewpoint.

Crocker et al. (1976) describe the types of technical assistance and training services offered to school districts under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV: indirect assistance provided through Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs), State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Training Institutes (TIs); and direct grants for the hiring of a desegregation specialist and for desegregation-related inservice training. The early Title IV workshops (discussed above) have given way to a variety of approaches to desegregation-related staff training which are determined by the individual school district, the outside agency, or both. Accounts of Title IV programs offered by SEAs typically do not appear in the literature. Some of the programs offered by DACs and TIs have been reported as indicated in the following examples.

The Program for Educational Opportunity (PEO), operating at the University of Michigan, is a Title IV DAC whose service area includes school districts in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Among the services provided by the PEO are those of needs assessment, staff training and evaluation. Training is available through programs offered in the districts, through conferences held at various locations, and through the many publications and materials prepared and disseminated by the PEO staff.

District staff training programs range from assisting bus drivers
and secretaries to work more effectively with the new population in
desegregating schools to training teachers to counteract bias in test-
ing materials and texts used in the desegregated classroom. The annual
series of conferences offered by the PEO is built around particular
desegregation-related topic areas and the major presentations from each
conference are compiled for publication. The PEO has contributed to
multicultural education through training programs and through a series
of publications compiled by Webb.†

The Training Institute for Desegregated Education (TIDE), opera-
ting under the auspices of Title IV, was begun at Wayne State University
in 1975 to respond to desegregation-related staff development issues
in the Detroit Public Schools. Hayes (1977, pp. 10-12) describes TIDE's
main purpose as "the reduction and/or elimination of problems related
to desegregation by race and by sex."** Their objective is to train
school-site interdisciplinary teams to incorporate anti-racist and
anti-sexist information into the total school curriculum. TIDE assumes
that "the greatest impact on responding to local school needs can be
made when groups of key individuals are trained to serve as leader-
trainers for their own schools."

Federal support for staff development extends beyond the Civil
Rights Act of 1964. The Emergency School Aid Act has, for the past
six years, provided aid for developing and implementing desegregation-
related inservice training programs through the use of Special Project
funds. One example is the Rainbow Program, which was formed for use in
the Seattle Public Schools to provide insight and experiences relative
to multicultural education. The program addresses four categories:
cultural pluralism, self image, feelings and values. A book of 50
multicultural experiential activities was developed by the program
staff for classroom use (Seattle Public School District No. 1, 1977).

With or without the assistance of federally funded training pro-
grams, many school districts use local funds for desegregation-related

---

* For examples, see Moody (ed.), A Look at the Education of Teachers,
† For the most recent of Webb's works, see Implementing Multicultural
** The addition of sex discrimination to the purview of Title IV
concerns is treated by King et al. (1977).
staff training. For example, the Minneapolis Public School District funded a human relations staff development program which was adopted as part of their desegregation plan (Nesset, 1973). The program set out to change school climate and to have the staffs serve as models for communicating and interacting. Individualized programs, based on each school's needs assessment, were designed to focus on the development of communications skills among the staff.

School districts which developed their own training programs have often incorporated approaches which were tested in other settings and disseminated through publications. Robert Alley (1974) cites different simulation models which were developed in the late 1960s specifically for the purpose of facilitating integration. Each of the models employs role-playing techniques with follow-up analysis and discussion of the applicability of the simulated experience to real life situations.

A human relations training guide was published in 1976 by Ayers and Bronaugh. It offers a series of unit modules or mini-courses for teaching school staff about conflict management. The authors, recognizing the need for flexibility and adaptability, want the separate units to be selected according to individual staff needs or training program objectives, and expect variance in actual content and length of time for training.

Though resources available to assist desegregating school districts with staff training are described in the literature, no definitive answers are provided as to what works and why. Desegregation represents dramatic change for most communities. While few would question the wisdom of adequate preparation for such change, there is much less agreement on what constitutes adequate preparation. The substance of training for desegregation, its goals, the method of delivery, the providers, participants, circumstances and effectiveness are all topics of debate. Additional research is needed to help school districts make decisions about the content, implementation and desired outcomes of staff development for desegregation.

CURRENT APPROACHES TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN GENERAL

The current trend in staff development is to adopt delivery systems
which are individualized, if not by teacher at least by school site; those in which the participants collaborate in the planning; and those which involve experiential components of actual or simulated classroom practice. A sample of the approaches to staff development reported in the literature in recent years is given here for the purpose of illustrating the direction in which the programs are moving. There is no scientific evidence by which to measure their effectiveness.

The most widely utilized of the individualized approaches to staff development is the one which bears the name "teacher center."* A national survey conducted in 1973 by the Syracuse Teacher Center project (Yarger and Leonard, 1974) estimated that there are as many as 4,500 sites that see themselves as being associated with the Teacher Center Movement.

Today this movement has strong backing. Lobbying and support from teacher organizations were powerful incentives for Congress to authorize as much as $68 million a year for three years for teaching centers.† Congress specified that these centers were to be local school-district sponsored sites where working teachers could pursue professional improvement directly related to their own classrooms. It was further stipulated that the program would be operated by a policy board, the majority of whose members are practicing teachers. Devaney (1977, p. 14) believes that "about 100 entities across the country loosely fit this definition," but that each "embodies unique resources" and each "attempts to fulfill unique needs."

There is further teacher center support at the state and local levels. California, Florida, and Michigan have enacted legislation either mandating or at least supporting the existence of teacher centers. Strong teacher organizations at the local district level have placed the establishment of teacher centers on the bargaining table. Teachers are clearly the primary enthusiasts of these centers since they have the benefit of active involvement in setting center policy, developing

*For extensive coverage of teacher centers see Burrell, 1976; Devaney and Thorn, 1975; Yarger and Yarger, 1978; and Zigarmi, 1978.
†Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482.
programs, determining the direction of the centers and, in short, deciding their own professional development.

Many other staff development models afford experienced teachers the opportunity to share and provide mutual assistance to one another. They have taken hold in school districts under several different names, notably, the helping teacher (Rauh, 1978), the peer panel (Lawrence and Branch, 1978), and the teaching advisor (Mai, 1977). In general, the effectiveness of these approaches to continuing teacher education is "felt" rather than tested and the published accounts are descriptive in nature.

University educators have collaborated with school district personnel in the formulation of teacher training programs which are operational at the local school site. The three examples to follow are comprehensive, continuous programs of school renewal which begin with the classroom teacher.

Diagnosing teacher needs as an important step to providing relevant staff development activities is a major focus of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) initiated at the University of Texas at Austin. "CBAM rests on the conviction that institutions cannot change until the individuals within them change" (Hall and Loucks, 1978, p. 38). The frame of reference of the model is the concern that users express about an innovation, how the innovation is used, and the ways in which the innovation can be adapted to the needs and styles of individuals.

The interdependence between school change and teacher change provides a conceptual basis for the formulation of a Staff Development for School Change (SD/SC) model as described by Miller and Wolf (1978, p. 142) of the University of Massachusetts. Beginning with individuals and their concerns, this model moves to "collaborations through the use of extensive dialogue," and then to "institutional change based on those collaborations."

A diagnostic, prescriptive, and evaluative staff development tool* was developed at UCLA (Hunter, 1976) after a ten-year period of investigation of the teaching/learning process. This on-site analytic

* Teacher Appraisal, Instructional Improvement Instrument (TA Triple I).
approach to teacher development involves administrators and teachers in an ongoing process of assessing and improving patterns of instruction. The method is being used in several major education projects and is being continually appraised and refined.

The approaches to staff development described in this section address the process of the delivery of ongoing teacher education. Generally, the promoters of the various training methodologies believe them to be adaptable to all manner of content. They represent a departure from the workshop/institute plan and appear to be built on concepts which accommodate the major recommendations found in the literature on educational change which will be treated in a subsequent section of this review. Both the extent to which these newer inservice delivery models are being used in school districts for the purpose of facilitating desegregation and the direct applicability of the training methods to desegregation-related issues warrant further study.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION RESEARCH

The literature on school desegregation effects typically does not address staff development issues directly; it does present evidence on school characteristics associated with successful desegregation and thus has implications for staff development efforts in a desegregated context. For example, the school effects literature provides some insights into the characteristics of the population to be "developed" and into training contents which might be expected to influence student performance.

Researchers describe staff development programs for desegregating schools as being roughly of two types and attempt to identify the population most in need of each type of training. The first type is aimed at allaying racial or desegregation fears, promoting favorable racial attitudes and behavior and generally making teachers psychologically comfortable with the idea of teaching students of differing backgrounds. Characteristics of the population most likely to benefit from such programs are suggested by Narot's (1973) analysis in Southern Schools, the National Opinion Research Center's
evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). Narot constructed a scale of general racial prejudice designed to tap feelings about the civil rights movement, racial intermarriage and the like. Her analysis showed that the teachers most likely to score high on this measure (more prejudice) tended to be white, female, over 35 and from rural areas.

A second type of teacher training is geared toward developing instructional techniques that would be especially useful in a multiracial classroom. The work of Marcum (1968) gives us an idea of who would be likely to benefit from these programs. Marcum examined student and teacher outcomes at the elementary school level in Urbana, Illinois, the year following desegregation. Marcum contends that though Urbana teachers were generally pro-integration, a substantial proportion did not feel qualified to teach minority students. Since specific data on the frequency and intensity of training activities are not presented, we do not know whether teachers felt unqualified before, afterward or both.

Narot's analysis links certain teacher demographic characteristics and racial prejudice. Marcum's work suggests that a reluctance on the part of teachers to work with minority children may stem from feelings of inadequacy rather than from racial prejudice.

Both outlooks are congruent with the contention of practitioners (Conley et al., 1977; Forehand et al., 1976a) that districts and their staffs will have multiple needs at the time of desegregation and that priorities will have to be established. The implications of each for district staff development policies, however, are somewhat divergent. The population described by Narot is, almost by definition, unlikely to perceive a need for training. External identification of that need is likely to be met with something short of teacher enthusiasm. Teachers similar to those in Marcum's sample can be expected to perceive a need for training, at least to some degree, but may be reluctant to seek training. There is apparently a built-in tension between allowing participants to identify their needs in desegregation-related staff development and accepting the needs identified as the ones for which staff development will be provided.
In addition to looking at the desegregation needs of district staff, school desegregation researchers have studied the relationship between student outcomes and teacher training programs. They have been concerned with the effects of staff activities on student attitudes and student achievement.

*Southern Schools* (NORC, 1973) reports more favorable elementary student attitudes toward integration in urban schools which in the past had some experience with such educational innovations as ungraded classrooms, team teaching and individualized instruction. Human relations activities were also found to favorably influence student racial attitudes. No relationship was found between student achievement and either human relations activities or curriculum reorganization.

The Emergency School Aid Act In-Depth Study (Wellisch et al., 1977) found that certain teaching approaches positively affected student achievement. For example, provision of practice time was significantly related to reading gains, while the contextual presentation of new materials was related to mathematics gains. Various interactions among variables measuring teacher use of praise, limitation of praise to academic accomplishments, use of behavioral objectives, setting challenging goals and the use of individualized instruction were associated with mathematics gains. The In-Depth Study thus suggests that activities designed to "teach teachers to teach" have potential for raising student academic performance.

In an extension of the *Southern Schools* research, Forehand, Ragosta and Rock (1976a) and Forehand and Ragosta (1976b) attempted to identify those school characteristics that distinguish between more and less effectively integrated schools. The analyses defined effectiveness in terms of both favorable race relations and academic achievement.

The Forehand work suggests that a staff which exhibits good race relations will contribute to good race relations among students. For staff development this implies an initial focus on activities designed to reduce desegregation-related apprehensions and fears. Second, there appears to be a connection between a staff's commitment to desegregation as exemplified by the existence of a multiethnic curriculum
and a school's race relations so that later staff development efforts need to familiarize teachers with the tools of effective multiracial teaching. Forehand and Ragosta recommend training in minority history for schools which do not have multiethnic texts and materials. They find such training also facilitates student intergroup projects and classroom discussions about race, factors strongly associated with improved student achievement and racial attitudes. Finally, this research shows a connection between the level of tension within the school and the quality of race relations. Forehand et al. conclude that while cause and effect here are probably highly entangled, programs designed to improve school integration effectiveness might well consider tension reduction as a goal.

In sum, Southern Schools found curriculum reorganization and human relations activities to be related to student attitudinal growth, but not to achievement. Wellisch found achievement effects to be related to certain teaching practices. Forehand found school race relations to be favorably influenced by a variety of staff activities. The Forehand work suggests a connection between student achievement and the use of a multiracial curriculum. More often than not, the studies suggest a connection between certain kinds of staff activities and school race relations. Achievement effects associated with staff inservice are found considerably less often.

While school desegregation research addresses participant needs for various kinds of desegregation-related training, it leaves the study of the implementation of this training to others. Similarly, desegregation research suggests a linkage between certain staff activities and student outcomes, but deals with the subject matter and not the methodology of these activities. More explicit information is needed about how staff development relates to improved student outcomes and to various teacher characteristics in desegregated settings.

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE LITERATURE

The research on school desegregation focuses on the identification of school characteristics that have a positive effect on race relations and student achievement. Once identified, it is helpful to know how
schools go about acquiring these characteristics. The process of change was the subject of a number of books and articles published during the 1960s* and has received in-depth treatment in recent years.

Two comprehensive studies of educational innovation and change deserve particular consideration. Both studies indicated that a key element in successfully implementing innovations within a school or school district was found in the staff development process. One research team took a five-year (1966-1971) longitudinal look at the process of change in 18 California schools, each of which agreed to undertake a major change effort. The second study was a nationwide four-year (1973-1977) examination of the implementation of four federal programs designed to bring about educational change.

The five-year study was undertaken by the Kettering Foundation Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (/I/D/E/A) and is described most fully in Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle (Bentzen, 1974). It was undertaken to look at the total context in which change took place, the human and organizational influences that operated within individual schools and within a new social system (the League of Cooperating Schools) which was created from 18 schools, each representing a different LEA in Southern California. The /I/D/E/A/ staff worked with the schools to help them implement educational change, and at the same time was studying the process of the changes that were occurring. What was initiated in these 18 schools was a process of continuing self-renewal, the training of school staff to discern their own needs, respond to their own problems, and jointly solve these problems. A process of dialogue, decisionmaking, action and evaluation (DDAE) was seen as occurring in staffs that were receptive to change. Schools with low DDAE ratings were resistant to change.

The League component of the experiment was necessary to the change process as a support and informational exchange device. Goodlad (1975), who founded the League, suggests that its role could be effectively undertaken by the LEA in the district context. He contends, "Only in rare instances, if ever, will individual schools become and remain self-

*See Havelock et al. (1969) for a comprehensive summary of the early literature on change.
renewing when not part of some supporting mechanism" (p. 161). Goodlad suggests that the LEA should decentralize and its "orientation and accompanying practices (should be) focused on supporting the capabilities inherent in local schools" (p. 187).

The four-year Change Agent study conducted by The Rand Corporation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975, 1978) looked at the reasons why some school sites were more effective than others at implementing change. A sample of 293 local projects funded by four federal programs was drawn from 18 states, and almost 2,000 personal interviews were conducted with project staff at all levels. The four federal programs included in the study had a common purpose, the stimulation and spread of educational innovations. Two local factors were found to be important in determining the outcomes of local projects regardless of the type of innovation. The first was the degree of institutional support from administrators and the second was related to the effectiveness of the locally chosen implementation strategy.

The Rand study has many implications for staff development since the outcome measures included change in teacher practices, and many of the process variables are synonymous with those considered in inservice education. McLaughlin, a principal investigator for the study, found that "successful change agent projects seem to be functioning as staff development projects" (1977, pp. 76-81). The Rand team observed certain phenomena in districts that seemed to have effective staff development programs. Briefly stated, they are: 1) They "didn't have a program" but, rather, a "point of view that pervaded the whole district." 2) There were teacher centers "providing the context for useful peer interaction, cross-fertilization, and for peer evaluation." 3) They "made no attempt to offer a standardized district program," but emphasized small groups "of about 4-8 within a school working collaboratively on the same need." 4) They "used local resource people to guide their innovative efforts whenever possible." 5) They used "joint governance (between teachers and administrators) to determine staff development needs and activities." 6) They provided release time which is a "signal" to teachers that the district takes their professional development seriously.
The recommendations for bringing about change offered by the Rand and /I/D/E/A/ groups are similar despite the fact that the design of the two studies, the methodologies employed and the analyses of the results are very different. The factors contributing to successful integration are probably not very different from those contributing to successful educational change in other areas. This issue has not been raised in the literature, but it poses an important consideration for this study. The role of staff development in the process of educational change has been discussed, but has not been studied directly.

**SUMMARY**

In the 1960s, providers of staff development for desegregation purposes applied the kind of inservice then in vogue (workshops/institutes) to desegregation efforts with little measurable impact. The educational change literature offers a fairly convincing explanation as to why these programs were insufficient for long-term effects. This literature and assertions of practitioners are mutually supportive; it stands to reason that unless teachers and administrators are involved in the planning and implementation of a change effort, the change will not happen.

If we apply the suggestions of the change literature to a phenomenon such as desegregation we are necessarily assuming that desegregation is similar in some respects to the educational innovations addressed by that literature. Certainly, it is often accompanied by such innovations as nongraded classrooms, learning centers, magnet schools, and the like. The effects of the changes accompanying desegregation on student attitudes and achievement is addressed by desegregation researchers, but factors influencing these outcomes are merely suggestive when it comes to staff development. In contrast to the research dealing with educational change, existing desegregation research implies that familiarity with such things as cooperative learning techniques (DeVries and Slavin, 1976; Aronson, 1975), the design and use of a multiethnic curriculum, and classroom reorganization can have substantial payoffs in the classroom and in the school.
This review underscores how little analytic study of desegregation-related staff development has been undertaken, and how difficult it is to measure the elusive notions associated with it. For example, the body of desegregation evidence which can be related to inservice training suggests that the influence of the teacher as an agent of change is dependent on such factors as school climate and organizational structure, but the relationship of these factors to staff development content is not developed. Similarly, the current trend in staff development delivery models is consonant with the literature on effective change, but the implications for desegregation are untested. The need for intensive research on the intersection of successful staff development and successful desegregation is apparent.
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