September 5, 1973

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Rostislav Mol entitled "A Study of Perceived Barriers to Change in Tennessee Education." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Educational Psychology.

Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor for
Graduate Studies and Research

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO CHANGE IN TENNESSEE EDUCATION

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

Rostislav Mol

December 1973

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was two-fold: to identify barriers to change in education in the elementary and secondary schools of Tennessee and to determine whether background factors in different populations vary the perceptions of the identified barriers.

To accomplish the identification of barriers, a survey instrument was constructed based primarily on similar studies in other states and on an earlier survey in Tennessee. The items on the instrument which was constructed are unique to this survey, however. The instrument also contained items related to background factors of the respondents which might show variation in the way in which barriers were perceived. This instrument was distributed to 2,562 persons selected by random sampling procedures which were designed to get a representative sample of persons according to the background factors asked for on the survey.

The data was analyzed according to the following: (1) the hierarchy of barriers according to the percent of people responding to each item, (2) the major barriers as perceived by different groups, (3) comments made on an open-ended response sheet included with each survey document, (4) items which were not perceived as barriers, and (5) which population group perceived the magnitude of barriers in general.

The results show that problems in communication and inadequate information are perceived to be the greatest barriers to change in education. There was some variation by different groups as to what they perceived to be the greatest barriers. This was particularly

1118244

true in the way in which Whites and Blacks perceived the role of the Federal Government in determining changes in education. Students and teachers in particular were not perceived as being barriers to change.

A major result of this study is the development of the survey instrument which could be used to identify perceptions of barriers to change in situations where goals requiring change have been established. The particular results presented in this study could be used to determine what groups of people need information about necessary changes in education and in what areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELATED RESEARCH	8
	Studies in Other States	8
	Earlier Tennessee Survey	13
III.	METHOD	17
	History and Development of this Study	17
	Survey Instrument	21
	Method of Data Collection	26
	Treatment of Data (Machine Scoring)	27
IV.	RESULTS	30
	General Information	30
	Supplementary Response Sheet	30
	Survey Forms as Perceived by Total Group	34
	Hierarchy of Perceived Barriers	41
	Major Barriers According to Personal Descriptors	44
	Non-Barriers	46
	General Perceptions of Barriers	47
V.	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	49
BIBLIOGRAPHY		54
APPENDIXES		56
	INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO SURVEY INSTRUMENT USED IN THIS STUDY	57

CHAPTER PAGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EARLIER SURVEY IN TENNESSEE. 58

RESPONSE SHEET FOR EARLIER SURVEY IN TENNESSEE. 59

VITA. 60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study of barriers to change is complex for several reasons: Extant studies often lack a common frame of reference and approach to the study of change. In addition, there does not seem to be a commonly accepted observation system in the study of barriers to change. In regard to the approach to the study of change, some say that without the existence of explicit organizational goals, the study of change is meaningless. Others say that perceived need for change despite the lack of expressed goals provides enough framework for the study of change in any given context. In either case, perceptions about barriers to change constitute an important function in the overall study of the change process. Constraints to organizational movement exist whether goals are implicit or explicit. The first major purpose of this study is to define the constraints.

The press for organizational change exists in the minds of both organization personnel and those who support the organization. The obvious value judgments which occur when change is suggested, occur in relation to whether the proposed changes constitute progress or merely movement. A common observation is that change does not mean progress, but that progress cannot take place without change. In the context of this study, "change in education" implies movement which results in progress toward better learning. The term "barrier"

implies some impediment in the way of change. A question arises as to whether barriers which exist in people's minds constitute a force in itself.

While some distinction may be made between "barriers" and "perceived barriers," the results are the same when those perceivers have a say in how things are run. The majority of barriers to change in any human endeavor might lie in the minds of people and may not be actual or literal barriers. The barriers defined in the survey used for in this study may or may not be actual barriers to change, but if they are perceived as such by significant numbers of people, they are nonetheless barriers.

Barriers to change may be described on many continua, and therefore observation systems for perceiving barriers would understandably vary accordingly. While one type of continuum may involve mainly power struggles or powerful people, another may involve the tendency of organizations per se to be unresponsive to societal change.

An example of organization inertia is given in a report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare,[1] which traces some developments in education leading to a situation which the Task Force now concludes is inappropriate. According to the report, the coming of industrialization changed the educational system from its primary purpose of transmitting knowledge to a system also designed to meet the needs of industrialization. The character of life in the early days of industrialization was such that people

---

[1] Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Cambridge: The MIT Press (no date).

went to work at very regular times as dictated by industry; as whistles blew or bells rang, breaks were taken at very regular times and job activities were directed by authoritarian supervisors. This situation is well known because it still exists to an extent today. Life in the schools consisted of rigid regimentation, an authoritarian teacher, strict adherence to time schedules, and so on — also a situation which still exists. Schools were intended to be a replication of what youth would face when they went to work. But now "work" is starting to change and, in places where it is not, some workers are demanding change. The workers generally are demanding a more meaningful job experience, and experiments are being made successfully to change the work situation. There is a trend away from the production line, even where assembly work is taking place. There is also a general trend toward jobs in social services and other service-oriented industry that is geared to the improvement of the quality of life and not necessarily to production. The trend is away from rigid distinctions between "clock-punchers," who do meaningless and repetitive work, and the more professional and leisurely "white-collar" class, probably now misnamed.

Perhaps complete automation will never come because there is no necessity for it. The report views education, at least to a certain extent, as being a preparation for some type of work, and asserts that work be made more meaningful. A philosophy within whose framework work might come, according to the report, is Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which includes meaningful work at the highest level of self-actualization. On the other hand, while education for work is

advocated and defined as being career education, it is explicitly pointed out that this is not a new version of vocational education.

The implication of the Rand report is the need for change. The premises of the report are that life should be a continuing process of education, but never a lock-step; and that education cannot continue to be a training ground for a regimented life to be, at best, tolerated, and, at the least, fairly meaningless. The perception of barriers to change by those who agree with the report above would understandably be different from those who perceive the existing school organizational context as acceptable, and who consider financial constraints to be the chief hinderance.

Other differences in perceptions exist. Illich[2] for instance, says schools are a system which "legally combines prejudice with discrimination." He calls education a monopoly comparable to a single state church and calls for complete disestablishment of the system. Within this framework studies of barriers to change in education are quite different from a viewpoint which accepts change within the system.

Silberman[3] believes that education needs to change, especially by adapting methods previously used successfully in various places. These ways of teaching seem more efficient to him than those presently pervasive in education. Change in this instance can be pictured as dealing with generalizations or previously successful encounters with barriers.

---

[2]Ivan Illich, De-Schooling Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 11.

[3]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970).

Synthesizing data regarding barriers to change, then, is a formidable task, expecially when opinions from various sub-populations are gathered. The following statement[4] addresses itself to the nature of differences in perceptions as related to public opinion:

> The answer to what is better and what is worse naturally depends upon the set of values one uses as a standard. Since all such yardsticks are man-made, there is bound to be no unanimity. Nonetheless, certain goals or ideals do exercise greater influence at any given time or place than others . . ."

The press for change in the minds of some who view education seems to be substantial; however, the contexts from which individuals view education vary greatly. Some perceive the educational scene only in terms of how different it seems from their schooling, which they understand. Others, such as researchers at the Rand Corporation, perceive it from a highly analytical frame of reference. While the general public tends to see no cause for basic changes, the Rand Report[5] (sponsored by the President's Commission on school finance), while taking note of both extreme and moderate points of view regarding change in education, nonetheless concludes with the policy implication that:

> Research tentatively suggests that improvement in student outcomes, both cognitive and noncognitive, may require sweeping changes in organization, structure, and conduct of educational experiences.

---

[4]Curtis D. MacDougall, Understanding Public Opinion (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1952), p. 83.

[5]Harvey A. Averch and others, "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings." (Report for the President's Commission on School Finance by the Rand Corporation, 1972), p. 158.

While it is difficult to classify all of the points of view regarding barriers which people have, there is some evidence that people having certain situational similarities tend to have differing viewpoints.

It is generally assumed that certain background factors influence a person's value system which in turn may vary perceptions relative to many spheres of life. To determine whether some background factors vary the perception of barriers to change in education by different populations is a second major purpose of this study.

Since this study is related to Tennessee, a comment regarding this seems appropriate. The assertion hardly needs proving that work is being done in Tennessee to change the way students participate in education. For over a year Tennessee's goals of education have been studied with the objective of revising those goals. Such was accomplished in 1973. The Tennessee State Department of Education has recently undergone an extensive reorganization to change, ultimately, the way in which the Department relates to local school systems.

In summary, it will be assumed, then, that the world is changing, our society is changing, and, as a societal institution, education will logically have to change. Some more radical thinkers would abolish schools as we know them. However, this study will assume that change will come, but not to the extent that we will not recognize our educational system after change. Work will be done to change schools and the direction of education more or less within the framework of the system as we know it. If this is not so, then most of the barriers which will be discussed in the following study might be quite meaningless.

If change is to come, then, hopefully related activities will be conducted in an orderly and logical manner. For this it may be necessary to know what, if any, barriers exist to bringing about changes decided upon. While this study will not presume to be the last word in defining barriers to change in education in Tennessee, perhaps direction for some action or further study may emerge.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

I. STUDIES IN OTHER STATES

Major emphasis was placed on reviewing the studies being conducted by other states in the Southeast Region. These studies were current and conducted in states which have similarities to each other and to Tennessee both in social structure and educational systems. Also, some states had already accomplished extensive reviews of the literature, summarized many sources and issued reports similar to the one by Maguire on "Observations and Analysis of the Literature on Change".[6] This report and some of the following state reports are interesting not so much for their content but for an illustration of the point made in the preceding chapter that perceptions of barriers do vary. Parts of such reports merely show that there is a great variety of perceived barriers. Other states based their reports on various surveys. Following are brief summaries of the reports for the states participating in the Southeastern States Work Conference on Barriers to Change in Education.

Arkansas[7]

This report consists primarily of agendas for meetings at which barriers would be identified and strategies for overcoming the identified barriers would be determined.

---

[6]L. M. Maguire, "Observations and Analysis of the Literature on Change." (Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, 1970).

[7]Evalena Berry and Earl Willis, "Project on Innovations and Barriers to Educational Change," Arkansas Progress Report, June, 1971.

The most concise statements of conclusions include the following observations:

1. The more innovative schools tend to be larger and better financed.

2. More innovative schools have a more favorable climate for experimentation.

3. A curriculum specialist is present on the staff of the more innovative schools.

4. One-fifth of all innovative practices were at least partially Federally funded.

5. Federal funding was a major factor in all more substantial innovative projects.

Georgia[8]

An ad hoc committee appointed by the State Superintendent of Schools and the Executive Secretary of the Georgia Association of Educators produced a list of stated and implied barriers. These were put into survey form and were rated by the Georgia State Department of Education, Division of Planning and Evaluation, and members of the State Advisory Council for Title III. The originally written items were not rewritten for the survey into a common format, with constant level of specificity, or to avoid any contradictions. No conclusions were drawn. An analysis of the items by this writer did not identify any unique "barriers".

---

[8]"Barriers to Educational Change in Georgia." Progress Report, prepared by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, June, 1971.

Kentucky[9]

This report apparently was one of the first, or was the first, of such reports from the Southeastern States. An informal survey was conducted resulting in a listing of fourteen general categories of change barriers, all of which were identified (or verified) later by other studies. Because of this consistency and the general nature of the barriers identified, they are, in modified form, contained in Tennessee's survey. In the report's extrapolation the barriers identified in the survey are viewed as a set of symptoms. The extrapolation is interesting because this was an early work in this series and the analysis of the survey brought the "picture" down to comprehensible proportions. The analysis (not the factors or symptoms identified in the survey) might be summarized as follows:

1. There is a lack of agreement among educators as to the goals (or purposes) of education.

2. There is a lack of communication. One problem is the language of education used by educators. Another is lack of communication between the schools and community.

3. "The quest for . . . the perfect solution to the imperfectly identified problem . . ."

4. Educators have some conservative tendencies which must be abandoned even if personal security is threatened.

5. In terms of change, there is a tendency to examine what is being done and try to do it better.

---

[9]Richard L. Winebarger, "Barriers to Educational Change in Kentucky," Kentucky State Department of Education.

Louisiana[10]

This report was primarily the result of the use of a survey form and was patterned after the study conducted in Kentucky. Identified barriers were ranked according to percent of response received with explanations given for each area. In descending order of apparent significance the barriers identified were finance, administration, curriculum, school-community relations, personnel, external factors (politics and lack of parental interest), support services and "other".

North Carolina[11]

This study apparently might turn out somewhat similar to the survey in Tennessee and will be called "An Analysis of Perceptions of Barriers to Change in Education in North Carolina Public Schools" after doctoral investigation by Milford Clark at the University of North Carolina. Clark joined the project after it was well under way, but seemed to give it some new direction. The personal descriptors in this study are limited to jobs or occupations of the respondents, most of them in some way related to education. The "opinionaire" to be used consists of 172 items and will be distributed to 1300 persons.

---

[10]Wanda W. Kirby, "Barriers to Educational Change in Louisiana," Planning and Evaluation Section, Louisiana State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, January, 1971.

[11]"Special Project: Barriers to Educational Change," North Carolina Status Report.

South Carolina[12]

South Carolina's report consists of a rather extensive review of the literature. Using thirty-three sources, the report produced a listing of barriers under the headings of finance, organization, leadership, personnel attitudes, personnel training, communications and laws-regulations-policies. The report concludes that "in reviewing the barriers to educational change, one discovers that educators everywhere must claim as applicable, in varying degrees, all these barriers".

Virginia[13]

The State of Virginia reviewed the study "Barriers to Educational Change in Kentucky" and concluded that all the "barriers" identified in the study were applicable in Virginia and analyzed them in terms of education in the latter state.

West Virginia[14]

This paper includes the following: (1) an overview of the problem, (2) a review of the related literature, (3) an abstract of a study using data collection instruments, and (4) implications. The report concludes

---

[12]Ellen Tallison and Jane Ness, "Barriers to Educational Change," Research Information Unit, Office of Research, South Carolina State Department of Education, June, 1971.

[13]Francis T. Phillips, Jr., "Analysis of the Kentucky 'Barriers to Educational Change' and Possible Actions to be Taken in Virginia." A report prepared for the Virginia State Department of Education.

[14]Ernest Berty, "Barriers to Innovation in West Virginia." A report prepared by the Office of Research, West Virginia State Department of Education, Charleston, West Virginia, April, 1971.

that it borders on an "exercise in futility" to attempt to design strategies to resolve the problem because of the variety of barriers and lack of a good foundation to use as a point of departure arrived at scientifically.

II. EARLIER TENNESSEE SURVEY

The results of an earlier survey are presented in this section because, in terms of background information, they were used in a similar way to the studies from other states, although more heed was paid to these results because they were obtained in Tennessee.

In essence, the respondents were asked to list five to ten prominent barriers to educational change as concisely and well-focused as possible. (For complete instructions given to the respondents, see appendix.) The respondents were also asked to give their position, sex and number of years experience in education.

The results were listed at the State Testing and Evaluation Center and analyzed according to the varieties of the responses. The following list is a paraphrasing by this writer of some of the major, but by no means all, responses received from this survey. This list is grouped somewhat according to similarity of type of barrier but does not represent any type of hierarchy.

Some of the Major Barriers

1. The amount of finances available in general.

2. Specifically, the amount available for salaries to attract and hold good personnel.

3. The amount of money for facilities.

4. The amount of money for materials and equipment.

5. The way money is allocated.

6. Problems resulting from the restrictive use of funds.

7. Evaluation of the effectiveness of money spent.

8. Knowledge of school need by federal personnel.

9. Knowledge of school needs by legislators.

10. Knowledge of school needs by school board members.

11. Knowledge of school needs by State Department of Education personnel.

12. The physical comfort in the school buildings (heating, cooling, lighting, etc.).

13. The building maintenance (cleanliness, appearance, up-keep, etc.).

14. Space to accommodate learning activities.

15. The arrangement of the building or the design of building.

16. Extracurricular, sports and physical education provisions.

17. The textbooks.

18. The teaching equipment.

19. Interest and enthusiasm on the part of administrators.

20. The interest and enthusiasm on the part of teachers.

21. The interest and enthusiasm on the part of students.

22. The interest of the public in general.

23. The training and preparation of teachers to teach.

24. The leadership provided by local administrators.

25. The leadership provided by State Department of Education personnel.

26. The leadership provided by federal personnel.

27. The leadership provided by University or teacher training personnel.

28. The attitude toward change in general.

29. The attitude toward change based on belief or philosophy.

30. The attitude toward change based on feelings of need for security.

31. The number of counseling and guidance personnel.

32. The number of qualified specialists.

33. The existence of teacher tenure.

34. Staff work assignment or job-time allocation.

35. Community-school communication.

36. The meaningfulness and relevance of in-service education teachers.

37. The diffusion of new ideas based on tried innovations.

38. The diffusion of new ideas derived from research.

39. A systematic procedure for disseminating new ideas.

40. Participation in the decision-making process of all significant persons involved.

41. Participation of teachers in the decision-making process.

42. Participation of students in the decision-making process where applicable.

43. Participation of parents or other community people in the decision-making process.

44. Agreement among people on the philosophy of education.

45. Agreement on what changes are necessary.

46. The clarity as to what the educational objectives are as expressed or understood by federal personnel.

47. The clarity as to what the educational objectives are, as expressed or understood by state personnel.

48. The clarity as to what the educational objectives are, as expressed or understood by local administrators.

49. The clarity as to what the educational objectives are, as expressed or understood by teachers.

50. The clarity as to what the educational objectives are, as expressed or understood by parents and the community.

51. Systematic program planning and development procedures.

52. Program evaluation methodology.

53. The rules, laws, and/or regulations.

54. The relevance of curriculum to students' needs.

55. The individualization of instruction.

56. The application of proven traditional methods of teaching.

57. Accrediting agencies, when used.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

I. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THIS STUDY

In the spring of 1971, a preliminary meeting was held between State Department of Education personnel and personnel from the State Testing and Evaluation Center at the University of Tennessee regarding the studies of "Barriers to Change in Education" being conducted by the states of the Southeast Region. It was decided that the Center would begin work on determining how such "barriers" could be identified. The writer provided the input for Tennessee's first report to the Southeastern States Work Conference on Barriers to Change in Education and subsequently wrote what became the final report. Where applicable, some information from these reports shall be included in this study. However, it is not the purpose of this thesis to be a report to the aforementioned conference.

Several of the states in the region had already submitted reports. Some reports were in the form of more or less completed studies and some in the form of preliminary proposals for studies in their state.

Much of the decision to involve anyone in Tennessee in this study was based on the ultimate usefulness of the information so derived to other activities in this State. For instance, if a needs assessment is conducted then ultimately this type of activity would lead to change in education. It therefore seems logical that possible barriers to change must first be identified; then, if the results of

needs assessment give direction to actions, strategies to overcome these barriers may be facilitated.

Some preliminary search of the literature for previously identified barriers to change had already been conducted by some State Department personnel. This preliminary work was passed on to the writer and the search was continued and expanded at the State Testing and Evaluation Center. Where any thoughts or ideas based on the preliminary research by others entered into the final construction of the survey instrument used in this study, they will, by necessity, simply be attributed to the State Department of Education.

The early work done by other states was of particular interest, and expedited final development of the instrument used in this study. Summaries of the work done in these other states are included in Chapter II.

A survey, using an open-ended instrument (see appendix), was conducted in Memphis, in Tennessee Technological University classes, and of Polk County teachers and other educators. The data obtained from this survey were summarized into broad categories with a listing of more specific items under these broad categories. Information gained from this preliminary survey was then used, in part, in the construction of the final survey.

Decisions were made regarding format for the final instrument, that is, what type of survey to use (again open-ended, check-list, etc.). Following the decision on type of format, a rather large pool of questions generated by the previously mentioned research was developed. This included types of questions used in other surveys

and other items written from ideas in the literature. The items went through many revisions and decisions were made as to which could be most significant so as to "narrow the field" to workable proportions.

A decision was made to include another factor into this study. In an area dealing with human interaction, the perceptions of people become much more important at times than any objective "barriers". Could not "who" was perceiving the barrier be as important a point to consider as the barrier itself? Emphasis at this point shifted to include, not only "barriers to change," but also receptivity to change in education. The decision was to find out, through additional questions, some characteristics of the respondent. Essentially, these factors are the traditionally recognized indicators of background variables which might influence a person's receptivity to change, such as educational level, income level, and so on.

Final item construction was begun in the fall of 1971. The instrument thus constructed was field tested by the writer in February of 1972. The sample used for field-testing was broad in background and included respondents who had most of the personal characteristics anticipated in the items dealing with these. Some difficult-to-contact individuals were not included, specifically school superintendents, school board members and state legislators. This fact, however, was not a problem since the main purpose of field testing was to determine whether the items, as written, would be comprehensible to the persons to whom the survey was addressed and to determine whether there were any communication problems. No particular problems came to light and only slight modification was required. Some persons with higher levels

of education noted that this instrument would be too difficult for the layman but there was no actual evidence of this, and it was also not borne out when the survey was actually conducted (excepting illiterates, of course). The rate of no response to items was fairly small considering the total sample used. Field testing was conducted in the form of personal administration so that immediate feedback could be received regarding any problems.

The final instructions and questions were printed on a machine-scorable document because of the anticipated volume of response ultimately to be data-processed. A supplementary response sheet was included for those respondents who wished to elaborate on their views.

Distribution began in April of 1972 and continued, except for the summer months, through March of 1973. Some preliminary data processing was done in the fall of 1972 to check for trends and final data processing was accomplished in April of 1973.

Much data are now available and probably no single work could handle, in a comprehensible way, the volume and combination of variables possible as a result of this survey alone. This thesis will attempt to handle a part of the data, perhaps pointing up directions for further study and making data analysis.

As previously indicated, such factors as socio-economic, educational and other background factors do make a difference in the way people behave (on surveys, in school, etc.).

In this study, the following factors were used as indicators:

1. Job, position or occupation.

2. Sex.

3. Age.

4. Race.

5. Income.

6. Level of education.

7. Community background.

II. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The work described in the preceding chapters resulted in a survey form, the contents of which follow. Technical aspects of machine scoring, such as circles and response positions, are omitted. See the appendix for the letter introducing the survey to Tennessee citizens.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
CHANGE AND PROGRESS IN SCHOOLS
AN OPINION SURVEY

INTRODUCTION: Since the founding of public education many years ago people have expressed concern about its goals, its methods, and the quality of education attained by children. This concern by the American public about its schools has resulted in a considerable amount of change in the above areas.

Concern about public education is more pronounced today perhaps than at any time in history. Aside from the "headline-hunting critics", there are many people, both educators and lay citizens, who are conscientiously seeking better ways to educate our youth. More than ever, educators are turning to the people they serve for suggestions and help.

The purpose of this survey is to get your opinions about progress and change in the elementary and secondary schools of Tennessee.

The survey is designed to get opinions from individuals in all walks of life with differing views and backgrounds. This is why several personal questions are asked; however, you will not be asked to give your name. You are encouraged to express your opinions freely.

The information obtained from the survey will be analyzed and distributed to personnel in the State Department of Education and in the local school systems to give them direction and guidance as they plan school programs for our children.

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Following each question or statement are two or more choices of answers. Choose your answer and completely blacken the lettered circle with a soft lead pencil as in the following example.

Question: What type marking instrument must be used to mark your answers?
The correct answer is

Fill in your answer like this one has been filled in.	Fountain pen	Ball point pen
	Soft lead pencil	Magic marker

Read each question or statement carefully then blacken the lettered circle that best answers the question. Please erase cleanly any answers you wish to change.

1. If you are an educator, mark your position in the first column. If you are not an educator, identify yourself in the second column. Mark one circle only.

A Teacher	A Student
B Counselor	B Parent
C Principal or Assistant	C Other Lay Citizen
D Supervisor of Education	D State Legislator
E Superintendent	E School Board Member
F College or University Educator	F City or County Government
G State Department of Education	

2. Sex: A Male
B Female

3. Age: A Under thirty
B Thirty to fifty
C Over fifty

4. Race: A White
B Black
C American Indian
D Oriental
E Other

5. Please mark the figure below that is closest to your annual family income.
A Below $6,000
B $6,000 - $10,000
C Above $10,000

6. How much formal education do you have? Mark one.

A Less than high school graduate
B Did not graduate but have other training
C High school graduate
D High school graduate plus other training
E Some college
F Bachelor's degree
G Some graduate work
H Master's degree or over

7. In what type of community do you live?

A A rural area or small town
B In or near a medium size city - 10,000 to 100,000 population
C In or near a large city - over 100,000 like Nashville or Knoxville

If you marked "B" or "C" above is this:

A In or near downtown--inner city?
B In city but not downtown?
C In a suburban community?

PART II

Probably everyone feels that all schools should become better schools. This section of the survey deals with reasons why desirable change and progress do not occur at all or do not occur as rapidly as they should in our schools. Below are listed sixteen possible reasons. As you read the given reasons, you are asked to decide if each one holds true in elementary and secondary schools in Tennessee. If you do not know for sure, give your opinion. Please rate each of the sixteen possible reasons by using the following scale:

A Not a reason why change and progress do not occur
B A small reason why change and progress do not occur
C Somewhat of a reason why change and progress do not occur
D A large reason why change and progress do not occur
E I do not have enough information to give an opinion

Here is an example of how one person marked the first item in the list below.

A B C D E The way decisions are made is not good because all those concerned are not asked for their opinions. State and local officials, teachers, parents and students do not have clearly defined roles.

In this example the circle A is marked and interpreted to mean that in this person's opinion, the way decisions are made is not a reason why desirable change and progress do not occur.

Please respond to each of the given reasons in the following manner: (1) Read a proposed reason; (2) think of the situation in the school and school system that you know best; and (3) look at the scale above

the answer circles to decide which one of the five circles to mark. If you do not know a particular school and school system well enough to rate the reasons, please rate them in relation to Tennessee elementary and secondary schools in general. Hopefully, the results of this Survey will be used to improve the quality of education in our state. You will not be identified, so feel free to mark exactly how you feel.

BEGIN PART II

1. The way decisions are made is not good because all those concerned are not asked for their opinions. State and local officials, teachers, parents and students do not have clearly defined roles.

2. There is a general lack of understanding and agreement among State and local school personnel and parents about the purposes, goals and objectives of the school program. No one seems to know what changes should be made because of a lack of agreement on what should be accomplished by the school.

3. Centers for research in education have failed to keep school personnel informed of new and better methods, techniques and materials.

4. On the whole, school people have failed to keep up with new ideas and developments about <u>what</u> is taught, <u>how</u> it is taught, materials and equipment and school organization.

5. Politics get in the way of desirable change and progress. (Rate each level).
   On local level
   On State level
   On National level

6. Generally, people are not willing to pay the required costs for desirable changes and progress in the school.

7. State rules, regulations and laws governing schools and personnel are not flexible enough. They prevent or discourage change and progress.

8. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, do not feel secure about change. They feel more comfortable with present school programs and therefore resist change. (Rate each group).
   Superintendents
   Supervisors and Directors
   Principals
   Teachers
   School Board Members
   Parents
   Students
   State Educators
   State and Local Legislators

9. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack interest and enthusiasm for bringing about change and progress. (Rate each group).
   Superintendents
   Supervisors and Directors
   Principals
   Teachers
   School Board Members
   Parents
   Students
   State Educators
   State and Local Legislators

10. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, seem to be waiting on someone else to take the lead in bringing about change and progress. (Rate each group).
   Superintendents
   Supervisors and Directors
   Principals
   Teachers
   School Board Members
   Parents
   Students
   State Educators
   State and Local Legislators

11. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack the knowledge necessary to initiate and implement a desirable change; that is, they do not know how to bring it about. (Rate each group).
   Federal Educators
   State Educators
   Superintendent's Staff
   Supervisors and Directors
   Principals
   Teachers
   School Boards

12. There are not enough people in the following positions to carry the present work load and initiate desirable changes. (Rate each group).
   Superintendents
   Supervisors and Directors
   Principals
   Teachers
   Special Personnel (Counselors, Social Workers and Other Special Areas)
   State Educators

13. Colleges and universities do not provide future teachers with methods, techniques and list of materials to best meet the needs of the students.

14. The present physical facilities are not adequate; they do not permit desirable program changes.

15. Desirable change and progress are hampered because Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away from the State and local governments.

16. Poor communication. People are not kept informed. Communication among the State's citizens, local school officials, and State and Federal officials is inadequate.

III. METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

A 5% random sample of the schools within the State was drawn for each of three grade levels: grades five, eight and twelve. A total of 102 schools and 62 systems was to be used. The superintendent of each system agreeing to participate was contacted to elicit cooperation and support. After this, principals of the schools involved were contacted to work out details. Enough forms of the machine-scorable document used in the survey were printed for distribution to get a 5% random sample. Specifically, the following people were asked to respond using this method: (There were some additional contacts for a few of the other categories.)

1. Parents or guardians of fifth and eighth grade pupils.

2. Twelfth grade pupils in each participating school.

3. Teachers of all the three grades involved in each school responding to the form. In case of departmentalized scheduling, the homeroom teacher was to respond.

4. The principal of each school.

5. The superintendent.

6. Members of the Boards of Education.

7. Members of the County Court or the City Commissioner.

8. State Department of Education employees.

9. College or University personnel.

10. State legislators.

All respondents remained anonymous as to their personal identity. If arrangements were made to identify their response documents, each school or particular system could be notified of response data for their area.

Included with each survey form were: a pre-addressed envelope; a supplementary response sheet (for those wishing to make additional comments or to amplify and express their feelings and thinking, since this could not be done on the machine-scorable instrument), and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey and requesting cooperation. (See appendix.)

IV. TREATMENT OF DATA (MACHINE SCORING)

As the machine-scorable answer sheets were returned to the State Testing and Evaluation Center, they were all checked to see if supplementary response sheets were attached. When this was the case, the latter were read. As some patterns in written responses emerged, code numbers were assigned to the different types of responses. The number of codes at the final tally was 23. Numbers one through 16 represented amplifications by the respondent regarding questions on the survey form. Numbers 17 through 23 were used to indicate distinct categories not specifically covered on the survey form.

The code number assigned to the written comments on the supplementary response sheet were entered on the appropriate machine-scorable survey form on "for office use only" response positions designed for this purpose.

The initial print-out was a listing of each individual respondent according to personal descriptor. The primary purpose of this first data-processing was to provide a means to "eye-ball" the data to determine what type of computer print-out would best allow the data to be used in a meaningful way. It was decided that it would be best to have print-outs according to personal descriptors giving the percent response to each item on the survey form according to what degree the item was viewed as a barrier to change. Some personal variables were combined. The final print-outs gave the percent responding to each item according to the following groups:

1. Total group
2. Principal or assistant
3. School board members
4. Students
5. Teacher or counselor
6. Supervisor of education or superintendent
7. College or university educator or State Department of Education
8. City or county government
9. Parent, other lay citizen or state legislator
10. Income below $6,000
11. Income $6,000 - $10,000
12. Income above $10,000
13. Income omitted
14. Race - White
15. Race - Black
16. Race - American Indian, Oriental or other

17. Education - high school graduate plus other training and above
18. Education - high school graduate or below
19. Education omitted
20. Community - rural area or small town
21. Community - city, other description omitted
22. Community - city, in or near downtown -- inner city
23. Community - city, in city but not downtown
24. Community - near city in a suburban community
25. Community omitted

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The total return was 2,562 respondents. This was not quite the anticipated volume of response.

The survey forms were distributed using field personnel of the State Department of Education. Much job realignment was being anticipated, in terms of job function, by some key personnel involved in the distribution. What, if any, bearing this fact had on the final return is purely a matter of conjecture.

A question might arise about the extent to which the methodology outlined in this report was followed and the randomness of the sample. Since all returns were anonymous, no definitive answer can be given. The returns do not preclude the possibility that the sample is indeed a random one as intended. This judgment is based on the number of returns according to personal descriptors, which, according to the methodology used, are proportionately what might be expected.

There was a total of 806 additional comments on the supplementary response sheet. These comments were made by 483 respondents. Of these 483 respondents, 331 were parents. (There were a total of 981 parents responding to the survey.)

II. SUPPLEMENTARY RESPONSE SHEET

A supplementary response sheet was included with each machine-scorable document. As described in the previous section related to

data processing, the remarks were coded and entered on the machine-scorable document. The latter document and the supplementary sheet were matched because all respondents returned their documents in separate envelopes. Codes one through 16 related to the same numbered items on the survey form and represented amplifications by the respondent about these questions. Codes 17 through 25 were new and distinct enough topics to warrant special attention.

There were actually more supplementary response sheets returned than were counted and coded, but some judgment had to be made as to what constitutes a meaningful comment and significant number of responses. As previously noted, almost anything might be viewed as a barrier by someone. The codings represent responses judged to be important because a significant number of people who were surveyed repeated these themes and ideas more frequently on their supplementary sheets.

Items coded 17 to 23 were as follows: (key words underlined)

1. Teacher apathy and lack of concern for students (and lack of fairness).

2. Lack of discipline (order).

3. Comments indicating satisfaction with schools as they are.

4. Bussing is bad.

5. There is a need for more religion, prayer, bible reading in school.

6. Money (at local level) is improperly allocated.

7. Old teachers are a barrier to change (tenure).

As noted, importance was determined by judgment. While the number of written responses may be meaningful, the number gives no indication of the tone of the comment made by the respondent. Since the writer personally coded almost all of the response sheets and therefore passed judgments in the first place, the validity of the following comments will be no greater or lesser than the original judgments.

Judging from the number of responses and strength of the statement made by the respondent, three items appeared to be of primary concern. (With few exceptions, almost all the comments relative to the following items were made by parents.) The items were number 20 (bussing is bad, 55 responses), number 15 (Federal intervention, 33 responses), and number 53 (order or discipline, 53 responses). The way in which these comments were often written seemed to follow the same general theme which, in essence, was integration. If such is the case, one might look for a difference between the perception of Whites and Blacks as related to item 16, which is concerned with the role of the Federal government in education.

To test for this, under the assumption that there should be no difference between the way Blacks and Whites responded to the item on the Federal role in education, the chi-square test for the two-sample case was applied. The results are given in Table 1. The chi-square analysis indicates that Whites definitely do differ from Blacks in their perception that Federal laws have taken too much control away from State and local governments.

TABLE 1. RESPONSES OF BLACKS AND WHITES TO A QUESTION REGARDING FEDERAL CONTROL IN EDUCATION[a]

	no response	not barrier	small barrier	somewhat a barrier	large barrier	no info	Raw Subtotal
Blacks	87 (28) =	76 (50)	59 (40)	65 (50)	87 (241)	107 (72)	481
Whites	57 (116)	184 (210)	148 (167)	192 (207)	1158 (1004)	262 (297)	2001
Column Subtotal	144	260	207	257	1245	369	2482

[a]Expected frequencies in parentheses.

N = 2,482

df = 5

X^2 = 331.00

P < = .01

III. SURVEY ITEMS AS PERCEIVED BY TOTAL GROUP

This section lists all the items on the survey form and gives the number of persons who responded to each possible choice for each item and the percent of the total group for each item. Double responses were so few (maximum of four persons per question) that this category was omitted.

The key to the symbols following each question is as follows:

0 = no response to the item

1 = not a reason why change and progress do not occur

2 = a small reason why change and progress do not occur

3 = somewhat of a reason why change and progress do not occur

4 = a large reason why change and progress do not occur

5 = not enough information to give an opinion

After the "symbol" column, "freq." means the number of persons who chose the response (frequency) and "pr.ct." is the percent of the total group responding to each item.

Question Number	SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
1. The way decisions are made is not good because all those concerned are not asked for their opinions. State and local officials, teachers, parents, and students do not have clearly defined roles.	0	110	4.29
	1	489	19.09
	2	435	16.98
	3	636	24.82
	4	631	24.63
	5	260	10.15

2. There is a general lack of understanding and agreement among State and local school personnel and parents about the purposes, goals and objectives of the school program. No one seems to know what changes should be made because of a lack of agreement on what should be accomplished by the school.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	109	4.25
1	324	12.65
2	413	16.12
3	556	21.70
4	840	32.79
5	320	12.49

3. Centers for research in education have failed to keep school personnel informed of new and better methods, techniques and materials.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	108	4.22
1	669	26.11
2	432	16.86
3	377	14.72
4	398	15.53
5	577	22.52

4. On the whole, school people have failed to keep up with new ideas and developments about <u>what</u> is taught, <u>how</u> it is taught, materials and equipment and school organization.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	124	4.84
1	586	22.87
2	490	19.13
3	478	18.66
4	606	23.65
5	278	10.85
		0.0

5. Politics get in the way of desirable change and progress.

On local level

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	206	8.04
1	311	12.14
2	334	13.04
3	409	15.96
4	999	38.99
5	301	11.75

On State level

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	258	10.07
1	179	6.99
2	330	12.88
3	636	24.82
4	804	31.38
5	353	13.78

On National level

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	256	9.99
1	269	10.50
2	270	10.54
3	348	13.58
4	943	36.81
5	474	18.50

6. Generally, people are not willing to pay the required costs for desirable changes and progress in the school.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	109	4.25
1	483	18.85
2	385	15.03
3	496	19.36
4	905	35.32
5	184	7.18
		0.0

7. State rules, regulations and laws governing schools and personnel are not flexible enough. They prevent or discourage change and progress.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	124	4.84
1	477	18.62
2	418	16.32
3	527	20.57
4	600	23.42
5	415	16.20

8. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, do not feel secure about change. They feel more comfortable with present school programs and therefore resist change.

Superintendents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	175	6.83
1	449	17.53
2	336	13.11
3	393	15.34
4	714	27.87
5	495	19.32

Supervisors and Directors

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	191	7.46
1	377	14.72
2	376	14.68
3	461	17.99
4	609	23.77
5	547	21.35

Principals

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	191	7.46
1	463	18.07
2	406	15.85
3	534	20.84
4	653	25.49
5	313	12.22

Teachers

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	183	7.14
1	512	19.98
2	526	20.53
3	521	20.34
4	537	20.96
5	281	10.97

School Board Members

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	202	7.88
1	205	8.00
2	290	11.32
3	463	18.07
4	983	38.37
5	415	16.20

Parents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	157	6.13
1	542	21.16
2	490	19.13
3	529	20.65
4	578	22.56
5	265	10.34

Students

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	194	7.57
1	1236	48.24
2	367	14.32
3	255	9.95
4	263	10.27
5	245	9.56

State Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	193	7.53
1	328	12.80
2	375	14.64
3	435	16.98
4	549	21.43
5	681	26.58

State and Local Legislators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	178	6.95
1	276	10.77
2	264	10.30
3	450	17.56
4	712	27.79
5	681	26.58

9. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack interest and enthusiasm for bringing about change and progress.

Superintendents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	178	6.95
1	557	21.74
2	355	13.86
3	395	15.42
4	648	25.29
5	428	16.71

Supervisors and Directors

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	191	7.46
1	440	17.17
2	393	15.34
3	451	17.60
4	601	23.46
5	486	18.97

Principals

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	184	7.18
1	545	21.27
2	447	17.45
3	472	18.42
4	621	24.24
5	289	11.28

Teachers

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	187	7.30
1	589	22.99
2	467	18.23
3	585	22.83
4	467	18.23
5	266	10.38

School Board Members

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	203	7.92
1	305	11.90
2	333	13.00
3	518	20.22
4	820	32.01
5	380	14.83

Parents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	168	6.56
1	573	22.37
2	473	18.46
3	505	19.71
4	603	23.54
5	238	9.29

Students

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	186	7.26
1	1111	43.36
2	443	17.29
3	292	11.40
4	292	11.40
5	236	9.21

State Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	190	7.42
1	366	14.29
2	362	14.13
3	433	16.90
4	550	21.47
5	661	25.80

State and Local Legislators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	167	6.52
1	297	11.59
2	292	11.40
3	422	16.47
4	726	28.34
5	657	25.64

10. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, seem to be waiting on someone else to take the lead in bringing about change and progress.

Superintendents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	192	7.49
1	484	18.89
2	365	14.25
3	391	15.26
4	697	27.21
5	430	16.78

Supervisors and Directors

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	216	8.43
1	355	13.86
2	379	14.79
3	481	18.77
4	660	25.76
5	471	18.38

Principals

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	209	8.16
1	327	12.76
2	408	15.93
3	503	19.63
4	812	31.69
5	303	11.83

Teachers

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	205	8.00
1	328	12.80
2	416	16.24
3	514	20.06
4	801	31.26
5	296	11.55

School Board Members

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	219	8.55
1	245	9.56
2	307	11.98
3	457	17.84
4	938	36.61
5	395	15.42

Parents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	196	7.65
1	413	16.12
2	363	14.17
3	439	17.14
4	873	34.07
5	276	10.77

Students

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	216	8.43
1	808	31.54
2	378	14.75
3	349	13.62
4	537	20.96
5	273	10.66

State Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	218	8.51
1	302	11.79
2	300	11.71
3	427	16.67
4	676	26.39
5	639	24.94

State and Local Legislators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	202	7.88
1	274	10.69
2	250	9.76
3	388	15.14
4	803	31.34
5	645	25.18
		0.0

11. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack the knowledge necessary to initiate and implement a desirable change; that is, they do not know how to bring it about.

Federal Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	193	7.53
1	607	23.69
2	260	10.15
3	270	10.54
4	551	21.51
5	680	26.54

State Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	206	8.04
1	533	20.80
2	358	13.97
3	360	14.05
4	520	20.30
5	583	22.76

Superintendent's Staff

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	219	8.55
1	480	18.74
2	367	14.32
3	441	17.21
4	549	21.43
5	504	19.67

Supervisors and Directors

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	217	8.47
1	465	18.15
2	390	15.22
3	416	16.24
4	546	21.31
5	528	20.61

Principals

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	211	8.24
1	509	19.87
2	403	15.73
3	477	18.62
4	598	23.34
5	363	14.17

Teachers

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	200	7.81
1	514	20.06
2	443	17.29
3	496	19.36
4	559	21.82
5	347	13.54

School Boards

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	184	7.18
1	374	14.60
2	277	10.81
3	430	16.78
4	864	33.72
5	432	16.86

12. There are not enough people in the following positions to carry the present work load and initiate desirable changes.

Superintendents

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	200	7.81
1	900	35.13
2	316	12.33
3	251	9.80
4	396	15.46
5	497	19.40

Supervisors and Directors

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	209	8.16
1	695	27.13
2	357	13.93
3	308	12.02
4	466	18.19
5	526	20.53

Principals

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	207	8.08
1	780	30.44
2	396	15.46
3	401	15.65
4	441	17.21
5	336	13.11

Teachers

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	196	7.65
1	515	20.10
2	293	11.44
3	386	15.07
4	879	34.31
5	291	11.36

Special Personnel (Counselors, Social Workers and Other Special Areas)

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	182	7.10
1	417	16.28
2	257	10.03
3	333	13.00
4	976	38.10
5	396	15.46

State Educators

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	211	8.24
1	628	24.51
2	297	11.59
3	321	12.53
4	413	16.12
5	692	27.01

13. Colleges and universities do not provide future teachers with methods, techniques and list of materials to best meet the needs of students.

SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
0	131	5.11
1	642	25.06
2	334	13.04
3	348	13.58
4	529	20.65
5	576	22.48

14. The present physical facilities are not adequate; they do not permit desirable program changes.	SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
	0	126	4.92
	1	428	16.71
	2	348	13.58
	3	448	17.49
	4	935	36.49
	5	276	10.77

15. Desirable change and progress are hampered because Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away from the State and local governments.	SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
	0	116	4.53
	1	289	11.28
	2	251	9.80
	3	345	13.47
	4	1131	44.15
	5	429	16.74

16. Poor communication. People are not kept informed. Communication among the State's citizens, local school officials and State and Federal officials is inadequate.	SYMBOL	FREQ.	PR.CT.
	0	116	4.53
	1	251	9.80
	2	240	9.37
	3	434	16.94
	4	1210	47.23
	5	309	12.06

IV. HIERARCHY OF PERCEIVED BARRIERS

The hierarchy in this section starts with the item receiving the highest rating as a barrier, and ranges sequentially to the item perceived as being the least barrier. The number of people are given as a percent of the total number of people responding to each item. For example, number one, poor communication, was perceived as being a large reason why change and progress do not occur by 47.23% of the total number of persons who responded to this item on the survey.

Only the response "a large reason" was used in this section. For items which had more than one response factor (where the question had subsections), percentages were averaged to give the basic question overall rank in relation to other questions. The percent responding to each sub-factor is listed below that question. For purposes of

this part of the report, all groups responding are given equal weight. The questions are listed with those receiving the greatest percentages first and decreasing to the question which received the lowest percentage.

1. Poor communication. People are not kept informed. Communication among the State's citizens, local school officials and State and Federal officials is inadequate. 47.23%

2. Desirable change and progress are hampered because Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away from the State and local governments. 44.15%

3. The present physical facilities are not adequate; they do not permit desirable program changes. 36.49%

4. Politics get in the way of desirable change and progress. 35.73%

   On local level - 38.99%
   On National level - 36.81%
   On State level - 31.38%

5. Generally, people are not willing to pay the required costs for desirable changes and progress in the school. 35.32%

6. There is a general lack of understanding and agreement among State and local school personnel and parents about the purposes, goals and objectives of the school program. No one seems to know what changes should be made because of a lack of agreement on what should be accomplished by the school. 32.79%

7. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, seem to be waiting on someone else to take the lead in bringing about change and progress. 29.48%

   School Board Members - 36.61%
   Parents - 34.07%
   Principals - 31.69%
   State and Local Legislators - 31.34%
   Teachers - 31.26%
   Superintendents - 27.21%
   State Educators - 26.39%
   Supervisors and Directors - 25.76%
   Students - 20.96%

8. There are not enough people in the following positions to carry the present work load and initiate desirable changes. 25.05%

   Special Personnel (Counselors, Social Workers and Other Special Areas) - 38.10%
   Teachers - 34.31%
   State Educators - 27.01%
   Supervisors and Directors - 18.19%
   Principals - 17.21%
   Superintendents - 15.46%

9. The way decisions are made is not good because all those concerned are not asked for their opinions. State and local officials, teachers, parents and students do not have clearly defined roles. 24.63%

10. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, do not feel secure about change. They feel more comfortable with present school programs and therefore resist change. 24.28%

    School Board Members - 38.37%
    Superintendents - 27.87%
    State and Local Legislators - 27.79%
    Principals - 25.49%
    Supervisors and Directors - 23.77%
    Parents - 22.56%
    State Educators - 21.43%
    Teachers - 20.96%
    Students - 10.27%

11. On the whole, school people have failed to keep up with new ideas and developments about what is taught, how it is taught, materials and equipment and school organization. 23.65%

12. State rules, regulations and laws governing schools and personnel are not flexible enough. They prevent or discourage change and progress. 23.42%

13. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack the knowledge necessary to initiate and implement desirable change; that is, they do not know how to bring it about. 23.35%

    School Boards - 33.76%
    Principals - 23.34%
    Teachers - 21.82%
    Federal Educators - 21.51%
    Superintendent's Staff - 21.43%
    Supervisors and Directors - 21.31%
    State Educators - 20.30%

14. Each of the following groups of people, on the whole, lack interest and enthusiasm for bringing about change and progress. 23.11%

    School Board Members - 32.01%
    State and Local Legislators - 28.34%
    Superintendents - 25.29%
    Principals - 24.24%
    Parents - 23.54%
    Supervisors and Directors - 23.46%
    State Educators - 21.47%
    Teachers - 18.23%
    Students - 11.40%

15. Colleges and universities do not provide future teachers with methods, techniques, and list of materials to meet best the needs of students. 20.65%

16. Centers for research in education have failed to keep school personnel informed of new and better methods, techniques and materials. 15.53%

V. MAJOR BARRIERS ACCORDING TO PERSONAL DESCRIPTORS

This section shows the perceived major barriers (receiving the highest percentage rating) according to the various personal descriptors. Where more than one question is listed per group, the other question(s) listed either tied for high rating or were different enough from all the rest to merit attention.

College or University Educators; State Department of Education

73.33% School board members do not feel secure about change.
73.33% State and local legislators seem to be waiting for someone else to take lead.
73.33% School boards lack the knowledge necessary.

Teachers, Counselors

56.89% People are not willing to pay the required costs.

Supervisors of Education, Superintendents

62.07% People are not willing to pay the required costs.

Students

47.48% Poor communication.

Above $10,000 Income
56.01% Politics get in the way on local level.
60.82% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

$6,000 - $10,000 Income
44.69% Poor communication.
49.08% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Below $6,000 Income
26.87% People are not willing to pay the required costs.
26.87% School board members seem to be waiting for lead.
38.43% Poor communication.

Principal or Assistant Principal
64.71% People are not willing to pay the required costs.

School Board Members
53.85% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

City or County Government
70.97% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Blacks
28.96% Poor communication.

Whites
57.89% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.
(Poor communication was second at 52.63%.)

Parents, Lay Citizens, Legislators
47.08% Poor communication.
43.39% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Education omitted (field test indicated reluctance to mark if less than high school)
37.04% Poor communication.

Education up to high school graduate
31.88% On the National level politics get in the way.
42.75% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Education beyond high school graduate
56.79% Local politics get in the way.
57.53% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.
57.53% Poor communication.

Community - Suburbs of City
62.02% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Community - In City not Downtown
40.91% Poor communication.

Community - Inner City
52.00% Poor communication.

Community - City Related Specific Omitted
42.39% Poor communication.
42.39% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

Community - Rural, Small Town
52.62% Federal laws and courts have taken too much control away.

VI. NON-BARRIERS

The following items received a higher rating as not being barriers to education than as being barriers. For all other items the reverse was true, as might be expected, since all items had been identified as barriers. Those items perceived as non-barriers are as follows:

8. Students not feeling secure about change and feeling more comfortable with present school programs.
9. Teachers and students lacking interest and enthusiasm for bringing about change.
10. Students are waiting on someone else to take the lead in bringing about change.
11. Federal and state (state by a very small margin) educators lacking the knowledge to initiate and implement change.
12. Not enough superintendents, supervisors and directors, principals and state educators in their positions to carry the work load.
13. Colleges and universities not providing future teachers with methods, techniques and lists of materials.

VII.GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF BARRIERS

The listing below gives the overall degree to which the various groups of respondents perceived that there are barriers to change in education. The percent responding to the option that the item is "a large reason why change and progress do not occur," for all the items answered by each group, was averaged. The group with the highest average percent perceived the most barriers (or greatest amount) to change.

College or University Educators; State Department of Education - 38.85%

Community - Suburbs of City - 30.45%

Students - 29.61%

Education beyond high school graduate - 28.80%

Above $10,000 Income - 28.50%

Teachers, Counselors - 26.27%

Whites - 26.03%

Supervisors of Education, Superintendents - 25.89%

Community - Inner City - 25.85%

$6,000 - $10,000 - 23.60%

Principal or Assistant Principal - 23.59%

Parents, Lay Citizens, Legislators - 23.58%

Community - Rural, Small Town - 23.00%

Community - In City not Downtown - 20.86%

Education up to high school graduate - 20.43%

School Board Members - 20.32%

City or County Government - 18.62%

Below $6,000 Income - 17.71%

Blacks - 15.64%

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The "Study of Perceived Barriers to Change in Tennessee Education" had two primary purposes: (1) to identify and define the barriers to change and (2) to determine the extent to which these barriers were perceived to be such by different groups.

To accomplish this, a machine scorable survey instrument was developed. It was then distributed according to a methodology designed to elicit responses from randomly selected members of the target groups, identified according to various personal descriptors related to the respondents' backgrounds.

The total response to the survey was 2,562 completed survey forms. The data were analyzed according to the total group, major barriers perceived by the sub-groups identified according to personal descriptors, identified barriers percentage ratings to establish a hierarchy, and additional comments from the supplementary, open-ended, response sheet included with each survey form.

As would be expected, since all items on the survey were already defined as barriers to change in education, almost all items were rated as such. They were ranked to determine the extent to which the items were perceived as barriers, and the major barriers perceived by groups were listed. Of the exceptions (those items which received a greater rating as <u>not being</u> a barrier than <u>being</u> one) two should be emphasized because they are at the "cutting edge" of education. Specifically, students and teachers were not seen as lacking interest and enthusiasm for bringing

about change and progress. These two groups were the only exceptions and all the other groups rated received a higher rating as a barrier than not as a barrier in the question addressing itself to the issue of interest and enthusiasm. The group which saw the greatest number of barriers in general was College or University Educators; State Department of Education.

Assuming that more caring persons take the time to write additional comments on open response options on a survey, then the return on the supplementary response sheet indicates that parents do care. This refutes the Louisiana study summarized in this report which concluded that parents do not care. Also, blacks differed significantly from whites in perceiving the Federal Government as a barrier to change in education. A slightly larger percentage of blacks saw this item as a great barrier than not a barrier.

In the by-group results, poor communication was seen as the greatest barrier. It is interesting to note that, in other studies, finance was seen as the greatest barrier. While it is true that this item on this survey (". . . people are not willing to pay the required costs . . ."), did receive a fairly high rank in relation to the rest of the items, without exception the only respondents who saw this as the greatest barrier were public school educators.

As for the item of "poor communication", were it known in advance that this would receive the highest rating, then perhaps greater definition could have been given to this item. As it is, it is difficult to say what is indicated when people in Tennessee (at least those who responded to the survey) feel there is poor communication and people are not kept informed.

The results presented in this study scanned the general aspects of the data. A wealth of data remains which can, and some of it probably will, be studied in future reports if specific questions arise. One possible, but not necessarily probable, problem is the extent to which the data can be generalized. This is due to the fact that the returns, although substantial in number, may or may not be random according to the method of distribution outlined. The respondents, in terms of personal characteristics, do represent the approximate frequency which might logically be expected. Some other possible cautions follow.

While parents did show a considerable interest in responding to this survey, frequent comments, with indication of strong intensity of feelings, were related to the issues of Federal intervention in the schools, bussing and lack of discipline. The latter was often tied in the remarks to the first two. These issues were prominent at the time the survey was conducted and, if they did indeed influence the rate of response as the writer's analysis indicated they did, then care should be taken in assuming that there would be a similar frequency of response in other studies at different times. It might also be asked whether these responses really addressed themselves to barriers to change. Quite the opposite may be true in that changes which were occurring were presented.

The problem with including finance in a study of barriers to change is that many seem to view increased funding as the simplest solution for improving the quality of education. As noted, the persons who saw lack of finance as the greatest barrier were educators. This leads one to speculate that the reason that barrier ranked so high in other

studies surveyed was because many of the persons involved were educators. While it is true that it takes money to support any type of "operation" such as public education, this writer knows of no definitive study which clearly shows that greater amounts of expenditures, as such, improve the quality of education. In fact, the Rand report cited in this study states that "Increasing expenditure on traditional education practices is not likely to improve educational outcomes substantially."[15]

Part of the question dealing with "poor communication" also deals with keeping people informed. If people are not kept informed, why was there not a greater rate of response to the "not enough information" option on many of the items? Where the latter choice was made, the item usually dealt with persons in high positions in education with whom the general public has little contact, so this response might be anticipated. Other words of caution may be necessary in any interpretations which might be made regarding the "communication" item and these have to do with the item itself. First of all, while people tend to be less critical on surveys if an item is strongly negative about specific persons, this item is fairly innocuous in that no one is being specifically criticized. Yet the item itself is strongly stated in a negative fashion (perhaps leading). In addition to this, it was the last item on the survey and this in itself might be a variable. That may seem to view more money spent as the simplest solution for improving the quality of education.

---

[15]Harvey A. Averch and others, "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings." (Report for the President's Commission on School Finance by the Rand Corporation, 1972), p. 158.

Drawing definite conclusions from this study at this point was not the intent of the activities related to it. Rather, the aim was to have a point of departure for possible future activities.

One such possible activity, already implied, would be a follow-up study in the area of communications. The writer's opinion is that communication is indeed the major problem where problems exist in human interaction. But, used this way, communication can include many facets and is not necessarily synonymous with information or the lack of it.

To the extent that certain populations are present in situations where educational change is determined to be necessary, consideration might be given to those factors viewed by the groups as being significant barriers to change. This might apply in situations where goals of education are being determined.

This might particularly apply in identifying groups as targets for the dissemination of information. Items perceived by groups as large barriers could be used as a basis for determining what the groups need information about.

In summary, many barriers have been identified and rated by groups according to the extent that the groups perceived the barriers to be such. However, this information would be more useful if goals had been established, educational needs assessed and the kinds of necessary changes defined. Although the data gathered can have some usefulness to decision makers, the primary or enduring usefulness of this study lies in the development of the instrument which can be used when directions for change in education are specified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Averch, Harvey A. and others. "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings." (Report for the President's Commission on School Finance by the Rand Corporation, 1972).

"Barriers to Educational Change in Georgia." (Progress Report, prepared by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, June, 1971).

Berry, Evalena, and Willis, Earl. "Project on Innovations and Barriers to Educational Change." (Arkansas Progress Report, June, 1971).

Berty, Ernest. "Barriers to Innovation in West Virginia." (A report prepared by the Office of Research, West Virginia State Department of Education, Charleston, West Virginia, April, 1971).

Illich, Ivan. De-Schooling Society. (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

Kirby, Wanda W. "Barriers to Educational Change in Louisiana." (Planning and Evaluation Section, Louisiana State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, January, 1971).

MacDougall, Curtis D. Understanding Public Opinion (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1952).

Maguire, Louis M. "Observations and Analysis of the Literature on Change." (Philadelphia, Pa: Research for Better Schools, 1970).

Phillips, Francis T., Jr. "Analysis of the Kentucky 'Barriers to Educational Change' and Possible Actions to be Taken in Virginia." (A Report prepared for the Virginia State Department of Education.)

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. (New York: Random House, 1970).

"Special Project: Barriers to Educational Change." (North Carolina Status Report).

Tallison, Ellen, and Ness, Jane. "Barriers to Educational Change." (Research Information Unit, Office of Research, South Carolina State Department of Education, June, 1971).

Winebarger, Richard L. "Barriers to Educational Change in Kentucky." (Kentucky State Department of Education).

Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (Cambridge: The MIT Press [no date]).

APPENDIXES

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO SURVEY INSTRUMENT

USED IN THIS STUDY

May 2, 1972

Dear Tennessee Citizen:

At times, everyone would like to express their feelings about things that are important to them. Perhaps few things are more important to you than your schools and the quality of education of your's and others' children. Here is an opportunity for you to tell how you feel about school and some of the problems as you see them.

The enclosed survey form is sent to you by the Tennessee Department of Education in cooperation with the superintendent, principal, and teachers. Filling in the form will take about 20-30 minutes of your time. After completing the form, you may wish to make additional comments on the Supplementary Response Sheet.

It is important that you fill in the form and mail it for two reasons. First, your opinions are important as a basis for improving the quality of education. Second, the forms are being given to a select group of adults in the State (including some twelfth grade students) and if you do not mail your form in, the data will not be complete. So, why not take a few minutes now to complete the form? If you lay it aside, you may never get around to it again. Just follow the directions printed on the form. When finished, place it in the self-addressed and stamped envelope and drop it in the mail.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Note: If the form is delivered to you by your child, either parent or both parents (jointly) may fill it in.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EARLIER SURVEY IN TENNESSEE

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Barriers to Change in Education

Have you ever felt that newer or better ways of doing some things in education should be adopted, but that the barriers are so great that little if any change ever takes place? This is a survey to find out what several groups of people perceive as the barriers to progress and change. You are asked to list the barriers, as you see them, to changes which should take place. Some of the barriers may be at the administrative level (local and state), and some may be at the teacher or classroom level. Others may be related to the community and others to the "climate for change." Still other barriers may be within the individual and others related to knowledge about the change process and newer things in education. The above possible areas are not meant to be suggestive or restrictive, but rather to stimulate thought. With this in mind, please list five to ten prominent barriers to educational change as you perceive them. Make statements as concise and to the point as possible. Thanks.

RESPONSE SHEET FOR EARLIER SURVEY IN TENNESSEE

Barriers to Change in Education

Position_____Sex_____

Number years experience in Education_____

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

VITA

Rostislav (Ross) Mol was born in Riga, Latvia, on March 31, 1940. He began his public school education in Germany and completed it in the spring of 1958 in Hemstead, New York. The following fall he enrolled at Adelphi College (now Adelphi University) in Garden City, New York, and was graduated in the spring of 1962 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Psychology. Following graduation, he worked in process engineering in electronics, which was essentially a continuation of work based on experience in related work dating from 1957.

In the fall of 1962 he entered military service where he was first an enlisted Testing Specialist and later a commissioned Personnel Psychologist and Test Control Officer. He was released from active military service in November of 1966 with the rank of First Lieutenant.

In January of 1967 he began employment with the Tennessee State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation as a counselor and later as an evaluator.

He began work at the State Testing and Evaluation Center at the University of Tennessee, where he is presently employed as Director of Program Planning, in September of 1970.

He studied from the beginning of this employment at the University of Tennessee, and received his Master's Degree in Educational Psychology in 1973.