

An Instructional Development Look at Staff Development in the Public Schools

Sharon A. Shrock

and

David M. Byrd

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

The content of conference programs and professional conversations in the field of instructional development suggest renewed interest in the public schools. After several years of focusing attention on corporate and governmental training some instructional developers find themselves standing knee deep in the aftermath of the "rising tide of mediocrity in the public schools." They are bothered by the fact that the ID field has had little positive impact on improving the effectiveness of the nation's schools.

Most instructional developers have long known that the public school's "media coordinator" is not an instructional developer; neither is the school librarian. Schools don't hire "District Instructional Developers". Some developers have tried to influence instruction indirectly through the application of systems processes to the design of commercially produced materials. Some of these efforts are undoubtedly promising, but teachers tend to dismantle these carefully designed materials in practice. Some instructional developers are skeptical that "teacher proofing" is possible.

Several instructional technologists have advocated rather massive reorganization of the schools accompanied by a heavy infusion of technologically delivered instruction. However strong the conviction that such reorganization and mediated instruction would solve the problems in the nation's schools, one has to question the feasibility of these ideas. Teachers will not be forced out of their traditional roles. Unless they can come to see their role in education differently, instructional technolo-

gists are only talking to themselves about a collective dream. Those instructional developers who doubt that it is possible to plan for every conceivable contingency doubt that "teacher proofing" instruction is desirable; the dream has a nightmarish side for them. Realistically, who is going to influence changes in teaching?

What many instructional developers may not know is that there is an emerging profession devoted to improving teaching practice at the K - 12 levels. This field is now routinely called "staff development" or "inservice teacher education," sometimes abbreviated in the literature as INSET (Campbell, 1982; Daresh, 1987). Staff development has come to connote training, education, and consultation provided to practicing teachers in the interest of improving their teaching and/or career development.

It is the thesis of this article that staff development is one of the most influential forces currently impinging upon teacher behavior and that instructional developers who would seek to influence the public schools may find it instructive to examine the messages that are currently being delivered to teachers through staff development. Further, it is the authors' contention that within the last few years an attempt to communicate to teachers some of what constitutes instructional development has already been made. Instructional developers can learn a great deal about the likely reception of their field within public education by examining the recent course of staff development.

This article begins with an overview of three major themes in the current staff development literature. These themes are then viewed critically for their consonance with instructional development principles and assumptions, i.e., with how much of the advice being given to teachers would professional instructional designers agree?

The article concludes with an analysis of how the reception of staff development efforts to date indicates the schools' likely acceptance of a systems approach to teaching and learning.

The New Profession of Staff Development

"Teacher inservice" has been around for decades. However, within the last few years staff development has emerged as a discrete profession. Many university colleges of education now have units or subunits composed of PhDs who are primarily staff development specialists. These programs train practicing teachers at the masters and doctoral levels to assume positions as staff developers in schools. The field has its own professional associations.¹ One might expect this professionalization of the field of staff development to increase its impact.

There is a broadening base of research concerning staff development (Daresh, 1987). However, the literature in this area is dominated by a relatively small group of luminaries. These writers are the commonly acknowledged experts in staff development by teachers, schools, and other staff development agencies, such as units within state departments of education. Their work is frequently cited by one another, and in reading through the literature, one has the sense of an emerging, cogent practice of teacher supervision and development among professional staff developers. The new cohesion in this effort makes it possible to analyze the primary messages that teachers are receiving via staff development in a way not possible in previous years.

The Process of Staff Development

A great deal of the literature relevant to teacher staff development concerns itself with *how* rather than *what*, i.e., it

comprises an ongoing discussion regarding how best to implement staff development programs regardless of the content of those programs. Given the history of teacher inservice education, this work represents an important contribution to the improvement of teaching.

Unfortunately, for decades teacher inservice has been characterized by the "quick fix" workshop, frequently lasting only a day or less. As described by Wood and Thompson (1980), "most staff development programs are irrelevant and ineffective, a waste of time and money. Disjointed workshops and courses focus on information dissemination rather than stressing the use of information or appropriate practice in the classroom" (p. 374). The work of this group of staff developers, whose interest is primarily in process, has been devoted to changing the concept of staff development from this ineffective strategy to one that involves long term commitment to changes in teacher behavior.

As a result of this work, the concept of "clinical supervision" now seems well ensconced among professional staff developers. The literature that describes the procedures of clinical

teacher to practice new teaching skills and to receive feedback in an ongoing cycle of observations and conferences is a hallmark of the field (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

More recently, some writers in the area of clinical supervision have been addressing the finer points of the procedure (Hunter, 1986b; Lordon, 1986; Pavan, 1986). Others have been addressing the elaboration of the concept of clinical supervision beyond the procedural steps (Garman, 1982) and acknowledging the requirement for concomitant organizational development in schools (Goldsberry, 1984; Howey, Matthes, & Zimpher, 1985). These works are probably an indication of the growing sophistication of the field of clinical supervision.

Perhaps predictably, many of the writers in the area of staff development processes have relied heavily on the tenets of adult education in addressing the appropriate implementation of staff development (Daresh, 1987; Wood & Thompson, 1980). These authors see the previous failures of staff development efforts as resulting from a failure to consider that teachers are adult learners. As most instructional developers know, adult learning the-

touchy political issue of control of staff development. The issue of adult education as a force within staff development is an important subtheme throughout the literature.

ID Perspective on the Staff Development Process

Most developers would find much to applaud in the current direction of this staff development process advice. The basic procedures of clinical supervision are well known to most developers. In fact, they are identical to the conventional wisdom espoused by instructional developers working in faculty development offices so popular in higher education during the seventies (Berquist & Phillips, 1977; Sorcinelli, 1984).

Most instructional developers who have worked in teacher improvement have used a process similar to clinical supervision for observing and giving feedback to instructors. The only major difference may be that developers working with higher education or corporate instructors have routinely included student perceptions of teacher effectiveness as a data source along with their own observations. Student data is predictably less utilized in public school settings because of the age of the learners and possibly because of the authoritarian relationship between teachers and students at the K-12 levels.

If there is an area of this literature likely to unsettle an astute instructional developer, it would be the ascendancy of adult education theory in staff development. Even here there is much with which to agree. Developers certainly believe in the immediate application of new skills, plenty of diagnostic feedback, and an instructional focus on job relevant behaviors — all recommendations derived from adult education principles. However, the problematic part comes with teachers choosing the objectives of staff development. It is doubtful that, when given an array of topics, teachers would choose to learn the rigorous application of instructional design.

If one reads the staff development literature closely and is willing to extrapolate a bit, one finds some support

No one seems to be writing about providing teachers with a cognitive map that would allow them to see the relationships among the techniques recommended by effective teaching research.

supervision is longstanding (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). Cogan's (1973) eight phases of clinical supervision are: (a) Establish a relationship with the teacher, (b) plan with the teacher, (c) plan for observation, (d) observe instruction, (e) analyze the data from the observation, (f) plan for the conference, (g) conduct the conference, (h) renew planning — thus the beginning of another cycle. This body of advice consistently advocates the development of long term professional relationships between teachers and supervisors. The opportunity for the

ory argues for greater learner control of both the methods and the objectives of learning situations. As Wood and Thompson (1980) argue, teachers "want to be the origins of their own learning; that is, involved in selection of objectives, content, activities, and assessment in inservice education" (p. 376). Furthermore, "adults reject prescriptions by others for their learning, especially when what is prescribed is viewed as an attack on what they are presently doing" (p. 376). This seemingly innocuous aspect of staff development has embedded within it the

for these reservations. Daresh (1987) conducted a literature review of over 500 research studies of staff development conducted between 1977 and 1984. His conclusions confirm that teachers want to control the objectives of staff development.

However, he also concluded that the skills sought most frequently by teachers were knowledge-level skills. The staff development and inservice edu-

belief among staff developers, programs that were initiated within the school either by teachers, administrators, or supervisors were considerably less effective than those initiated by state or federal government or by a university. She also concluded that programs using teachers to teach other teachers were less effective than programs conducted by support staff or college personnel. Expertise in ID is

much on-going research that has examined time-on-task variables with different types of learners in different types of schools. The second category of research, classroom management, may be somewhat less well known among developers partly because many do not work with children. This literature, characterized by the work of Good (1983) and Emmer, Evertson, and Anderson (1980), seeks to translate the research on discipline and preventive classroom management for application by teachers.

Of the three categories, the third is by far the most complex. The term "interactive teaching" does not have the connotation of the term "interactivity" as used by instructional technologists. Instead the term refers to direct teaching of students by teachers. Those teacher behaviors that effective teaching research has indicated increase student learning are described in this literature. Knowledge of these research findings is then recommended as the primary content of staff development programs for teachers. Of all the staff development programs based on teaching effectiveness research, Madeline Hunter's model has been by far the most widely implemented.

Hunter's Description of Her Message

Because Hunter's work has been widely misinterpreted and misapplied, it is important, at the outset, to understand the message she has tried to convey through her books, articles, consulting, and speaking engagements. According to Hunter, she simply recommends using the results of instructional research to guide the decisions that every teacher has to make. Hunter has stated, "Teaching is a constant stream of decisions and . . . good decisions increase the probability of learning. We now know cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning. Teachers can't control everything, but they can certainly influence it" (Brandt, 1985, p. 61). Hunter (1987) states that the decisions that teachers must make fall into three categories as follows:

1. What content, skill, or process is achievable and worthwhile for these students in this

It appears that many of the critics of the teaching effectiveness movement are hastening its demise by attacking its faulty implementation without an exploration of its legitimate potential.

cation content most desired by teachers was concerned with topics of immediate interest to practitioners. Programs or activities designed to deal with less concrete, more conceptually-oriented topics were of considerably less interest. Daresh (1987) noted the dominance of fads in staff development topics, from mainstreaming the handicapped a few years back, to the current rage for computer applications. Add to these conclusions Wood and Thompson's (1980) suggestion that many teachers may not be functioning at Piaget's formal operational stage. These findings don't suggest that public school teachers are likely to embrace difficult, abstract content like instructional design. ID is neither concrete nor trendy; its content is not likely to occur to teachers as a "hot" topic for staff development.

Another of Daresh's (1987) conclusions is pertinent here. Many studies indicated that teachers do not wish to have someone else 'do' staff development to them. Teachers want to play the primary role as the source of their own learning. However, there is data to suggest that teacher initiated and conducted staff development is not very effective. Wade (1985) conducted a meta-analysis of research on the effectiveness of different types of staff development programs. She concluded that, contrary to the popular

not likely to be found among school district personnel; to the extent that teachers prefer to initiate and deliver staff development, ID is not likely to form the substance of that training.

The Effective Teaching Message and Madeline Hunter

The second major theme in the staff development literature is drawn from a body of work that recommends a content focus for staff development. This group of authors tends to recommend that teachers be taught the results of the research on effective teaching. The first synthesis of the effective teaching research is typically attributed to Rosenshine and Furst (1971). However, a number of prolific authors have related these research results to the content of staff development (Brandt, 1985; Hunter, 1987; Joyce, Showers, & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987; Stallings, 1982).

Howey et al (1985) have grouped effective teacher research into three large categories: effective use of time (time-on-task); classroom management; and interactive teaching. The so called "time-on-task" literature is probably somewhat familiar to most instructional developers. This concept which began with the work of Fisher et al. (1978) and the Beginning Teacher Education Study has been the focus of

group at this time?

2. What modalities and learning processes will these students use to acquire, and to demonstrate they have acquired, the content, skill, or process?

3. What research-based principles of learning will facilitate that acquisition? (p. 52)

The Distortion of Hunter's Message

Hunter (1986a, 1987) maintains that these decisions must be considered for *any* learning — discovery learning, experiential or lecture driven learning, group or individualized or cooperative learning — not just for teacher dominated traditional classroom learning. However, according to Wolfe (1987), in an effort to translate the vast store of instructional research into principles that teachers could apply in real world classrooms, Hunter and Doug Russell formulated, in 1976, seven elements that should be *considered* when creating a lesson. These are: anticipatory set, objective, input, modeling, checking for understanding, guided practice, and independent practice. Wolfe points out that Hunter and Russell did not list the elements as steps, nor did they indicate that the elements were to be carried out in order.

Unfortunately, training teachers in the performance of these elements has been mistaken for the whole of Hunter's approach to staff development. School administrators and teacher supervisors have converted Hunter's elements for consideration

out" the evaluator by play acting the inclusion of each step during evaluative observations regardless of their appropriateness within the context of the lesson being taught (Nancy Puckett, personal communication, July 6, 1987). Consequently and predictably, an avalanche of criticism has fallen on Hunter's work in the last few years (Gibboney, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1985; Slavin, 1986,1987). Some of Hunter's most severe (and articulate) critics have been the proponents of the reflective teaching movement. The work of these authors and its relationship to Hunter will be discussed later in this article.

ID Perspective on Effective Teaching and Hunter

The research basis of the effective teaching movement within staff development is consonant with instructional development principles. Like these staff developers, instructional designers tend to believe that research has yielded valuable principles that, when applied to the design of instruction, can dramatically increase student achievement. Instructional developers also consider themselves in the business of translating research findings into practice. Hunter's seven elements look alot like Gagne's Events of Instruction (Gagne, 1977; Slavin, 1986). It's hard to argue with the spirit of a movement like this one within staff development.

Reservations about the effective teaching movement within staff de-

velopment literature causes an instructional developer to wonder if some of the research based principles that are being espoused are fully understood by staff development professionals. For example, Hunter (1985) distorts badly the application of primacy and recency research in relaying examples of how psychological principles can be applied to learning. She states that primacy and recency research implies that teachers ought not to take attendance during the first part of the school day since this time is the most productive for learning. For another example, the concept of task analysis and its function within instructional design does not appear to be well understood among any of these authors (Hunter, 1985; Gibboney, 1987). This criticism, however, is probably minor in comparison with the other source of discomfort discussed below.

Lack of a Comprehensive Schema

It is disturbing that writers in the area of effective teaching see the area merely as a collection of techniques, albeit powerful ones. Time-on-task may be important, but proficiency in applying this concept alone will surely not make a superior teacher. The emphasis seems to be on what teachers should do rather than on what they should *think about*. No one seems to be writing about providing teachers with a cognitive map that would allow them to see the relationships among the techniques recommended by effective teaching research.

One has to wonder what meaning teachers make out of all these prescriptions. Do they see, for example, the connections between objectives and choosing an instructional strategy? The intervening step of task analysis, so familiar to developers, is not discussed accurately at all in the literature reviewed. The concept of needs assessment, so important to identifying objectives in the first place, is never addressed. Hunter (Brandt, 1985) suggests that curriculum specialists rather than instructional specialists have to be consulted in order to determine objectives and their sequence; therefore, she divorces curriculum from instruction in a way that is foreign and dis-

Hunter recommends using the results of instructional research to guide the decisions that every teacher has to make.

into checklists of specific teacher behaviors. These checklists have become the basis for teacher evaluation schemes. Teachers have been evaluated negatively when naive observers armed with checklists have failed to see each of Hunter's steps in every lesson observed (Slavin, 1987). Teachers who have been exposed to these evaluation schemes report that it is easy to "fake

vlopment in general and about the Hunter message in particular fall into two categories: the integrity of the principles as elaborated by staff developers and the lack of a comprehensive schema or frame for integrating the various aspects of this complex advice.

Integrity of the Principles

A close reading of the staff devel-

agreeable to most instructional developers.

Furthermore, as Anderson (1987) points out, the movement seems directed toward what teachers should do, rather than toward what students should do. There are two consequences of this characteristic that occur to instructional developers. The first is that teachers are reinforced in their tendency to see themselves as the only "delivery medium" for instruction. The second is that teachers are deflected from the legitimate criterion of their performance, i.e., student achievement. By focusing on teacher behavior rather than the analysis of student behavior, the teaching effectiveness movement obscures the teacher's potentially powerful role as a designer of instructional systems in favor of the teacher's more limiting role as instructional presenter.

Hunter seems cognizant of some of these weaknesses in the effective teaching movement since her own work has been heavily criticized as a mere collection of techniques (Gibboney, 1987). In the last two years, in response to this criticism she has begun to assert forcefully that her work taken as a whole addresses decisions that teachers should think about, not behaviors they necessarily should perform (Brandt, 1985; Hunter, 1985, 1987). However, she does not describe a cognitive frame that would help teachers retain and place the advice she gives them in some sort of judgmental perspective. In short, the instructional design model is not communicated to teachers by the effective teaching advocates within the field of staff development.

The Reflective Teaching Message

The third major theme within the staff development literature deals with what is termed "reflective teaching." Generally, there are two perspectives within the reflective teaching movement both of which draw heavily on the work of Dewey (1904, 1933) and his seminal concept that analysis and introspection, rather than imitation, are central to teaching excellence. The reflective teaching advocates that are most interested in the staff

development *process* tend to focus on ways to encourage teachers to think about teaching—they are more interested in the *means* (instructional methods) than the *ends* (the outcomes teachers choose to pursue) (Cruickshank, 1985). Other authors who use the term "reflective teaching" focus on both means and ends. This second perspective is a more holistic interpretation of Dewey's work and is perhaps best articulated by Zeichner's (1981-1982) work in preservice teacher education and Sergiovanni's (1985, 1986) work in staff development. Authors representing these two perspectives tend to distance themselves from one another and are engaged in their own internal debate at the same time, the reflective teaching advocates, as a whole, have been strident critics of the effective teaching movement within staff development.

Reflective Teaching as a Staff Development Process

The author perhaps most closely associated with the concept of reflective teaching as a teacher training process is Donald Cruickshank (1985). Reflective teaching as proposed by Cruickshank, is a self-contained, highly controlled microteaching experience. It is based on providing microteachers with content which is unfamiliar to both teachers and students. In this way, teachers are encouraged to focus on the process of teaching rather than the specific subject matter. Each participant receives a reflective teaching lesson containing a measurable objective, fugitive content, and a posttest. Through teaching these lessons and analyzing learner comments and performance, participants generate hypotheses relative to the teaching learning process.

The reflective teaching literature is deficient regarding other suggestions for how staff developers should go about encouraging teachers to be more reflective. Besides the process described above by Cruickshank (1985), the most specific suggestions come from Glickman (1986) who recommends direct consulting with individual teachers; curriculum development projects; inservice training in-

volving demonstration, role playing, classroom trials, feedback, and discussion; and action research projects. Each of these techniques can, according to Glickman, be structured to suit the functioning cognitive level of individual teachers.

Reflective Teaching as Criticism of the Effective Teaching Movement

Those advocating reflective practice among teachers, are among the most severe critics of the effective teaching movement within staff development (Costa & Garmston, 1985; Gibboney, 1987a, 1987b; Glickman, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1985, 1986; Slavin, 1986, 1987). Perhaps because of her dominant position within the effective teaching movement, much of this criticism has been directed specifically at the work of Madeline Hunter.

Sergiovanni (1985) criticizes Hunter for viewing teaching and learning as "an instructional delivery system" (p. 8), a pipeline through which knowledge and information must travel toward specified objectives. Sergiovanni criticizes Hunter's emphasis on instructional objectives, explaining that many worthwhile objectives are missed if teachers focus too narrowly on objectives specified in advance. "Good teachers realize this and behind closed classroom doors teach accordingly despite supervisory efforts to the contrary" (Sergiovanni, 1986, p. 356).

The works cited above by Sergiovanni, were printed before Hunter's most recent attempts to convince critics that her model of effective teaching does not prescribe lock-step behaviors in which all teachers must engage every time they teach. It is doubtful that these authors have been convinced by her recent protestations. It is clear that they do not feel that teaching is an applied science. Gibboney (1987a, 1987b) goes so far as to assert that Hunter has no scientific data to back up her advice to teachers. Sergiovanni (1986) is less inclined to deny the validity of applying the techniques recommended by effective teaching research in certain circumstances; however, he finds the objective driven approach assumed by effective teaching simplistic, and asserts that real teachers do not

think and act in accord with discrete goals and objectives.

Reflective Teaching as the Focus of Staff Development

These reflective teaching authors, feel that no amount of training in applying the results of effective teaching research will improve teaching practice. Instead they advocate encouraging and/or teaching teachers to think about teaching, i.e., to become reflective practitioners and to discover their goals and objectives during the act of teaching. As noted above these authors are concerned about both the process of teaching and the outcomes. One might infer that they disapprove of the split between curriculum and instruction that appears to characterize the teaching effectiveness approach to staff development. However, they do not use that language to describe their position, and they are adamantly opposed to any teaching model that would encourage objectives to be specified in advance of instruction.

ID Perspective on Reflective Teaching

Principles of instructional development support some but certainly not all of the points argued by advocates of reflective teaching.

Reaction to Teacher Training Method

Instructional development practice is consonant with many aspects of the

rather than the design of that subject matter's presentation. Cruickshank's reflective teaching materials discourage that digression. Furthermore, since the topics of Cruickshank's lessons are sufficiently obscure, few of the learners in the microteaching session have any previous knowledge of them. Therefore, the microteacher gets a much clearer picture of just how successful she was in teaching the lesson.

However, Cruickshank's procedure has some weaknesses when viewed from an instructional developer's perspective. Developers — focusing as they do, on very specific features of a lesson's design — might have less confidence in teachers' ability to diagnose their own strengths and weaknesses on the basis of the microteaching activity. For instance, if learners do poorly, will it occur to teachers that their task analysis of the lesson's terminal objective may be in error? Teachers would probably focus on the delivery of the lesson rather than on its design. Developers might heartily endorse the process, provided that some substantial debriefing of the activity under the direction of an expert was included. The debriefing would prompt teachers to consider aspects of their lesson design and delivery that might otherwise escape them.

Reaction to Criticism

One can view the reflective teaching advocates' criticism of the teaching

of naive school administrators and supervisors, to checklists of specific behaviors that teachers are expected to demonstrate every time they are observed (Goldsberry, 1986; Hunter, 1985, 1987; Slavin, 1987; Wolfe, 1987). Since this scheme increasingly has been tied to teacher evaluation, it raises the specter of hoards of teachers mindlessly engaging in techniques divorced from the specific context that makes them effective. Sergiovanni's (1985, 1986) scathing criticism of Hunter would make sense if this implementation of Hunter was all that her work is about.

However, anyone with instructional design sensibilities who reads the teaching effectiveness literature can readily discern that this distorted implementation has little to do with the intent of the scholars in this area and even less to do with the potential impact of this valuable information. Even two years after Hunter (1985) expressed horror at the "checklisting" of her approach to making teaching decisions, critics have continued to misrepresent her model (Gibboney, 1987; Slavin, 1987). Instead of placing the responsibility for the deplorable state of implementation where it belongs, (i.e., on poorly trained school administrators and supervisors looking for simple solutions to complex problems) some reflective teaching advocates have indicted the authors of teaching effectiveness approaches to staff development. Responsible criticism should make a distinction between intent and implementation.

A lack of instructional design knowledge prevents some of these critics from seeing the worth of Hunter's perspective. Slavin (1987), for example, asserts that Hunter's model is merely traditional instruction and that almost all teachers already use her recommended elements. This statement translates roughly into an assertion that all teachers already know about Gagne's *events of instruction*, so Gagne's work can make no contribution to teaching improvement! Most developers who have interacted with public school teachers know that teachers understand very little about behavioral objectives, let alone the rest of the

The instructional design model, as we know it, is not communicated to teachers by the effective teaching advocates within the field of staff development.

process outlined by Cruickshank (1985), as a device for encouraging teachers to reflect on their teaching performance. The procedure's use of content previously unknown to the learners and the microteacher, is particularly laudable. Any instructional developer who has consulted with teachers, has probably noticed a tendency for the teacher to focus on, and to debate intricacies of the subject matter,

effectiveness movement from two perspectives: criticism of the intent of the movement and criticism of the actual attempts to implement staff development based on teaching effectiveness research.

One has to agree with much of the criticism of the implementation in this area. For example, it has been well documented that Madeline Hunter's model has been reduced, at the hands

components of sound instruction.

It appears that many of the critics of the teaching effectiveness movement are hastening its demise by attacking its faulty implementation without an exploration of its legitimate potential. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that some of these critics are either naive, irresponsible or both. This is not to say that these authors don't raise legitimate questions about weaknesses in teaching effectiveness approaches. They complain that the teaching effectiveness writers do a better job of telling teachers what to do than of assisting them to apply teaching techniques conditionally. Furthermore, Gibboney (1987) makes a point similar to one made earlier about Hunter's model lacking guidance regarding the determination of higher order objectives. He seems to miss in Hunter's model, the curriculum part of instructional design, a discussion of how content decisions should be made.

Reaction to Reflective Teaching as a Staff Development Goal

Instructional developers would agree with the reflective teaching advocates that teachers should be able to think about their teaching, not just to engage in rote behaviors. Costa and Garmston (1985) have described one process for how staff developers might assist teachers in thinking about their teaching performance. Their work contains the only representation of an ID like model discovered in the staff development literature reviewed.

Sergiovanni not only maintains that most teachers do not teach to a set of preordinate objectives, he asserts that teachers *should* not do so. He goes so far as to suggest that teaching to objectives runs counter to "human nature" (Sergiovanni, 1986, p. 359).

Sergiovanni (1986) criticizes objectives as "the linchpin in a chain of events which is presumed to characterize best practice" (p. 355). He finds the tight alignment between discrete goals, curriculum, teaching, and testing objectionable. He emphasizes the importance of discovering goals and objectives in the act of teaching and feels that it is arrogant and naive to suggest that objectives must be set

beforehand.

Sergiovanni's (1985) recommendations for staff developers must be inferred from passages similar to the following:

In reality, the task of the supervisor is to make sense of messy situations by increasing understanding and discovering and communicating meaning. Since situations of practice are characterized by unique events, uniform answers to problems are not likely to be helpful. Since teachers, supervisors, and students bring to

together. If the teacher can grow professionally by reflecting on his own experience, who needs staff developers? If it runs counter to human nature to teach to objectives or to apply research based principles, then why suggest that teachers plan at all or read research or listen to staff developers who try to communicate research findings to them. The reflective teaching movement, if misinterpreted, could seriously damage the staff development momentum that has been building over the past decade. One might well ask Madeline Hunter if there is a

This analysis suggests to us that it is extremely important for instructional designers to be involved in preservice teacher education.

the classroom beliefs, assumptions, values, opinions, preferences, and predispositions, objective and value-free supervisory strategies are not likely to address issues of importance. Since uncertainty and complexity are normal aspects in the process of teaching, intuition becomes necessary to fill in between the gaps of what can be specified as known. (pp. 11-12)

In contrast instructional developers find that instructional research helps to make sense of messy situations. Patterns of effective practice are typically found even in superficially unique situations. The advice of instructional developers is not value-free, and seeks to convince practitioners to align their beliefs, assumptions, etc. with empirically supported effective practices. Instructional developers acknowledge uncertainty and complexity and think intuition that springs from a basis of sound instructional design knowledge is powerful intuition indeed, possibly even a hypothesis worth testing (or reflecting upon.)

The greatest danger in Sergiovanni's message, as well as that of other reflective teaching advocates, is that it is likely to be used as a justification for dismantling staff development al-

chance that the message will be misinterpreted!

Implications for ID as a Focus of Staff Development

This concluding section seeks to explore what meaning the foregoing analysis of staff development has for instructional developers who hope to communicate their message to schools. An attempt to get practicing teachers to use instructional design would be very difficult. A partial list of the barriers derived from an examination of this literature follows.

1. Teachers *think* they already know instructional design (Slavin, 1987).
2. Teachers want to control staff development (Wood & Thompson, 1980).
3. Task analysis and teaching to an objective are the two most difficult concepts for teachers to master (Hunter, 1986a).
4. Teachers rely on their own experiences and on other teachers, rather than on theory or abstract principles when forming conclusions about teaching practices (Sergiovanni, 1985).
5. Adult learning theory argues for staff development content that addresses immediate, limited needs, not for abstract, difficult content requiring rigorous analysis (Daresh, 1987; Wood & Thompson, 1980).

6. Most staff development programs are targeted toward what teachers do, rather than what students do (Anderson, 1987).

7. Staff development programs seem not to be addressing the lethal split between curriculum and instruction. Teachers have no basis on which to integrate the two. They take curriculum courses separately from instruction courses in college, and as practicing teachers they find this separation maintained (Hunter, 1986a). The process of task analysis of objectives that informs the selection of instructional behaviors is unknown to them. Cohen (1987) also cites the separation of instruction from assessment in preventing what mainstream educators are now calling "curricular alignment" (Hunter, 1986a, p. 178) or "instructional alignment" (Cohen, 1987, p. 16). As Cohen (1987) points out, the refined analysis that allows objectives, instruction, and testing to match has always been a part of instructional design, but has never been accepted by conventional educators.

Add to these obstacles the following inferences that might be drawn from this analysis of the course of staff development during the past few years.

8. Madeline Hunter's message for teachers has been distorted beyond recognition in the process of attempts to implement it in the public schools. As Hunter (1987) herself has stated, it is an indictment of the preparation of school administrators and teaching supervisors that this has happened. The temptation to convert conditional, complex knowledge into concrete observables is probably overwhelming given the personnel and contingencies prevalent in the public schools. The message of instructional development is far more complex than the decision

making model offered by Madeline Hunter. There is no reason to believe that ID processes would receive any other treatment than that afforded Hunter and others advocating the application of research based principles to teaching.

9. Furthermore, the criticisms that would likely be launched against an ID focus in staff development have already been largely articulated by the reflective teaching advocates. ID has not been communicated to teachers; however, the vaccine in the form of teaching effectiveness research has already been injected and the antibodies are already forming. We may find the schools already "immune" to our message.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is important for developers who seek to influence the public schools to realize that others have preceded them. Teachers have already heard about, been forced to write, and rejected behavioral objectives as a meaningful part of their practice, if not as an acceptable part of their teaching philosophy. This rejection happened because teachers did not have a cognitive structure in which to place objectives. Teachers didn't know what they were supposed to do with the objectives after they had them; therefore, the objectives appeared useless to them. Teachers may presently be having a similar experience with other facets of the instructional design message.

This analysis suggests that it is extremely important for instructional designers to be involved in preservice teacher education. Teachers will not emerge from their undergraduate years as accomplished designers. However, they might acquire a cogni-

tive structure that would allow them to add to their expertise as they amass experience and additional training. This frame of reference would allow them to put instructional research findings into perspective and to apply the results conditionally. Such a schema might also prevent teachers from dismantling sound instruction that they seek to adapt and hasten their acceptance of delivery systems other than themselves.

Perhaps the wisest course of action in regard to staff development or inservice teacher education, is to enter immediately the ongoing debate now taking place within the staff development field. After all, instructional development provides the schema that the teaching effectiveness approach has lacked, and, therefore, provides the support for thinking about teaching for which the reflective teaching advocates are calling. If carefully communicated, instructional design could be seen as a logical extension of the teaching effectiveness movement, and as an answer to criticisms raised by the advocates of reflective practice.

Footnote

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum has long had an interest in staff development. The National Staff Development Council (NSDC), is an association exclusively for those devoted to improving teaching practice. NSDC holds an annual, national conference, and their journal, *The Journal of Staff Development*, began publication in 1983.

Author Note. The authors would like to acknowledge Sidney L. Stepp and George W. Schlenk for valued assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Anderson, L. W. (1987). Staff development and instructional improvement: Response to Robbins and Wolfe. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 64-65.
- Berquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. (1977). *A handbook for faculty development*. (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.
- Brandt, R. (1985). On teaching and supervising: A conversation with Madeline Hunter. *Educational Leadership*, 42(5), 61-66.

If carefully communicated, instructional design could be seen as the logical extension of the teaching effectiveness movement, and as an answer to criticisms raised by the advocates of reflective practice.

- Campbell, R. J. (1982). Some aspects of INSET and subsequent curriculum change: A case study and discussion. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8(3), 203-222.
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Cohen, S. A. (1987). Instructional alignment: Searching for a magic bullet. *Educational Researcher*, 16(8), 16-20.
- Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. (1985). Supervision for intelligent teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 42(5), 71-80.
- Cruikshank, D. R. (1985). Uses and benefits of reflective teaching. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 66, 704-706.
- Daresch, J. C. (1987). Research trends in staff development and inservice education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 13(1), 3-12.
- Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. *The third NSSE yearbook (Part 1)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.
- Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *Elementary School Journal*, 80, 219-231.
- Fisher, C., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., Dishaw, M., Moore, J., & Berliner, D. (1978). *Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Gagne, R. M. (1977). *The conditions of learning* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Garman, N. B. (1982). The clinical approach to supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp. 35-52). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Giboney, R. A. (1987a). A critique of Madeline Hunter's teaching model from Dewey's perspective. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 46-50.
- Giboney, R. A. (1987b). The vagaries of turtle research: Giboney replies. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 54.
- Glickman, C. D. (1986). Developing teacher thought. *Journal of Staff Development*, 7(1), 6-21.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). The realities of clinical supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 41(7), 12-15.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1986). The reflective mind-scape. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 1, 347-352.
- Good, T. (Ed.). (1983, Summer). Research on teaching (Special issue). *Elementary School Journal*, 83(4).
- Howey, K. R., Matthes, W. A., & Zimpher, N. L. (1985). *Issues and Problems in professional development*, (Commissioned Paper/Professional Development No. CP/PD - 001). Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Hunter, M. (1985). What's wrong with Madeline Hunter? *Educational Leadership*, 42(5), 57-60.
- Hunter, M. (1986a). Comments on the Napa County, California, follow-through project. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(2), 173-179.
- Hunter, M. (1986b). Let's eliminate the pre-observation conference. *Educational Leadership*, 43(6), 69-70.
- Hunter, M. C. (1987). Beyond rereading Dewey... what's next? A response to Giboney. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 51-53.
- Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The message of research. *Educational Leadership*, 37(5), 379-385.
- Joyce, B., Showers, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1987). Staff development and student learning: A synthesis of research on models of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(2), 11-23.
- Lordon, J. (1986). In defense of the preobservation conference. *Educational Leadership*, 43(6), 70-71.
- Pavan, B. (1986). A thank you and some questions for Madeline Hunter. *Educational Leadership*, 43(6), 67-68.
- Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1971). Research in teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), *Research in teacher education* (pp. 37-72). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1985). Landscapes, mindscapes, and reflective practice in supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 1, 5-17.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1986). Understanding reflective practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 1, 353-359.
- Slavin, R. E. (1986). The Napa evaluation of Madeline Hunter's IFIP: Lessons learned. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(2), 165-171.
- Slavin, R. (1987). The Hunterization of America's schools. *Instructor*, 46(8), 56-58.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. (1984). An approach to colleague evaluation of classroom instruction. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 7(4), 11-17.
- Stallings, J. (1982). How useful are the findings from the research on teaching? In M. E. Defino & H. Carter (Eds.), *Changing teaching practices: Proceedings of a national conference* (pp. 5-24). Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Wade, R. K. (1985). What makes a difference in inservice teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. *Educational Leadership*, 42(4), 48-54.
- Wolfe, P. (1987). What the "seven-step lesson plan" isn't! *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 70-71.
- Wood, F. H. & Thompson, S. R. (1980). Guidelines for better staff development. *Educational Leadership*, 37(5), 374-378.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1981-1982). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. *Interchange*, 12(4), 1-22.