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ABSTRACT. This study inquired into the attitudes of administrators and
teachers in the Republic of China Industrial Vocational Schools toward the
Inservice Education Ordinance enacted in 1985. It also recommended that
adult learning theories and strategies be adopted for implementing inservice
education for industrial vocational teachers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Significance
The quality of the teacher has an impact on the success of educational
production. Increasing teachers' professional knowledge and enhancing teach-
ing methods through inservice education is an effective approach to improving
the outcome of education. To improve teacher inservice education, the Ministry
of Education in the Republic of China (R.O.C.) issued the Inservice Education
Ordinance for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers (hereafter referred
to as the Ordinance) in 1985. The Ordinance has several significant aspects:
it is the first statute regarding teacher inservice education, and some
important elements are explicitly identified such as types and providers of
inservice education.

Literature Review
A review of the inservice education literature clarified various dimen-
sions. It provided the definition that inservice education is a kind of well-
planned, goal-oriented, continuing education activity designed to improve
teachers' performance. Although the review affirmed that teachers' performance,
their morale and job satisfaction are improved through inservice education, and they
are helped to keep pace with changing society and technology, the real signi-
ficance lies in the fact that the ultimate beneficiaries are the students of
these teachers who participate in inservice education.

The review also revealed that the content of inservice education needs
to be a combination of practical experiences—such as occupational knowledge and
skills, using learning theories and instructional strategies that encourage
and facilitate self-directed learning, inquiry, discovery and decision-making.
The most effective inservice education programs were identified as those
which incorporate teachers' participation in the planning, designing and
implementing while including feedback on participant progress and when conducted
in the teachers' own school as well as in "on the spot" corporate settings.

Additionally, because teachers are adult learners when they are involved
as participants in inservice education, educators need to utilize theories of
adult learning when designing and conducting inservice education programs.
Some studies indicate that an andragogical approach (the art and science of
helping adults learn) appears to be the most effective in designing and con-
ducting inservice education programs for adults.

Questions Considered
Although inservice education practices in the R.O.C. appeared comprehen-
sive, problems existed such as unequal access, inadequate resources,
ineffective programs and personnel conflicts which gave impetus to developing and enacting the ordinance in 1985. The Ordinance, however, fails to address several problems. Concerned only with elementary and secondary school teachers, it does not address the unique needs of special groups such as industrial vocational teachers. Because of these shortcomings, it is necessary to explore the attitudes of industrial vocational teachers and administrators toward the Ordinance and to trace its implementation and effectiveness in order to recommend amendments to the Ordinance.

The purpose, then, of this study was to evaluate the Ordinance to improve inservice education for industrial vocational teachers in Taiwan. Four questions gave direction to this study:
1. How has the Ordinance been implemented?
2. What are the attitudes of school administrators and teachers regarding the effects of the Ordinance on teachers' participation in inservice education?
3. What kinds of inservice education systems are preferred by school administrators and teachers?
4. How can changes in governmental policy improve inservice education for industrial vocational teachers?

Research Hypotheses

This study was basically descriptive. Previous research indicated that conflicts between administrators and teachers had affected teachers' participation in inservice education. Therefore, two hypotheses related to the second and third research questions, respectively, were tested:

No. 1: There are no significant differences between administrators' and teachers' mean attitude scores toward the effects of the Ordinance on teachers' participation in inservice education.

No. 2: Administrators' and teachers' preference frequencies on inservice education delivery systems are homogeneous.

METHODOLOGY

The Instrument: To answer the aforementioned research questions, the researchers developed a survey instrument, consisting of three sections:

Section I: Demographic data and personal information, such as the subjects' school type, and school location (see Table 1).

Section II: Information regarding the kinds of inservice education preferred by school administrators and teachers. This section included four multiple-choice questions about three topics (see Table 2-4).

Section III: Information regarding the attitudes and opinions of the subjects about the Ordinance. This section was a Likert-type attitude questionnaire containing 28 questions which addressed seven issues (see Table 6).

Populations and sample: One segment of the population surveyed consisted of all school principals (195) and directors of academic affairs (195) in industrial vocational schools in Taiwan. There were 5567 industrial vocational teachers who were teaching occupational courses comprised the second population. Ten percent (356) of the teacher population was selected as the sample. The administrator sample consisted of 374 administrators including 187 principals and 187 directors of academic affairs.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA

The nature of respondents in this study is shown in Table 1. The respondents from public and private schools reflected the population who received the questionnaire: 39.7 percent were from public schools and 60.3 percent were from private schools. Of the entire sample, 40.7 percent of the respondents were working for schools located in the northern area. The proportions of the respondents in the middle and southern areas were equal (27
percent). Only 4.6 percent of the respondents were from the eastern area. This response rate also reflected identical proportions of teachers in each geographical area in the total teacher population. The respondents in this study were representative of the population sampled.

Table 1 Nature of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators and teachers differed very little in their attitudes and opinions about the Ordinance and inservice education delivery methods. Chi-square tests of the responses in Section II of the instrument revealed homogeneity between administrators and teachers, except the designer of short-term inservice education curricula (see Table 2-4).

Table 2 Designers of Short-term Inservice Education Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum specialists</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Representatives of teachers</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principals and directors</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College instructors</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governmental Administrators</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For designers of short-term inservice education curricula, items selected by administrators were curriculum specialists, representatives of teachers, principals and directors, college instructors, and governmental administrators, ranked in order according to the proportion of respondents selecting the relative item. In the teacher respondents, the items were representatives of teachers, curriculum specialists, college instructors, principals and directors, and governmental administrators. (see Table 2-4)

Concerning time period for conducting inservice education and reasons for attending inservice education, teachers believed that summer vacation was the best time period to offer inservice education, and that the next most opportune times were weekends and Sundays. They chose "to improve knowledge and skills for instruction" as the strongest reason to attend inservice education. (see Table 3-4)
Table 3 Time Period for Conducting Inservice Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Weekend &amp; Sunday</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Only teachers responded to this question.

Table 4 Reasons for Attending Inservice Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Only teachers responded to this question.

Use of MANCOVA to analyze the responses in Section III of the instrument revealed that there were no meaningful differences between administrators and teachers. The first research hypothesis was accepted (see Table 5-6).

Table 5 MANCOVA of Differences in Mean Attitude Scores

Wilks Multivariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.96407</td>
<td>3.90781</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>.000 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F-tests (DF=1, 740)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>SSb</th>
<th>SSw</th>
<th>MSb</th>
<th>MSw</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.207</td>
<td>227.475</td>
<td>3.207</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>10.432</td>
<td>.001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.935</td>
<td>205.611</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>211.952</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.563</td>
<td>323.359</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>361.239</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>7.503</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>235.594</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>6.584</td>
<td>.010 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>374.534</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 (A) = .0135
R^2 (F) = .0088

Respondents only gave positive scores (slightly more than 3.0) to Issues B and A. This indicates the subjects had slightly positive attitudes toward the incentive policies and the implementation of the Ordinance. The scores of Issue C, D and G were very close to 3.0, indicating that neither groups had strong feelings toward the relation between the teacher’s priority to attend inservice education and his or her seniority, the implementation of the teaching certificate renewal policy, as well as how the Ordinance had influenced teachers’ participation in inservice education. The mean scores of Issues E, and F were less than 3.0, especially Issue E, indicating the subjects expected that inservice education should be mandatory, and that the government should bear the expenses of inservice education. (See Table 6)
### Table 6 Differences of Adjusted Grand Means to 3.0 (No Opinion) and Adjusted Mean Scores on Each Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Adjusted Grand Mean</th>
<th>Difference (AGM-3.0)</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. A How has the Ordinance been implemented?</td>
<td>Administrator 3.381</td>
<td>Teacher 3.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.245</td>
<td>+0.245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. B How do the subjects respond to the incentive policies of the Ordinance?</td>
<td>Administrator 3.363</td>
<td>Teacher 3.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>+0.385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. C How has the Ordinance influenced teachers' participation in inservice education?</td>
<td>Administrator 2.773</td>
<td>Teacher 2.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. D Should the teacher's priority to attend inservice education be determined by seniority?</td>
<td>Administrator 2.891</td>
<td>Teacher 2.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. E Who should pay for inservice education: the government or the teacher?</td>
<td>Administrator 2.515</td>
<td>Teacher 2.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.416</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. F Should inservice education be mandatory?</td>
<td>Administrator 2.514</td>
<td>Teacher 2.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable .. G Should the teaching certificate renewal policy be implemented?</td>
<td>Administrator 2.862</td>
<td>Teacher 2.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Conclusions**

Several conclusions are drawn from the findings of this study:

1. The respondents in this study are representative of the population sampled; therefore the external validity of this study is considered high.
2. Administrators and teachers differ very little in their attitudes and opinions about the Ordinance and inservice education delivery methods.
3. The subjects have no strong feeling about the Ordinance.
4. The respondents have slightly positive attitudes toward the implementation of the Ordinance.
5. Administrators and teachers believe that the effectiveness of the Ordinance's incentive policies is adequate.
6. Similar delivery methods of inservice education are preferred by school administrators and teachers. They believe that teachers who desire to attend the program, curriculum specialists, school administrators, and college instructors should be involved in planning the curricula of short-term inservice education programs. According to the respondents, summer vacations, weekends and Sundays are optimum times to offer inservice education programs. Improved knowledge and skills for instruction is the major reason teachers list for attending inservice education. According to the respondents, the government should pay costs of inservice education.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the investigator makes the following recommendations:
1. The following policies should be incorporated into the Ordinance to strengthen its effects on teachers' participation in inservice education:
   a) The amount of money budgeted for inservice education should be stated explicitly;
   b) The government should pay all costs needed for short-term and teaching-related inservice education;
   c) Policies for rewarding the providers of inservice education should be added to the Ordinance; and
   d) Standards for rewarding teachers who engage in inservice education should be established.

2. The instructor of inservice education should apply theories of adult education in teaching the participants. The review of literature reveals that by applying the methods of andragogy, the art and science of teaching adults, industrial training has been more effective in helping adult trainees to obtain management competencies and technical skills.

3. Since this study was conducted only two years after the announcement of the Ordinance, the investigator recommends continuous evaluation of the Ordinance. Furthermore, experimental studies should be conducted to reveal whether andragogy is applicable to inservice education in Taiwan. There are many research findings that indicate andragogy is conducive to inservice education in the United States and other countries; however, it has not been adopted in Taiwan. The investigator, therefore, recommends that experimental studies related to the application of theories of adult education be conducted as soon as possible.

The results of this study are beneficial to the Government of the Republic of China in amending the Ordinance and improving inservice education for industrial vocational teachers. The results also have implications for inservice education policy considerations in other countries.
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