EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Vol. 17 No. 1

The Journal of the International Society for Educational Planning
PROMOTING THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

International Society for Educational Planning

EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Marvin Bartell
University of Manitoba

Robert Beach
Alabama State University

George Crawford
University of Kansas

William Cunningham
Old Dominion University

Russell O. Mays
University of North Florida

Donna Ferrara
Long Island University

Charles Webber
University of Calgary

Mark Yulich
Kansas City, Missouri School District

Kathryn Gerbino
Board Cooperative Educational Services

Carleton Holt
University of Arkansas

Dan Inbar
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Virginia Roach
George Washington University

C. Kenneth Tanner
University of Georgia

Timothy R. Toops
Florida Southern College

Editor
Linda K. Lemasters
The George Washington University

Assistant Editor
Adam Nir
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Reprints: Articles and reviews are available from the editor. Please contact the editor for availability and costs.
Translations: *Educational Planning* will attempt to provide readers with major language translations of journal articles. Interested members should contact the editor regarding availability and costs.

©2007 International Society for Educational Planning
All Rights Reserved

Educational Planning is the refereed journal of the International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP). *Educational Planning* is published quarterly by ISEP, which maintains editorial offices at One Old Oyster Point road, Suite 200 Newport News, VA 23602.
The Journal is assigned ISSN 1537-873X by the National Serials Data Program of the Library of Congress.

All material in the Journal is the property of ISEP and is copyrighted. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means electronically or mechanically including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system without written permission from the publisher. Permission to use material generally will be made available by the editor to students and educational institutions upon written request.

For manuscript submission and membership information please see last pages.

For more information visit our web site: www.isep.info

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
A JOURNAL DEDICATED TO PLANNING, CHANGE, REFORM, AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 17 NUMBER 1
2008

Preface ii

About The Authors iii

Planning for Technology Integration: Is the Agenda Overrated or Underappreciated?
Amiee Howley and Craig Howley 1

A Communitarian Framework for Planning Educational Leadership Preparation Programs
Vincent Baxter 18

Teacher Burnout and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Turkish Elementary Schools
Cemil Yucel. 27

Evaluating the Legal Rights Support Program for Education in Egypt: A Case Study
Mahmoud Abbas Abdeen 44

Invitation to Submit Manuscripts 53

Invitation to Fall Conference 54

Membership Application 55

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING is indexed in H.W.Wilson,and available in Google Scholar, and EBSCO Information Services.

PREFACE

Linda K. Lemasters

This journal is a venue in which we would like to showcase meaningful research on planning and change. The International Society of Educational Planning (ISEP) encourages the readership to submit their research documents and articles. School leadership is experiencing success in student achievement as a result of planning and making changes based on strategic thinking. This success is acknowledged in the United States, as well as in many foreign countries. Our journal articles evidence this. We need to get the word out, as certainly all of us are bombarded with the news when success is not achieved. Not only do we want your articles, please note at various conferences, with your other professional organizations, and with your colleagues at your university that we are interested in their research as well.

I especially would like to thank the authors of the articles in this issue; they accepted the suggestions of the reviewers and revised their work in a very timely manner. Appreciation goes out as well to the ISEP Board and the membership for their support and willingness to help.

Once more there are several persons that are due appreciation for their assistance with getting the journal ready for publication. *Glen Earthman* has continued to make sure that the printing and mailing are done in an effective and timely manner. Most importantly he is always nearby for advice and consultation. The Editorial Review Board assisted with the juried reviews, as well as three guest reviewers: *Carleton Holt*, *Russell Mays*, and *Tim Toops*.

Our journal is now indexed in the *H. W. Wilson Education Index*. We have signed a contract with *EBSCO*, so our articles and journal will soon become a part of the *EBSCO* database. *EBSCO* has been serving libraries and organizations worldwide for more than 60 years.

ABOUT THE EDITOR

Linda Lemasters is an Associate Professor and Program Coordinator for Educational Administration and Policy Studies, Department of Educational Leadership, Graduate School of Education and Human Development at The George Washington University. She has collaborated with Glen Earthman on a textbook and numerous articles and is editor of the 2007 Yearbook for the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration: *At the tipping point: Navigating the course for the preparation of educational administrators*.

ABOUT THE GUEST REVIEWERS

Carleton Holt, EdD, has served as a band director, coach, and school administrator in the public schools in Iowa and South Dakota for over thirty years. He has had articles published by the *Educational Research Quarterly* and *School Business Affairs*. In addition, he is the author of a textbook for educational leaders entitled *School Board Success: A Strategy for Building America's Schools*. (cholt@uark.edu)

Russell O. Mays, EdD, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Leadership, Counseling, and Technology Educational Leadership at the University of North Florida. His active research agenda includes school facility design and planning and the affects on student achievement, faculty and staff morale, and community support. (rmays@unf.edu)

Timothy R. Toops, EdD, is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Division of Education at Florida Southern College. He is in demand as a speaker is in the field of reading and curriculum; however, as a former teacher, principal, superintendent, and consultant from the State of Ohio, he has significant expertise in leadership. (ttoops@flsouthern.edu)

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mahmoud Abbas Abdeen, PhD, is currently a professor of Educational Administration, Planning, and Economics of Education; Chair of the Foundations of Education Department, College of Education, Ismailia, Suez Canal University, Egypt. His research interests are educational leadership, educational quality, mathematical models, educational policy making, planning, economics of education, and administration. He has authored numerous articles and books, was the dean of Colleges of Education in Suez then Ismailia, and has been a key consultant at USAID.

Vincent Baxter is a Doctoral student in Educational Administration and Policy Studies at The George Washington University. His research interests include communitarianism, educational administration preparation programs, and ethnographic film. Mr. Baxter is a graduate of The University of Virginia and The George Washington University, a returned Peace Corps Volunteer (Cameroon), and a former District of Columbia Public School teacher. He currently serves Fall Church City Public Schools (VA) as the Assistant Principal of Mary Ellen Henderson Middle School.

Aimee Howley, EdD, is a professor in the Educational Studies Department at Ohio University. Her recent research considers issues relating to educational policy and rural education. She is also the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies.

Craig Howley, EdD, whose research focuses on rural education and small schools, is co-director of the NSF-sponsored ACCLAIM Research Initiative at Ohio University. He has authored or coauthored more than 120 conference papers, peer reviewed journal articles, monographs, and books.

Cemil Yucel, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at University of Usak, Turkey. His expertise is in educational leadership, organizational behavior, and school improvement. He recently has served as the dean of the graduate school of social sciences at the same university.

PLANNING FOR TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION: IS THE IT AGENDA OVERRATED OR UNDERAPPRECIATED?[1]

Aimee Howley
Craig Howley

ABSTRACT

Review of relevant literature and findings from an evaluation of one school's technology integration project raise troubling questions about the place of instructional technology in US schools. Major arguments supporting technology integration are varied, and some of them rest on fundamentally incompatible premises. But despite these arguments, technology integration in general has been neither thoroughgoing nor instructionally effective. Turning first to the relevant literature, this study identifies researchers' explanations for inadequate technology integration in US schools. Then it examines these explanations in light of data generated through the evaluation of one rural school's project to integrate computer-based technologies into instruction in core academic subjects. Findings suggest that technical, ideological, cultural, and systemic circumstances—impediments also identified in the prior literature—did indeed compromise technology integration in the school project evaluated by these researchers.

BACKGROUND

In response to the marketing of home computers in the early 1980s, some educators began to advocate widespread use of technology in K-12 classrooms (e.g., Clay, 1982). Early articles and textbooks on technology integration presented hopeful visions of educational transformations resulting from classroom technology use. Despite the enthusiasm of advocates, teachers were slow to incorporate computer applications in meaningful ways (e.g., Cuban, 2001). At present, following more than 20 years of advocacy and teacher training, advocates continue to extol the instructional benefits of computers and related technologies; yet a majority of teachers continue to eschew or even actively resist technology integration (Becker, 2000; Cuban, 2001). These teachers' perspectives and practices seem not to be associated with the numbers of computers and related technologies available to them in schools. Schools all over the United States have been purchasing hardware and instructional software since the early 1980s, and now, according to the U.S. Department of Education (2005) among other sources (e.g., Becker, 2000), computers and related technologies are available in the vast majority of US schools. Nevertheless, ample evidence suggests that the promises of technology integration have not been fully realized.

Whereas scholars offer various explanations for this disappointing outcome, interactions with practicing teachers tend to support certain of these explanations and cast doubt on others. In this paper, we examine the explanations set forth in the published literature in light of evidence grounded in the world of classroom practice. Such an examination provides important insights to guide educational planning efforts. Notably, it speaks to the question of whether or not technology planning—which in almost all cases represents a variant of rational planning—actually is likely to succeed.

Despite increasing agreement among educational planners that rational planning has distinct limits, technology planners continue to advocate the rational model (e.g., Anderson, 2001; Bennett & Everhart, 2003). Nevertheless, the evidence from empirical investigations of school projects to integrate technology suggests that technology planners ought to be attentive to the limits of rationality resulting from complexity, power dynamics, and cultural norms. Such limits have, in fact, been discussed by theorists of planning for more than 50 years (e.g., Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; Mintzberg, 1993; Simon, 1955).

METHOD

The analysis reported in this paper uses data from a program evaluation to interrogate the explanations for the pattern of incomplete and ineffective technology integration exhibited in classrooms in the United States. The first step in conducting the analysis was, therefore, to review literature on the extent and quality of technology integration in K-12 schools. In addition to establishing a context for the study, the literature

1 The authors wish to thank Edwina Pendarvis and Marged Howley for their assistance with data gathering and their contributions to an early version of the manuscript.

review also yielded a list of possible explanations for the current state of affairs. The literature used for these purposes included empirical studies and critical analyses published in the ten-year period between 1997 and 2007.

In an effort to explore the salience of the various explanations presented in the literature, the second part of the analysis drew on data from an evaluation of technology integration at a rural middle school. In effect, this part of the investigation answered the research question: "To what extent did educators' experiences at TMS fit in with each of the popular explanations for limited technology integration in US schools?" This approach might be seen as a way to challenge the generalizabilty of each of the explanations, but doing so was not its major intent. Rather, because technology *planning* was the domain of interest, the primary aim was to derive insights about the influence of systemic characteristics (across the classroom, school, district, and state levels of a school system) on the rhetoric and practice of technology integration.

Attending to this aim and considering that (a) the school represented just one example and (b) the number of participating teachers was small, the interpretation avoided making direct generalizations. Instead it focused on the way particular dynamics in one school fit with generalizations brought forward in previous literature. As such, the study might properly be said to elucidate theory rather than either to propose or test it.

FINDINGS

This section of the paper first presents researchers' explanations of the incomplete and uninventive uses of technology so often seen in US classrooms. Then it describes the school whose integration of technology is the case-in-point used in the present analysis. Finally, it investigates the extent to which circumstances at the school did or did not fit with the explanations offered in the literature.

The Empirical Literature

As Whitworth and Berson (2003, p. 483) suggested, the classroom computer is relegated to the status of "an appendage. . .[and] continues to serve the primary function of facilitating students' access to content." Cuban (2001) offered a similar assessment, reporting that approximately half of today's teachers integrate computers into classroom lessons but primarily as a way to give students access to word-processing and resources on the internet. These authors and many others speculated about the reasons for such limited and unimaginative integration of computers and related technologies, and some (e.g., ChanLin, Hong, Horng Chang, & Chu, 2006) found it useful to categorize these explanations. Using this approach but a different organizational scheme than that used by ChanLin and associates (2006), the current review organizes the explanations in four categories, each defining in a different way the conditions facing schools: (a) technical explanations, (b) explanations relating to organizational capacity, (c) explanations focusing on ideology, and (d) systemic and ecological explanations.

Technical explanations. Even though computers can now be found in most schools in the United States (e.g., Becker, 2000), technical problems still keep them from being used effectively. For example, many teachers reported that they have insufficient access to computers (Fabry & Higgs, 1997; Redmann & Kotrlik, 2004; Shayo, Olfman, & Guthrie, 2001; Smerdon, Cronen, Lanahan, Anderson, Jannotti, & Angeles, 2000; Styron & Disher, 2003) and appropriate software (Zhao, 2007), or that they lack adequate Internet access (Fabry & Higgs, 1997; Zhao, 2007). Problems with hardware, software, and internet connectivity call for technical support, which is limited or totally lacking in some school districts (Redmann & Kotrlik, 2004; Shayo, Olfman, & Guthrie, 2001).

The technical and access problems that face many schools may result from more extensive difficulties in garnering necessary resources and organizational supports of other types. In a sense, then, explanations for inadequate integration of technology that focus on the technology itself may form a subset of more widespread capacity issues such as those described in the next section.

Explanations relating to organizational capacity. Researchers have identified a range of capacity limitations that seem to interfere with teachers' effective integration of technology. In some studies, educators reported that they lacked funds to initiate and sustain technology integration (Fabry & Higgs, 1997; George, 2000; MacNeil & Delafield, 1998). In some, the major focus was on time (Fabry & Higgs, 1997; Franklin, 2007; George, 2000; Zhao, 2007).

Limited time, moreover, seems to keep schools from supporting the types of activities needed for the expansion of organizational capacity. Some researchers investigated this constraint from the vantage of principals, who reported that there was inadequate time for professional development (MacNeil & Delafield, 1998). Others captured teachers' perceptions that they lacked sufficient time to learn how to integrate computers into instruction (Smerdon, Cronen, Lanahan, Anderson, Jannotti, & Angeles, 2000) or lacked adequate instructional planning time in which to develop lessons that incorporated technology (Redmann & Kotrlik, 2004; Zhao, 2007). In some studies, teachers also indicated that there was inadequate time in the school day to allow students to use computers (Smerdon et al., 2000).

Although certain other studies also reported constraints upon organizational capacity, they did not necessarily attribute these constraints to lack of funds or insufficient time. Several research teams noted, for example, that teachers simply did not have adequate expertise (George, 2000) or experience in using technology for instructional purposes (Zhao, 2007). Some researchers cited lack of appropriate training (Budin, 1999; Fabry & Higgs, 1997; US Department of Education, 2005; Zhao, 2007) or sufficient administrative support (Shayo, Olfman, & Guthrie, 2001; Styron & Disher, 2003) as major impediments.

Several studies focused on the role that school leadership plays in technology integration (Baylor & Ritchie, 2002; Stegal, 1998). Key functions that leaders perform—planning, providing resources, arranging for professional development of teachers, maintaining an open and productive organizational climate—appeared to foster technology integration (Brockmeier, Sermon, & Hope, 2005; Hunt & Lockard, 1998; Staples, Pugach, & Himes, 2005). And evidently these functions tend to be performed to greater and lesser degrees in different schools and districts (Brockmeier et al., 2005). According to some researchers, principals often lacked knowledge about how to support technology integration and, like the teachers whom they were trying to assist, needed to expand their knowledge and skills (e.g., Brockmeier et al., 2005).

Explanations relating to ideology. In a sense, because they concentrate on the connection between organizational means and ends, both types of explanations examined thus far have a technical focus. These explanations assume that, once appropriate solutions are deployed, desired changes will ensue. For example, explanations targeting resources embed the assumption that technology integration will improve once resources are increased.

Another set of explanations identify the primary source of limited technology integration as educators' preexisting beliefs and attitudes. From this perspective, teachers either have a general tendency to resist change (Fabry & Higgs, 1997) or hold particular beliefs about teaching and learning that militate against technology integration (Kanaya, Light, & Culp, 2005; Palak, Walls, & Wells, 2006; Zhao, 2007). These two conditions, of course, are not mutually exclusive: teachers may resist change precisely because of the beliefs they maintain about teaching and learning.

Moreover, resilient beliefs about teaching and learning tend to promote a "teacher-centered" approach—what Freire (1970) called the "banking model of education"—whether teachers choose to deploy technology for instructional delivery or not (Cuban, 2001). This explanation seems to account for some teachers' resistance to technology integration as well as for others' unimaginative applications of instructional technology (e.g.., using technology solely to deliver content).

Systemic or ecological explanations. Although explanations that focus on technical insufficiencies and those that focus on teachers' resilient beliefs appear to have face validity, neither accounts for everything that seems to be going on. Furthermore, the two explanations are disconnected. Another type of explanation—one focusing on schools as systems—seems more inclusive and more parsimonious, and it seems capable of subsuming both of the other types of explanation. Li (2007), for example, offered a systemic description of functional technology integration:

> A technology-enhanced environment, therefore, can be viewed as a system that emerges from the interaction of its components. These components are the critical stakeholders and include students, teachers, and administrators. These stakeholder groups interact with each other and carry out certain tasks that enable the environment to function. For example, students' and teachers' beliefs about technology may affect their adoption of the tools which directly contributes to the establishment of a technology-enhanced environment. Further, administrators' understanding of technology-related issues may affect school policies. This, in turn, may influence the integration of technology in

schools and reshape the environment. (p. 378)

From Li's perspective, attitudes and beliefs influence practices, which, of course, then double back to influence attitudes and beliefs. What he portrayed in the passage quoted above is a more positive version of the systemic influences on the integration of instructional technology than most studies actually have revealed. These studies have tended to highlight the systemic dysfunctions that conspires *against* technology integration: (a) traditional beliefs about pedagogy (e.g., Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997; Cuban, 2001), (b) emphasis on high-stakes testing (Franklin, 2007), (c) propensity to avoid planning (Budin, 1999; ChanLin, 2007), (d) limited collegiality (Wiske, Sick, & Wirsig, 2001), (e) inadequate leadership, and (f) insufficient resources. Added together these circumstances sustain a durable system that all but disables reform. Building on this explanation—what he called the "history-and-context" explanation—Cuban (2001, p.180) outlined the types of solutions that would be required if school ecologies were to change in ways supportive of technology integration:

- "fundamental changes in how elementary and secondary schools are organized, time is allocated, and teachers are prepared" (p. 180);
- development of "software and equipment specifically designed for teachers and students" (p. 181);
- improvement of product testing, reliability, and support (p. 181); and,
- "sustained attention to the links between the economic, social, housing, and political structures of [urban and low-income] neighborhood[s] and the quality of schooling." (p. 181)

Cuban, however, did not propose that all of these changes be made *on behalf of* technology integration but rather that these and other critical changes be made to restore democratic purposes to the enterprise of schooling. From Cuban's vantage, economic and corporate purposes, so often invoked in calls to increase the integration of instructional technology, diminish schools' capacity to offer meaningful instruction through whatever channels; attention to the inadequacy of technology integration simply obscures this larger, far more important issue, in his view.

The School and Community

> T Middle School is located in the small town of R in a county in the central portion of West Virginia. Though T is the second largest town in the county, it is nevertheless located 25 miles away from the closest juncture with a US highway, the only four-lane highway in the county. The county is slightly more rural than the state as a whole. Currently, its population is estimated to be about 26,446, or about 40 people per square mile, compared to the West Virginia average of 75 people per square mile (US Census Bureau, 2007a). The 2000 census found the population to be 26,562, and the current estimate reflects a slight downward trend (US Census Bureau, 2007b). Not surprisingly, much of this downward trend results from the exodus of younger people who are leaving to find work. The unemployment rate is over eight percent. The county's economy is similar to that of many counties in West Virginia, where extractive industries have, in large part, determined the nature of community economic development and devolution.

The county school system includes 11 elementary schools, two middle school/junior highs, and two high schools. Three of the elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school are located in T. In 2005-2006, the county school system served approximately 4,159 students. That same year, the average class size for the county was 18.7. The attendance rate was high, 97.2 percent, and the drop-out rate fairly low at 3.3 percent.

Although resources available to T Middle School are limited, the school has a library and computer lab that teachers use with their classes. Most of the classrooms also have a few (i.e., typically one to four) computers. Despite the adverse economic circumstances, the atmosphere of the school and its classrooms is pleasant, and students who attend the school seem to feel safe and comfortable. The school building is divided into sixth, seventh, and eighth grade sections each housed along one the three major hallways in the building.

In 2005-2006, the T Middle School students did fairly well on the state's competency test. Table 1 shows the percentages of middle-school students scoring at the proficient level or higher in Math and

Reading at each grade level (WVDE, 2006).

Table 1:

Percentages of T Middle School Students at the Proficient Level, School Year 2005-2006

Students/Scores	Math	Reading
6th graders	82	90
7th graders	82	85
8th graders	70	80

Comparisons between the school's composite proficiency rates and those of the county and the state suggested that overall the school's performance is about average. Even though some of these comparisons (i.e., between the school and the county overall and between the school and the state overall) may achieve statistical significance, practically speaking they do not seem consequential. It is important to note that average performance in a community facing serious economic challenges is often viewed as a positive outcome.[2]

Perhaps contributing to this outcome, the teachers at T Middle are generally well-qualified and experienced. Over 55% of them hold a master's degree plus 45 hours; more than 77% hold the master's degree.

The Program Evaluation

In this section, the paper presents the story of technology integration at T Middle School. Doing so, it sets the stage for an examination of the particularities of the story in consideration of the major findings of prior literature, namely that technical problems, organizational capacity limitations, ideological perspectives, and systemic features of school districts tend to impose serious constraints nationwide on schools' efforts to integrate technology fully and effectively into their programs of instruction.

The story comes from an evaluation of a one-year technology-integration project funded by the state education agency through a competitive grant program. The project aimed to improve the school's technological resources and core teachers' meaningful integration of instructional technology. The activities directed toward the accomplishment of these broad goals were:

- purchase of laptop computers, peripherals, and software intended to increase teachers' and students' access to and effective use of various technological applications;
- delivery of professional development to core teachers; and
- classroom support for technology integration including technical assistance, modeling of technology integration, and co-teaching.

To accomplish these activities, the district used grant monies to employ one of the school's teachers as a Technology Integration Specialist (TIS). For the duration of the project, her role and responsibilities changed completely from those associated with teaching to those associated with project leadership. In short, the TIS temporarily abandoned a role she understood well for one that was new to her, and she did so with little support from district or building leaders and with inadequate technical resources.

The Technology Integration Specialist (TIS) kept weekly activity reports covering the period September

2 It is also important to acknowledge that, although the R students do as well, in general, as other West Virginia students, they may lag behind students in the US as a whole. Eighth graders in West Virginia scored lower than the national average on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) writing assessment (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2002). In 2007, they scored lower than the national average on the NAEP in mathematics and reading, but in 2005, they scored at the national average in science (NCES, 2005).

18, 2006 to June 8, 2007. These reports demonstrated the work she accomplished, which included:

- 164 sessions in which she provided coaching to fellow teachers,
- 60 lessons that she co-taught with one of the school's other teachers, and
- 242 other incidents, including efforts (with and without the help of the district's Technology Specialist) to solve significant problems with the school's network, computers, and peripherals.

Fine-grained analysis of the entries in the log revealed that the coaching provided by the TIS focused mostly on technical matters: helping teachers set up and use equipment (LCD projectors, whiteboards) or software (logging on to and using the network; searching the web; accessing and using email; using varied instructional software packages and so forth). Moreover, the software that the TIS made available on the school's network and then helped teachers learn to use was the sort that either offered practice of skills assessed on the state's accountability tests or provided assistance to teachers with routine tasks such as grading, scheduling, and submitting lesson plans.

Entries in the activity reports and also interviews with the TIS revealed that the installation of the "mobile lab" of laptop computers took place early in the school year, but that continuing network and connectivity problems posed serious challenges to the use of this resource up through the end of the year. In February 2007, the TIS offered this observation in the weekly report pertinent to teachers' developing willingness to use the mobile lab:

> This is the first time this teacher and her student teacher have conducted an Internet lesson without me in the building/classroom. I was thrilled that they were able to cope when faced with Internet problems and able to seek alternatives to help keep the lesson up and running. They are not comfortable with using the laptops with the 6th grade students. Therefore, this was a great success.

Of note in this entry is the fact that the TIS defined "success" primarily in terms of keeping the on-line lesson "up and running." Observations conducted in May 2007 included two class sessions in which the laptops were being used by students. Despite on-going difficulties, teachers did make some use of the new resource.

Teachers' knowledge. An important assumption underlying the project was that TMS teachers lacked knowledge about computer technology and its instructional uses. An explicit aim of the project, therefore, was to increase teachers' knowledge about technology and its various instructional applications. Drawing on the National Education Technology Standards, the evaluators and the TIS agreed to examine teachers' knowledge of: (a) technology operations and concepts, (b) the planning and design of learning experiences and environments using technology, (c) uses of technology to support curriculum and instruction, (d) uses of technology to support assessment, (e) issues of ethics and social justice that relate to instructional technology, and (f) uses of technology to increase professional productivity. The evaluation team constructed a self-report inventory to assess knowledge in these domains and asked teachers to complete the inventory close to the outset of the Project and then again at its conclusion. Information about the technical properties of the instrument is provided in Appendix A, and the instrument itself is included in Appendix B.

The evaluators used paired-sample t-tests to compare teachers' pre- and post-Project responses to items comprising the six scales of the inventory. As shown in Table 2, they found no statistically significant differences in responses on any of the six scales.

Table 2:

Paired Samples T-tests of Pre and Post-Project Self-Inventory

Scale	Mean: Post[a]	Mean: Pre[a]	N	Significance Level[b] (difference)	Effect Size[c]
Operations	3.70 (0.74)	3.30 (1.09)	8	.45 (NS)	+.29 (.40/1.40)
Planning	3.50 (0.59)	3.46 (1.18)	8	.94 (NS)	-.03 (-.04/1.33)
C & I	3.55 (1.25)	3.41 (0.69)	8	.79 (NS)	+.10 (.14/1.46)
Assessment	3.50 (1.21)	3.38 (0.62)	8	.80 (NS)	+.09 (.12/1.33)
Ethics	4.25 (0.20)	4.06 (1.39)	4	.81 (NS)	+.13 (19/1.42)
Productivity	3.83 (1.09)	3.56 (0.68)	8	.53 (NS)	+.23 (.27/1.16)

Notes.

a. standard deviations in parentheses

b. $p < .05$ is the standard (i.e., at this level of significance the odds that the observed results would be due to chance would be 1 in 20, or 5%)

c. effect size is computed as the ratio of the difference in pre- to post-Project scores and the pooled standard deviation; the associated difference and pooled SD appear in parentheses

These results revealed that the observed pre- to post-Project differences were positive for five out of six scales, and that associated effect sizes ranged from negligible (-.03, +.04) to modest (+.23, +.29). Nevertheless, but perhaps because of the small sample size, these effects did not achieve statistical significance. Notably, however, the more substantial effect sizes were in operations and concepts and in productivity. In view of the TIS's allocation of time, these results seem to make sense. The weekly reports demonstrated that the TIS devoted substantial time to training in operations (e.g., setting up video projectors) and to helping teachers access productivity tools (e.g., GradeQuick and various email applications).

Although the evaluation team received completed pre-Project self inventories from 13 teachers, the TIS received only 9 completed post-Project inventories—and one of these was from a teacher who had not completed a pre-Project inventory. This lack of participation (perhaps unwillingness) of teachers to complete the inventories may have indicated a response bias in the data. Such bias could represent a systematic skewing (either negative or positive) of the scores or could be the result of a random process (e.g., a field trip or other scheduled event).

Moreover, as noted above, none of the apparent changes from pre- to post-assessment achieved statistical significance. Certainly this finding could be explained by small sample size or response bias, but on closer inspection it actually seems to result from curious dynamics in how individual teachers responded. It is instructive, therefore, to examine the pattern of individual difference scores for the teachers who did return both inventories. Table 3 reports results for these eight teachers for all six scales. Table 3 is arranged to emphasize the progression across teachers from negative to positive difference scores. With negative difference scores, teachers are, in effect, reporting *reduced* capacity to integrate technology at the end of the Project.

Table 3:
Array of Teachers' Individual Difference Scores

Teacher	Operations	Productivity	C & I	Assessment	Planning	Ethics[a]
A	-3.00	-2.00	-2.00	-2.00	-2.00	NA
B	-1.20	-1.33	-1.29	-0.67	-1.14	-0.75
C	-1.00	-0.17	-0.86	-1.00	-0.43	-0.75
D	-.020	+0.17	-0.86	-0.67	-0.29	0.00
E	-0.40	-0.83	-0.14	-0.33	+0.14	NA
F	+0.60	+0.33	+0.29	+0.33	+0.57	NA
G	+0.30	-0.17	+1.14	+1.00	+1.10	NA
H	+1.70	+1.83	+2.57	+2.33	+2.29	+2.25

Notes. a. Missing scores on one item for 4 participants eliminated some difference scores.

With teacher A, this reported reduction was substantial across the board—even dramatic. The equivalent effect sizes would be about -1.5 to -2.0, a huge negative effect for a long-term project. In fact, three teachers altogether (A, B, and C) reported reduced capacity across virtually all scales. Two teachers (D and E) reported negligible changes tending to an assertion of reduced capacity. And the three remaining teachers (F, G, and H) reported improved capacity at the end of the Project. Teacher H is the mirror image of teacher A: substantially—even dramatically—*increased* capacity.

Table 3 suggests that the negligible to modest positive effects that are reported in Table 2 actually masked very sharp differences among teachers. The overall somewhat positive results are misleading: One group of teachers reported much greater capacity and one reported much reduced capacity. Interview data also tended to support these findings.

Teachers' integration of technology. Another important aim of the Project was to increase teachers' meaningful integration of technology into lessons. The evaluators investigated possible increases by gathering and analyzing lesson plans and conducting and analyzing classroom observations. These data-gathering activities took place at the beginning and toward the end of the Project. In order to contextualize findings from the comparison of lesson plans and observations, the team also conducted interviews with teachers, the County Technology Coordinator, and the TMS principal. Interview data offered a variety of perspectives on the Project and its accomplishments.

Early in the year the evaluation team observed in the classrooms of 13 out of the 14 core-subject teachers at TMS. At the end of the year the team observed 10 of the 14 core-subject teachers. Each observation lasted for a complete 50-minute period. The evaluators took notes during the observation, using an adaptation of an instrument called the OPTIC.[3] The instrument differentiated between direct and constructivist approaches to instruction as well as providing a gauge of the types of technology integration that teachers were deploying. Evaluators also developed narrative accounts of the classrooms, which provided higher-inference data about the character of the pedagogy in use and the social and affective climate of the classrooms. An example of these narratives is provided in Appendix C.

Data analysis, which involved coding and categorizing data based on a priori codes relating to technology use and general pedagogical approach, suggested that direct instruction was used far more frequently than other approaches, both at the start of the year and at the end. One teacher (observed in May 2007) conducted an inquiry-based lesson with students forming small groups and using calculators. Students were observed to be highly engaged and interested in the planned activities. This was the only instruction of this sort observed—that is, one with discovery, group work, and technology used in combination.

---

3 The OPTIC was developed and copyrighted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon. This work was produced by the Northwest Educational Technology Consortium of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory under contract number R302A000016 from the U.S. Department of Education. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory gave the evaluators permission to use the instrument.

In general, at both the beginning and end of the year, teachers identified the objectives of lessons, provided brief explanations of new material, questioned students about new concepts, monitored completion of worksheets, checked class work and homework assignments, offered review lessons preparatory to tests, and administered tests.

Substantial technology use (including calculators and video viewing) was observed during the May 2007 visits, and this frequency of use was a notable change as compared to the observations conducted in September 2006. In May, in 6 of the 11 periods of observation, evaluators observed *students* using computers. In September, not a single student was observed using computers. As might be expected from the dominant pedagogy at TMS, the most frequent use of computer technology was for direct instruction, specifically drill and practice. In several classes, however, this drill and practice also required students to access a particular website for specific information, which was used to complete a worksheet or similar assignment.

Overall, classroom observations provided evidence that the Project improved the frequency of computer use at TMS. But they also showed that teachers retrofitted technology applications into existing methods of instruction rather than altering instructional methods to take advantage of the opportunities for inquiry, creative production, and higher-order thinking that technology had the potential to offer.

Evidence from the content analysis of lesson plans was consistent with evidence from the observations. This analysis involved the categorization of planned instructional activities using the same categories as were used for analyzing observations (i.e., categories relating to technology use and pedagogical method). Overall, the analysis showed that, both at the start of the Project and at its conclusion, most teachers derived activities from textbooks or workbooks. Many plans, in classic form, keyed the lesson to pages in particular textbooks or workbooks. Nearly all of the teachers, however, developed some plans that included other forms of pedagogy in addition to the traditional sequence of review, lecture or demonstration of new material, practice, and checking of answers. Other instructional methods seen in the lesson plans included partnered reading, group activities, problem-solving activities, writing assignments, games or puzzles, and development of interpretive products (e.g., a themed collage related to the topic of instruction).

At the beginning of the year, seven of the plans of the 13 teachers referenced the use of some technology (video presentation, use of computer lab, or training of students in familiar PC applications like Word and PowerPoint). At the end of the year, 11 of 14 teachers' lesson plans indicated an intended use of technology (one teacher's plans called only for the showing of video material). Among the 10 whose plans did call for *computer* technology, four noted hyperlinks—indicating use of the Internet for instructional purposes—and three of these suggested an instructional use of the website with students rather than simply referencing the site as a resource for the teacher. Three sets of plans indicated use of the "computer lab." It may be worth noting that the teacher whose self-inventory difference scores were the most extremely negative *did* plan for students to use the computer lab—but in this case the plan specified that a *different teacher* would accompany the students to the lab. Evidently this teacher was finding a way to meet the expectation that his or her students have computer-based instruction without personally providing it!

Insights into the dynamics influencing teachers' receptivity to the Project came from interview data. Although interviews with teachers were conducted by phone during the school day and this circumstance perhaps constrained the length of conversations and made rapport more difficult to establish than would have been the case with face-to-face interviews, teachers nevertheless offered few positive comments about the Project. Only one expressed enthusiasm for the tools and opportunities that the project made available, and even this teacher reported frustrations with network connectivity and other impediments to full use of the resources purchased or assembled by the TIS. Most teachers, by contrast, were more negative than this. One teacher stated that computers and other equipment in the classroom still remained in their boxes. Another teacher, in a statement perhaps representing the middle ground between the extremes, approved the use of technology for instruction but observed that the way classes were currently structured created difficulties.

The County Technology Coordinator believed that the TIS had done a good job training teachers and providing technical assistance and that TMS teachers were using computer technology more frequently. He believed, further, that the drill and practice software that had been purchased was being used with increased frequency and that students were doing "a little more research" using computers. The Technology

Coordinator, however, held the view that in general teachers were not taking advantage of digital technology's potential for varied instructional formats and that sufficient time was not devoted to "higher level thinking instruction." Lack of knowledge of how to accomplish such instruction was the difficulty, according to this staff member.

The TMS principal also thought the Project had resulted in more frequent use of computer technology on average, but that only a few teachers used it extensively. The principal noted that he had reviewed the results of the self-inventory and was not surprised to learn that some teachers found themselves less comfortable with computers at the end as compared to the beginning of the Project. Early in the year, reported the principal, teachers remained "distant" from the Project. By May, he said, they were "complain[ing] and ask[ing] 'How come it's not working." In this light, he noted, the TIS "got complaints both ways—when the teachers were not very interested in using the computers in the ways [the TIS] recommended *and* when they were" [the quoted passages come from the evaluation team's field notes].

When asked about the kind of changes he desired, the principal replied: (a) more long-term projects and (b) use of computer labs for longer periods of time. The major technology barrier, according to the principal, was the unreliability of Internet connectivity. The principal also noted that in the next school year the TIS would "continue" to serve as the TMS technology coordinator even though she would also be returning to the classroom as a reading teacher.

INTERPRETATION: HOW WELL DO THE EXPLANATIONS FIT THE DATA

As discussed above, recent studies (e.g., Zhao, 2007) still offer technical explanations for limited technology integration despite the fact that computer equipment is available in most schools (e.g., Becker, 2000). The TMS case sheds light on this apparent contradiction: computers and related technologies were plentiful *in the school*, but they were inaccessible much of the time. This circumstance contributed to teachers' frustration. When a teacher designed a lesson using technology, he or she could not be sure that the technology would be functional. Or it might function for part of the lesson and then require the teacher or the TIS (if she was available) to intervene in order to keep it functional. This circumstance made it necessary for teachers to attend to the content of their lessons, the students, *and* the technology—more than many of them felt prepared to handle all at once. At TMS other issues—similar to those reported in recent studies—were at play. Time was certainly perceived to be a limited resource. The TIS reported that insufficient time—for her work and for that of the teachers—was a major impediment to the success of the Project, and the evaluators frequently heard teachers complain that the Project was taking time away from the important work of preparing students for State achievement tests. Teachers told us that they were unwilling to sacrifice the time needed for test preparation in order to learn how to integrate technology. Their comments suggested that they were extremely conscious of time limitations—construing the effort to learn how to integrate technology as an intrusion into the time they needed for essential instructional tasks.

Nevertheless, teachers' actions did not reveal particular adherence to "time-on-task." Members of the evaluation team observed considerable wastage of instructional time for pep rallies, field days, sporting events, videos, and clubs. Teachers also gave students routine deskwork, some of which did not seem to have much academic relevance, as a way to free up time to talk with one another in the halls, read and write email, and perform work associated with their extracurricular assignments (e.g., coaching). "Lack of time" appeared to the evaluators to be a demurral rather than a roadblock. The complaint therefore seemed to say more about teachers' priorities than it did about the objective conditions of their work. "Lack of time" really meant something like "lack of time for activities that we see as unimportant."

The research literature also identified teachers' resistance as an impediment to technology integration, focusing either on the general reluctance to change or on more specific beliefs about teaching and learning that cannot readily accommodate the infusion of technology. In the year in which the Project was instituted, TMS teachers had been asked to change a number of their routines. The school had changed from a junior high school (grades 7-9) structure to a middle school (grades 6-8) structure, with accompanying changes in teachers' assignments, daily schedules, and rooms within the building. Teachers reported that they were angry about the changes and claimed to be experiencing high levels of stress. The technology integration project, then, functioned as an additional stressor in an already difficult year.

In addition, teachers did not believe that the types of instruction that technology would make possible were better suited to the task of preparing students for the State tests than the traditional practices they were already using. Their teaching tended to focus on the presentation of content and the assignment of practice activities, and computers did not seem to offer them a way to perform such teaching much more efficiently or effectively.

Nevertheless, the teachers were not totally resistant, and their use of computers and related technologies did increase over the course of the year. Like teachers studied in much of the recent research literature, the TMS teachers fit technology to their existing instructional methods rather than seeing technology as a motive for reshaping those methods. Thus the one inquiry lesson, mentioned above, that made use of calculators was an anomaly not only because it incorporated technology into an inquiry lesson but also because it made use of the inquiry method in the first place.

The conditions observed at TMS—technical difficulties, insufficient time, limited support, and teacher resistance—mirrored the observations that led Cuban (2001) to frame the question of technology integration in systemic and contextual terms. Surely a system bent on effective technology integration or on using technology as leverage for more pervasive change in instructional practice would behave differently. Acknowledging teachers' likely resistance, planners in such a system would do everything in their power to assure that the technology worked, that teachers had time to retool, and that ample support came from multiple sources. Apparently something other than effective planning has been going on in the educational system of which T Middle School is a part.

Two planning scenarios seem plausible, given the findings: (a) there has been no planning or (b) planning has taken place without due consideration of issues of implementation. If one is willing to see the development of a state-wide grant program as a form of planning, then the latter scenario seems to fit the facts. State department administrators did, after all, envision the program and the projects that might result from it. They did put the competitive grant application process in place and follow through with the steps involved in soliciting and choosing among proposals.

Nonetheless, remote from practice, their planning might represent little more than wishful thinking. State department administrators and perhaps county administrators as well offer technology integration as one of many solutions to the problem of raising test scores. That the means (technology integration) is not clearly productive of the ends (higher test scores) seems less important than the willingness to hold out hope. That the conditions for effective implementation are not likely to be favorable hardly seems to matter. What systemic need might cause otherwise reasonable planners to bet on this unlikely horse?

With Cuban (2001) and others (e.g., Molnar, 2005), the researchers think corporate marketing might offer a reasonable explanation. For motives quite apart from the desire to raise students' test scores, corporate executives see selling technology to schools as an attractive proposition. Tyre (2002), for example, reported that in each of the three years preceding 2002, sales of technology to schools in the United States totaled 5.6 billion dollars. Moreover, corporate executives probably bank on the fact that children who work with computers at school are likely to want computers at home. The technology industry, as Cuban (2001) noted, has a vested interest in promulgating the belief that instructional technology will help children learn—increasing their achievement, improving their critical and creative thinking, and preparing them for a changing work place. Whether or not any of this is the case, however, hardly matters, so long as educators accept these claims.

This explanation, of course, begs the question of means-ends planning for technology integration. On the terms of the marketing argument, educational planners are simply responding to manipulation when they advocate and develop programs to support technology integration. Their energy would be better spent, as Whitehurst (2003) argued, on systemic efforts to promulgate instructional methods that actually work, or, as Cuban (2001) advocated, on reclaiming better purposes for our system of common schools.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. S. (2001). About face! Technology planning upside down, inside out, and standing on your head. *Multimedia Schools, 8*(5), 52-55.

Baylor, A. L., & Ritchie, D. (2002). What factors facilitate teacher skill, teacher morale, and perceived student learning in technology-using classrooms? *Computers & Education, 39*, 395-414.

Becker, H. J. (2000). Findings from the teaching, learning, and computing survey: Is Larry Cuban right? *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(51). Retrieved August 23, 2007 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n51/.

Bennett, H., & Everhart, N. (2003). Successful K-12 technology planning: Ten essential elements. *Teacher Librarian, 31*(1), 22-26.

Brockmeier, L. L., Sermon, J. M., & Hope, W. C. (2005). Principals' relationship with computer technology. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*(643), 45-63.

Budin, H. (1999). The computer enters the classroom. *Teachers College Record, 100*(3), 656-669.

ChanLin, L. (2007). Perceived importance and manageability of teachers toward the factors of integrating computer technology into classrooms. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(1), 45–55.

ChanLin, L., Hong, J., Horng, J., Chang, S., & Chu, H. (2006). Factors influencing technology integration in teaching—a Taiwanese perspective, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 43*(1), 57–68.

Clay, K. (Ed.). (1982). *Microcomputers in education: A handbook of resources.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1997). *The Jasper Project: Lessons in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. D., & Olsen, J. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(1), 1-25.

Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fabry, D. L., & Higgs, J. R. (1997). Barriers to the effective use of technology in education: Current status. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 17*(4), 385-395.

Franklin, C. (2007). Factors that influence elementary teachers' use of computers. *Journal. of Technology and Teacher Education, 15*(2), 267-293.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

George, P. (2000). Breaking ranks. *Principal Leadership, 1*(4), 56-61.

Hunt, J. L., & Lockard, J. (1998, February). *How do local school districts formulate educational technology policy?* Paper presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, St. Louis, MO.

Kanaya, T., Light, D., & Culp, K. M. (2005). Factors influencing outcomes from a technology-focused professional development program, *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 37*(3), 313–329.

Li, Q. (2007). Student and teacher views about technology: A tale of two cities? *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 39*(4), 377-397.

MacNeil, A. J., & Delafield, D. P. (1998, March). *Principal leadership for successful school technology implementation.* Paper presented at the SITE 98: Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference, Washington, DC.

Mintzberg, H. (1993). *The rise and fall of strategic planning: Reconceiving roles for planning, plans, planners.* New York: Free Press.

Molnar, A. (2005). *School commercialism: From democratic ideal to market commodity*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.

National Center for Education Statistics (2005). *The nation's report card: 2005.* U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC. Retrieved October 2, 2007, from http://nces.ed. gov/nationsreportcard/states/profile.asp.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *The nation's report card: Writing, 2002*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC. Retrieved October 1, 2007 from http://nces. ed.gov/nationsreportcard/writing/results2002/

Palak, D., Walls, R., & Wells, J. (2006). Integration of instructional technology: A device to deliver instruction or a tool to foster learning. *International Journal of Instructional Media, 33*(4), 355-365.

Redmann, D. J., & Kotrlik, J. W. (2004). Technology integration into the teaching-learning process by business education teachers. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journa*l, *40*(2), 76-91.

Shayo, C., Olfman, L., & Guthrie, R. (2000). Integration of IT into the school curricula: perceptions of kindergarten to high school (K-12) teachers, in: W. D. Nance (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGCPR Conference on Computer Personnel Research* (pp. 33–38). New York: Association for Computing Machinery.

Simon, H. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69,* 99-118.

Smerdon, B., Cronen, S., Lanahan, L., Anderson, Jannotti, N., & Angeles, J. (2000). *Teachers' tools for the 21st century: A report on teachers' use of technology.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education.

Staples, A., Pugach, M. C., & Himes, D. (2005). Rethinking the technology integration challenge: Cases from three urban elementary schools. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 37*(3), 285-311.

Stegal, P. (1998, April). *The principal—Key to technology implementation.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Education Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Styron, R., Jr., & Disher, F. (2003). Improving school performance and career preparation with a wireless computer lab. *T. H. E. Journal, 31*(3), 40–42.

Tyre, T. (2002). Hardware sales maintain a steady beat. *District Administration, 38*(6), 40-46.

United States Census Bureau (2007a). *American factfinder.* Washington, DC. Retrieved September 30, 2007, from http://factfinder.census.gov/

United States Census Bureau. (2007b). *State & county quick facts.* Washington, DC. Retrieved October 1, 2007, from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/54/54067.html.

United States Department of Education. (2005). *Toward a new golden age in American education: How the internet, the law and today's students are revolutionizing expectations.* Retrieved August 23, 2007 from www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/plan/2004/ plan.pdf.

West Virginia Department of Education. (2007a). *Schools by make up: All grades by county.* Charleston, WV. Retrieved October 2, 2007, from http://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/pub/enroll/e)6makeup.cf3?sy=07.

West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). (2007b) *School directory.* Charleston, WV. Retrieved October 2, 2007, from http://wvde.state.wv.us/ed_directory/index.

West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). (2006) *School report cards, 2005-2006*. Retrieved September 30, 2007, from http://wvde.state.wv.us/data/report_cards/2006.

Whitehurst, G.J. (2003, April). *The Institute of Education Sciences: New wine, new bottle.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 478 983)

Wiske, M. S., Sick, M., & Wirsig, S. (2001). New technologies to support teaching for understanding. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 483–501.

Zhao, Y. (2007). Social studies teachers' perspectives of technology integration. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 15*(3), 311-333

APPENDIX A

Technical Properties of the Self-Report Inventory

The instrument included six scales, all of which exhibited high reliability estimates both using data from a pilot test with a convenience sample of 20 teachers and using data from the first administration of the instrument with the 14 teachers at TMS. Table 4 shows Alpha reliabilities for each of the scales with data from each of these two administrations of the instrument. These estimates suggest that all of the scales have high levels of internal consistency.

Table 4:
Reliability Estimates (based on the pre-assessment)

Scale	Alpha Reliabilities (Pilot)	Alpha Reliabilities (R)
Operations & Concepts	.91	.96
Planning & Designing Learning Experiences & Environments	.95	.98
Curriculum & Instruction	.95	.99
Assessment	.92	.98
Ethics and Social Justice	.81	.91
Professional Productivity	.86	.97

APPENDIX B
Teachers' Use of Technology
Self-report Inventory

INSTRUCTIONS: This inventory will be used as a pre- and post-assessment for the Enhancing Education through Technology Project at T Middle School. In order to track any changes in your perspectives that result from this project, we do need you to include information about yourself. Please provide this information and then circle the best answer to the 40 items included on the inventory.

Your Name _____ Date _____
Your Subject Area(s) _____

To what extent would you feel comfortable …	Great Extent →				Not at All
Setting up a new computer?	5	4	3	2	1
Adding new software to your computer?	5	4	3	2	1
Using appropriate terminology to talk about computers and computer networks?	5	4	3	2	1
Using handheld computers (e.g., personal digital assistants, IPODs, Blackberry devices)?	5	4	3	2	1
Using all of the features of a word processing program (e.g., the table feature, mail merge feature, and add an object feature)?	5	4	3	2	1
Using a spreadsheet program (e.g., Excel)?	5	4	3	2	1
Using email?	5	4	3	2	1
Using web browsers (e.g., Internet Explorer, Netscape)?	5	4	3	2	1
Using web search engines (e.g., Google, AltaVista) to find information on the internet?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you spend time learning about current and emerging technologies?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to select developmentally appropriate technology to augment lessons?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to use appropriate technologies to differentiate instruction for diverse learners?	5	4	3	2	1

When you design learning environments and experiences, to what extent do you rely on relevant research findings about the influence of technologies on learning?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to identify technological resources that have the potential to help your students learn?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to evaluate technological resources to determine their alignment with learning outcomes and students' needs?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to make effective long- and short-range plans for using technology to enhance students' learning?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to design methods to keep track of the learning students acquire in a technology-rich environment?	5	4	3	2	1
	Great Extent	→			Not at All
To what extent are you able to align technology-enhanced lessons with state content standards?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to align technology-enhanced lessons with student technology standards?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you use technology to enable students to construct knowledge?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you match technological applications to students' different interests and needs?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you use technology as a way to develop higher-order thinking?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you use technology as a way to encourage students to be creative?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent are you able to keep track of the learning students acquire in a technology-rich environment?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you evaluate students' progress in learning to use technology?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you teach appropriate "netiquette?"	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you regulate students' access to internet sites?					
To what extent do you teach students about fair use and copyright?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you make technology accessible to all students in your classroom regardless of their characteristics and backgrounds?	5	4	3	2	1
To what extent do you use …					
Technology for assessing students' learning?	5	4	3	2	1
A variety of technological applications as part of the assessment process?	5	4	3	2	1

Technology to gather, analyze, and interpret data that helps you make wise decisions about curriculum and instruction?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to communicate information about students' performance?	5	4	3	2	1
Multiple methods to assess students' learning of technological applications?	5	4	3	2	1
Technological applications as a way to access professional development opportunities?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to increase the efficiency of your work?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to communicate with other educators in your school?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to communicate with educators other than those in your school?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to communicate with parents?	5	4	3	2	1
Technology to communicate with community members other than those who are parents of students in your classes?	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX C

Observation Vignette: 7th Grade Science Class

This classroom was bright and neat with more computers than most of the classrooms. There were more than a dozen stationary computers and one that appeared to be primarily for teacher use—I think all the classrooms had a computer that was primarily for the teacher's use, though the number of other computers varied.

As the students were coming in, and while she was greeting me, Ms. A. apologized for having a review lesson while I was there. She said that she usually does much more interesting lessons than I would see that day. For this class, she combined review of the textbook with review on the laptop computers. The computerized review was first and constituted most of the class time.

She told students to get the laptops, and they got them quickly and with no commotion, bringing them back to their tables from storage in the back of the room. As with Ms. S.'s class, this seemed to be a familiar routine. Students spent about three-fourths of the class time at the computers. They shared the laptops, with two or three students to each laptop. Students seemed engaged during most of the class, but they were not all on task. This was due in part to four interruptions related to (1) failure to connect to the Internet and (2) loss of Internet connections that had been established. Students did not seem very enthusiastic about the content, though they seemed to care what this young and energetic teacher wanted them to do. The review questions did not seem to engage them very much, but they volunteered answers and complied with her requests to try again if they answered incorrectly. Still, as I looked around the room, I saw a student here and there looking around the room or talking with a neighbor (in a conversation that may have been about the lesson, but seemed to focus on something other than the computer material). They appeared to be even less interested in the questions from their textbooks, but Ms. A.'s enthusiasm for the material helped them to focus. The material was on the scientific process, and thus was perhaps more abstract than they liked.

After the students left, Mrs. A. asked me to come back when she will be doing a creative class project on the computer. She again apologized for what she said was not a typical lesson for her classes. She added that she thinks the technology, especially the simulations, makes a big difference in her students' understanding and in their motivation. She mentioned teaching electricity through the use of computerized simulation specifically, saying that this method helped students to grasp the concepts relating to electrical circuits much better than they could have without the computer simulation. I told her that I would observe

her class again when I came back to T. Middle School for another day of observation, and I set a date for that day based on her identification of the best day to come to see her class in the middle of their project. (Unfortunately, on the day that I came back to observe others and to observe her classroom a second time, she was absent because of medical tests. I hated to miss her because this teacher seems genuinely interested in improving instruction through the use of technology.)

A COMMUNITARIAN FRAMEWORK FOR PLANNING EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Vincent Baxter

ABSTRACT

In response to the liberalization of the public school, many university-based principal preparation programs now emphasize a curriculum focused on the development of school leaders as data-driven business managers rather than as public servants and community leaders. This paper will describe a theoretical framework for planning the preparation of public school leaders with an emphasis on a communitarian balance between the rights of the individual and an individual's responsibilities to his/her community; between business supervisor and public servant; between management and leadership. The primary focus of this approach is to facilitate a learning experience that is multi-dimensional and diverse in content, membership, pedagogic process, and program administration.

INTRODUCTION

The language of school leadership has become increasingly business focused. We use a vocabulary that includes words like *results*, *input*, *output*, *accountability*, and *work product* to describe the individualized academic progress of children and the professional craft of their teachers. Some divisions offer *performance incentives* for their schools. Our urban centers have begun to privatize public education in the form of charter school, school voucher, and prepackaged whole-school learning and discipline programs. The school principal is obliged by local and federal law to evaluate the academic progress of students attending the school using almost explicitly quantitative measures. Mandates for instructional time on task and compliance to professional certification structures accentuate the more technical and managerial aspects of school leadership.

The corporate business model with an emphasis on scientific management of individual performance, however, is not exclusively a realistic model for public schooling. Business success is quantified by capital profit and loss. The public school—students, curricula, families, teachers—cannot quantify success in the same way. The products of the public school—if they can be called products—include learning, health, and citizenship. These less tangible products cannot be measured in dollars and their subtle characteristics are as varied as there are members in the school communities.

In response to the liberalization of the public school, many university-based principal preparation programs now emphasize a curriculum focused on the development of school leaders as data-driven business managers rather than as public servants and community leaders. This paper will describe a theoretical framework for planning the preparation of public school leaders with an emphasis on a communitarian balance between the rights of the individual and an individual's responsibilities to his/her community; between business supervisor and public servant; between management and leadership. The primary focus of this approach is to facilitate a learning experience that is multi-dimensional and diverse in content, membership, pedagogic process, and program administration.

WHAT IS COMMUNITARIANISM?

It is helpful to briefly distinguish philosophical communitarianism from communitarianism as it has been articulated as policy framework. Philosophical communitarianism was a response to the liberal philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and, contemporarily, John Rawls, which conceptualized man [*sic*] as an atomistic individual. Aliasdair MacIntyre (1984), Michael Sandel (1998), Charles Taylor (1992), and Michael Walzer (1984) are often grouped under the umbrella of philosophical communitarianism for their critique of Locke, Hobbes, and Rawls. For the purposes of this paper, it suffices to note that these communitarian writers argued generally that the individual exists only because of their membership withina broader community.

This paper uses the communitarian policy work of Amitai Etzioni (1993) and the emancipatory communitarian work of Isaac Prilleltensky (1997) as a point of departure for imagining a theoretical framework for the planning of educational administration preparation programs. Etzioni (1993) called for a balance between individual rights and the individual's responsibilities to their community. "The pursuit

of self-interest can be balanced by a commitment to the community" (Etzioni, 1993, p. 2). Etzioni does not imply duality in his imagination of communitarianism: his notion of rights/responsibilities is not an either/or proposition. Communitarianism can be depicted, rather, as a spectrum of social possibilities ranging from individual rights to community responsibility. More simply, the balance can be depicted as a simple teeter-totter (see Figure 1.).

Figure 1. *Communitarian model*

Emancicpatory communitarianism (Prilleltensky, 1997) takes the ideas of Etzioni (1993) a step further. Prilleltensky imagines the balancing of rights and responsibility as a purposefully liberating or emancipating action. When, for example, there is an overwhelming emphasis on personal rights, individuality, and liberty, the individual loses his or her sense of community. When, conversely, a society overemphasizes community, collectivism, or social activity the individual loses his or her sense of self. Either case, in the extreme, is oppressive. At one extreme, the individual is captivated by self-concern, like Narcissus, imprisoned by his own visage. Emancipatory communitarianism invites, or pulls, if necessary, Narcissus away from the fountain edge. At another extreme, the individual wholly sacrifices self to the greater group; like Echo punished to be forever without her own voice. Emancipatory communitarianism teaches Echo to speak. Emancipatory communitarianism mobilizes the ideas of Etzioni. It is a practical vehicle for social justice. Put simply, the balance action is social action when acted with deliberation.

Communitarian Illustrations

Consider an individual standing and smoking a cigarette at a crowded bus stop. In most American communities this individual is well within his or her legal right to smoke in a public place. Communitarianism argues, however, that this individual has a responsibility to fellow passengers to refrain from smoking for the benefit of their collective health. The transit authority could take an emancipatory communitarian approach by posting no-smoking signs at bus stops, or members of the crowd could ask the smoker to extinguish their cigarette or to step away. For a broader example, imagine an impoverished single mother pregnant with her sixth child. She certainly has the right to bring as many children into the world as she

desires. Communitarianism argues, however, that she is obliged to consider the impact this infant will have on the welfare of her family and of her community. The local department of health could adopt emancipatory communitarian approaches such as subsidizing birth control or hosting educative seminars on abstinence.

The concepts of communitarianism are immediately applicable to the school principalship. Consider the teacher who delivers a standard lecture from the front of a classroom while students sit quietly listening in rows. This individual might choose from a variety of pedagogic styles, and it is of one's professional prerogative to settle on a style that best fits one's personality. The communitarian, however, argues that the teacher has a responsibility to educate the class of students as best fits their collective personalities and learning styles. An emancipatory communitarian approach empowers the school principal not only to raise awareness in the teacher, but to collaborate with the teacher to find a more suitable pedagogic approach for the student community.

Shifting from the hyper-individual to the center is an accessible concept in an era which emphasizes self-interest. It is important to consider the other end of the communitarian balance. Imagine a group of coworkers who meet daily outside their office building to take a cigarette break. Each of their daily presence collectively constitutes the smoking group. Their community, however, is based on an unhealthy addiction. In this example, the communitarian balance should shift towards individualism to escape the oppression of codependence and addiction. The employer of the smokers, as an emancipatory communitarian policy, might sponsor smoking cessation classes. Consider, also, the state of Massachusetts and its role in the national debate on same-sex marriage. While the community of state legislatures either remained silent or took an active stance against gay marriage, Massachusetts made an independent decision to legally permit same-sex marriage. The state at once took a step away from the broader community of states, and liberated homosexuals to legally unite in marriage.

The principal is often faced with similar dilemmas. Imagine a group of students who have adopted a gang or mob-like mentality. They wear the same clothes, play the same games, communicate with a common dialect, and crowd into the same lunch tables, all at the exclusion of classmates. An emancipatory communitarian framework empowers the school principal to guide students to a realization of their unique and individual selves while re-conceptualizing a broader and more inclusive understanding of school community.

INDIVIDUALISM IN AMERICAN CULTURE

The term "liberty" in American culture is often discussed in terms of pervasive freedom and the presupposition of individual rights. As the concept was introduced in early American documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, liberty connoted individual rights such as property ownership, free speech, and religious choice. The introductory concept in the Preamble of The Declaration of Independence holds "that all men [*sic*] are created equal." Any equation necessitates that at least two independent constants are equal. This implies that we must be individuals in order to be equal with one another. The basic notion of states' rights is further example of the centrality of individualism as a concept in American culture; while America is a nation of united states, each state retains a unique legislative personality within the greater union.

From the beginning, America has idealized the rugged individual. Christopher Columbus and his peers in exploration struck out from the old world hoping to elevate themselves in terms of both fame and fortune. The Puritans emigrated from England in specific search of religious freedom. Our heroes include Davy Crockett and Daniel Boone, men famed to have single-handedly tamed the wild frontier; the pioneer families and claim-stakers who settled the American Midwest and West against harsh elements both natural and human. Tall Tale mythology elevated the individual to super-human status: Paul Bunyan the gigantic lumberjack who shaped the continent with his physical strength and willpower and the hard working John Henry who drove rail road steel more efficiently than any work-team or machine. Horatio Alger captured the attention of Americans with his "rags to riches" stories of success through self determination. We think of Admiral Robert Peary standing alone at the North Pole or Neil Armstrong walking on the moon, rather than consider the teams of people who made their adventures possible. Some of our greatest American unifiers—George Washington, Harriet Tubman, Rosa Parks, John Kennedy—are remembered more as

individual icons than as members of a movement or leaders of a group. America is a nation that respects and values individual thought and individual wealth.

A convenient illustration of individualism in American culture is made through analysis of the American Dream. The ideal American family is a nuclear and isolated entity. They live in a detached house, even further detached by a picket fence. They own a plot of real estate with clear boundaries legally documented. The family of the American Dream travels by private car rather than the more communal public bus or train. They erect a basketball hoop in the driveway, so their children play together at home rather than share the neighborhood park. The nuclear family prefers the home entertainment of television over the more social and communal experience of theater or museum. The most striking feature of a family who has attained the American Dream, perhaps, is that they no longer communicate in meaningful ways with the community; the front door is shut. The individual family who is closed to community engenders atomism in its members. Children of these families come to the public school, in many ways, self-concerned individuals.

INDIVIDUALISM IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS

To better illuminate challenges posed by the dominant climate of atomism and faced by the modern school principal, this section will discuss the ways in which individualism is manifest in American schools.

Students

A discussion on schools should always begin with their most necessary members: the children who learn within their walls. Public school students in this country know well the language of business at a young age. Their vocabulary includes words such as: accountability, measurement, product, input, output, and performance. They are each concerned primarily with measurement of their individual performance. In academic currency, consistently excellent grades are the mark of a student's individual wealth in the public school. The school system, from Kindergarten through secondary school, is laid out before children in a linear progression. Grades become a measure by which students periodically mark this independent journey. Each child is individually rewarded for performance in areas such as independent completion of work, mastery of individual academic skills, personal attendance record, and ability to follow rules. Students come to consider course credit and academic credentials individual and consumable items. Ideas, skills, books, courses, and entire years of school become mere milestones to tick off of a personal checklist. Students are further individualized in schools when they are labeled as different from their peers. This occurs when students are pulled out for remedial instruction: when English language learners, regardless of their level of education or native language proficiency, are grouped into an exclusive learning environment; when poor students receive subsidized lunch that is less nutritious than what their more affluent peers are served; when student performance is disaggregated along race and gender lines. Individualized plans of education, designed to aid the academic inclusion of special education students, serve in some ways to set students apart from their peers. Students ultimately define themselves more by their labels than as individual members of a greater school community.

Curricula

Curricula can contribute to the individualization of teachers and of students. A program of learning that requires a collection of generic specialists to administer fragmented sets of standards is, by design, professionally divisive. The mathematics teacher teaches mathematical skills to meet mathematics learning standards. These skills are taught in a period designated for the purpose of mathematical skill acquisition. The writing teacher plies his or her generic trade at another time and in another setting. While the learning of mathematics might be facilitated and enriched through the integration of writing skills, the curriculum does not explicitly call for this type of intersection or collaboration. Curriculum documents are presented in plain, logical, and sequential terms. Their format is that of a reference text. The standard curriculum document, by design, invites the teacher to find only that which they have the notion to seek. Standards are grouped generically and ordered from the most elementary skills through those taught in secondary school. Concepts and skills are itemized as components of a long checklist. When presented to students in this

fashion, concepts and skills are interpreted as individual pieces of information rather than as an integrated whole. Acute angles are only germane to the context of the geometry class; poetry is only relevant to the student in the context of the poetry unit of an English class. Students whose learning patterns are fragmented, whose skills are compartmentalized, become fragmented and compartmentalized individuals.

Families

The atomization of the American family at home was introduced earlier in this paper. By logical extension, parents are often self-concerned in their interaction with the public school. This individualized home-school relationship is evident in both high poverty schools and in more affluent schools. Parental absence is an active statement that individuality is more valuable to the parent than the notion of school community. Whether it is a work obligation or a negative personal school experience that keeps a parent disengaged with the school community, the parents have put their personal needs above the educational needs of their child and of their school. Parental micromanagement of the student experience, in the other extreme, indicates dominant individualism. Consider a parent whose child has been punished at school for violating a school community rule: fighting with a classmate. The parent who openly disagrees with the school-based punishment communicates a dominant individual perspective. Consider parents who insist on the individual success of their student at any expense, or parents who push for innumerable special accommodations for their child, even against the professional opinion of educators or medical doctors: they display the same variety of individualized self-concern. Parents send a similar message when they chronically excuse absences from school for events such as extended family vacation, parental court appearances, elaborate payday shopping sprees, or mild illness: the individual is, ultimately, more important than the school community.

Teachers

Teaching can be an extremely isolating profession. Educators might socialize with each other in the staff lounge, in a faculty meeting, or even outside of school. Inside the classroom, however, teachers are most often alone as a solitary adult with many children. This can be an individualizing experience; professional community can be difficult to achieve when each teacher's experience is so extremely unique. Because learning to teach can be a lonely and arduous process, successful teachers often cling to the individual traits and techniques, which have brought them success. Part of the art of teaching is the individual personality a teacher brings to the craft; students are attracted to instruction that is innovative, to teachers who offer them something different. From an evaluative perspective, teachers are typically rated by administrators for their individual instructional performance. As academic performance is reviewed annually per school, and per school division, teachers are often asked to track the academic success of their students as an aggregate group. Taking sole ownership of the performance of many students individualizes a teacher; the successes and failures of many become the success and failure of a single person. Through intricate structures of accountability, imposed both federally and more locally, teachers are systematically individualized by the performance of their students. State designed structures for professional licensure individualize teachers, labeling them by credential. Local teacher contracts further atomize the educator, delimiting in detail services a particular individual is obliged to render.

Facilities

The typical modern American school building can be characterized by the long hallway lined on either side with individual rooms where instruction occurs. These classrooms are solitary units, each housing a teacher. Each classroom becomes associated with the independent genre of learning that it hosts. One classroom, for example, is designated for mathematics learning, the next for Latin, while the next possesses an entirely separate and independent instructional purpose. Complete sections of a school building are sometimes designated for a particular learning purpose: the Sixth Grade Wing, the Special Education Hall, or the Vocational Department. In this way the school building facilitates the fragmentation and individualization of its inhabitants. Classrooms are barricaded from each other by concrete walls and long corridors. It becomes physically difficult for teachers to share craft knowledge when instructional spaces are partitioned. Their classrooms become islands, disconnected from one another geographically,

instructionally, and socially. Learning across a curriculum is difficult when learning spaces are physically disjointed. Students are set apart from one another even within the classroom. The heavy, largely immobile, plastic and metal furniture facilitates an individual learning experience for each student. Each desk is built for one student. Even when desks are arranged in formations designed to facilitate collaboration, classroom furniture reminds students that they are independent of one another. Students store their belongings in individual lockers. Cafeteria furniture factionalizes students into socially limited groups. Computer labs, by design, give each a student an independent work station. Teachers are isolated from students when there are areas of the school building, such as a faculty lounge or a teacher planning area, where students are not permitted. The faculty is isolated from the school principal whose office is buried deep inside an administrative suite. The physical plant of the school building, ultimately, is the most inescapable and omnipresent feature of the organization.

Educational Administrators

These descriptions of individualism in American schools are extreme and monochromatic by design. Schools also can exist as places where students are actively engaged in the performance of community service; where learning is cooperative and concepts are eloquently articulated across traditional curricular boundaries; where parents and teachers collaborate to establish healthy links between home and school; and, where the walls are broken down, physically or metaphorically, to liberate learning from the classroom. In an environment predisposed to individualism, however, the principal must be prepared to emphasize the significance of responsibility to the school community, if the school is to educate with balance. University programs that train principals for the field must adequately prepare their students for the ideological and practical obstacles they will encounter in their schools. An emancipatory communitarian model (Prilleltensky, 1997, p. 529) would emphasize elements such as collaboration, power sharing, and the negotiation of curriculum content and program structure. This approach deemphasizes self-determination, or individualism, favoring instead reciprocal or mutual-determination. To train school leaders in an explicitly communitarian mode is to ready principals to both function as efficient managers and to serve as community leaders; to lead with technical competence and with compassion; to facilitate the cultivation of unique yet responsible perspectives and to unite diverse individuals.

PLANNING THE COMMUNITARIAN PROGRAM

Program Accreditation and State Licensure Standards for School Leadership

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders (Council of Chief State School Operators [CCSSO], 1996) "have become a national model of leadership standards and serve as common language of leadership expectations across differences in state policies" (Sanders & Simpson, 2005, p. 1); in 2005, forty-one states adapted ISLLC standards into their state standards for administrative licensure. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), through the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), accredits principal preparation programs using ISLLC-based standards (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2002). Universities must consider these learning standards when designing programs to prepare individuals for successful acquisition of professional licensure. Exams such as the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) evaluate mastery of ISLLC standards. ISLLC standards are, fortunately, supportive of a communitarian framework for educating school leaders. Standards I (CCSSO, 1996, p. 10) and IV (CCSSO, 1996, p. 16), for example, are oriented to community responsibility and describe the facilitation and implementation of shared vision and the evaluation of school community needs. Standard III (CCSSO, 1996, p. 14) describes "management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment." ISLLC standards describe a leader capable of balancing the interests of the individual and of the community. These standards, in the emancipatory communitarian mode, use active language in the form of descriptive administrative "performances," illustrating that preparation must balance theoretical and practical aspects of school leadership.

Faculty and Staff Selection

A communitarian framework for principal preparation calls for a multi-voiced program of studies,

which is concerned not only with balancing individual rights with community responsibility, but also with balancing the roles of principal-manager with principal-public servant. Principals must be prepared to apply a diverse set of skills in leading diverse individuals toward community. To educate effectively within a communitarian framework, with full consideration of a variety of perspectives, program faculty should be diverse in expertise and in opinion. In order to prepare principals who are technically competent as well as socially aware, programs must recruit professors who are expert in areas such as planning, budget and finance, law, scientific management as well as leadership theory, education philosophy, social justice, and community development. Care must be taken to select faculty and administrative staff who voice a wide variety of political and cultural perspectives. Professors should explore with students a wide possibility of empirical research methodology not limited to positivist approaches. Qualitative perspectives such as critical theory, and methodologies such as case study and ethnography should be presented with the same care and importance as quantitative perspectives. The faculty in the communitarian program should be a diverse community of individuals dedicated to the education of a diverse community of learners, who in turn will lead diverse school communities.

Curriculum Design and Implementation

The learning and learning environments must be consciously and purposefully diverse. The classroom must include individual pieces of moveable furniture to allow for the continual transformation of the instructional facility to suit various purposes. The classroom, in this way, becomes a laboratory, a collaborative workspace, a lecture hall, an art gallery, or perhaps arena theater, depending on the instructional needs of the learning cohort. Principal trainees who are exposed to a wide variety of instructional methods will encourage a wide variety of instructional methodology in their schools.

In the same spirit, learning should be constructed using a wide variety of texts. Programs in educational administration most typically focus on the written work of Lee Bolman, Terrence Deal, Michael Fullan, and Thomas Sergiovanni (Hess & Kelly, 2007, p. 265). This short list should be expanded to include the written work of a wider variety of educational thinkers modern and foundational, progressive and conservative, popular and technical. Texts should not be chosen necessarily within the fields of education leadership or management. Students and teachers should discuss the work of social theorists and philosophers. They should, through a variety of texts, explore the intersection of educational leadership and other fields such as community development or corporate business. Texts should be selected to present a wide variety of cultural and political perspectives for purposes of thinking and discussion. Texts, for that matter, need not be limited to the written word. Film, photography, theater, and the expert guest speaker are examples of alternative texts that make the learning experience more tangible. The cohort learning structure is an integral facet of the communitarian preparation model and will be addressed in a later section of this paper. Through access and discussion of a wider variety of texts, principal trainees cultivate an understanding that while individual ideas have merit, these ideas do not exist in a vacuum; the unique individual is most relevant when considered in contrast with other unique individuals.

Prilleltensky (1997) called for emphasis of mutual-determination over self-determination in emancipatory communitarian program design. For this reason, if not because the public school is an organization where various groups of people cohabitate and hopefully collaborate, the primary structural facet of communitarian principal preparation is the learning cohort. In a cohort model, a group of students are pre-selected to complete the majority of their training as an intact group. In the spirit of communitarianism, individual learning experiences are purposely balanced with group learning experiences. Trainees should complete key courses within the cohort setting. Students also should have the opportunity to complete some independent elective coursework outside the cohort setting. In this way, learning is both a communal and an individual experience.

Learning projects and evaluations should be similarly varied. Group projects should be balanced with assignments in which students work independently. In this way, students develop independently and bring a variety of unique perspectives to collaborative assignments. The method of assigning group membership also should be varied throughout the learning experience. Methods might include self-selection, random assignment, or professor-determined groupings. Assignments and evaluations should be similarly varied. Traditional assignments such as technical writing projects or professional-style presentations should

be balanced with alternative and informal assessments such as round-table discussion or theatrical skit performance. This variety in assignments acknowledges and supports the reality of the public school principalship. Professional school leaders will be held individually accountable for certain measures, and will similarly be expected to measure the independent growth of teachers and students. Principals trained within a communitarian framework will balance the individualized perspective with the group perspective.

Many educational leadership preparation programs require students to complete an extensive practical field experience to meet state requirements for administrative licensure. Field experience should be purposeful and enriching to the individual student, the learning cohort, and the host organization. Students should practice clinical observation using a variety of methods in a variety of instructional settings. Equal emphasis should be placed on the instructional observation as a management practice, as a tool for instructor professional development, and as a vehicle for sharing innovative instruction across classrooms. Clinical observation in the communitarian preparation program mixes methods; administrative candidates are trained to make balanced critiques using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Training should include practical methods for sharing observations and critiques with instructors; this method invites teachers to consider their individual practice in the context of a broader instructional community.

Field experiences should be purposefully diverse in setting. Candidates should observe and practice school leadership in venues as varied as primary schools, secondary schools, special education classrooms, urban schools, rural schools, affluent schools, in racially segregated schools, parochial schools, and public charter schools. These experiences encourage students to identify differences and similarities in leadership practice over a variety of communities. Each leadership student should engage in an extended independent internship under the mentorship of a pre-selected school leader, who is expert in implementing, fostering, and maintaining balance between the individual and the school community. Providing a rich field experience for each leadership student will require extensive program planning and the ongoing cultivation of relationships with a variety of school systems, schools, school leaders.

All learning activities, inside and outside the classroom, should engage students in reflection. The central ideas of communitarianism should be explicitly stated from the outset of the program, and repeated periodically throughout the learning process. Students should reflect upon how their individual and group learning experience is linked to the concepts of communitarianism. Using a variety of reflective methods students will make continuous connection to these ideas over time, internalizing them both conceptually and practically.

Student Recruitment and Selection

The communitarian balance demands respect for both individual and community. Communities, therefore, are collections of diverse individuals united by common purposes. Just as it is essential to recruit a diverse professoriate, to present a variety of perspectives through text, and to plan an array of learning experiences, student diversity is fundamental to a communitarian preparation model. Programs should recruit students from a variety of schools and school systems. Cohort membership should be ideologically, culturally, racially, sexually, and generationally diverse. Selection committees should use a variety of criteria not limited to standardized test scores. Letters of recommendation, statements of reflection on professional and personal experience, creative writing samples, and non-traditional interviews are criteria that might give selection committees a better impression of the commitments and purposes of the individual applicant. Committees should seek outspoken individuals who will contribute to a multi-voiced community of learners and leaders.

Program Evaluation

The concepts of communitarianism "should be viewed not as a series of final conclusions, but as ideas for additional discussion" (Etzioni, 1993, p. 267). Students, faculty, administrators, and field experience hosts should describe their experiences within the educational leadership preparation program. Evaluative reflection should be ongoing through all stages of the preparation program, and should formally continue after students have been graduated and have begun their work in schools. In keeping with the spirit of diversity, program evaluation should take a variety of forms. Students and teachers should continue to participate in traditional anonymous course evaluation at the culmination of each term. Evaluation teams of

program administrators, professors, and students should periodically review these anonymous reflections as well as samples from reflections made after projects and field experiences. Themed focus groups should be periodically convened to discuss the program's success in balancing individual and community concerns from structural, practical, academic, and conceptual perspectives. The program should take great care to foster an ongoing dialogue with program graduates, their colleagues, and the communities in which graduates eventually serve to evaluate sustained impact.

REFLECTION AND CONCLUSION

Many elements of the proposed communitarian model are already applied practically in the preparation of school principals. This paper calls for principal preparation to be more conscientious in the integration of communitarian ideas and practices. It does not suggest that programs immediately and comprehensively implement a communitarian framework, but that programs recognize where themes of community, opportunities for collaboration, and emphasis on diversity already exist and highlight them in juxtaposition with and relation to the dominant managerial paradigm. This essay, initially designed as a theoretical exploration of the intersection of communitarianism and educational leadership preparation, is perhaps more a work of educational criticism (Eisner, 2002). In the spirit of educational criticism and communitarianism it is hoped, like Etzioni, that this paper initiates further thinking and discussion on the topic. Balance of individual and community is a challenge in the public school, as it is in society. The conscientious and purposeful education of school leaders through a communitarian framework prepares educational leaders for this challenge.

REFERENCES

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards for school leaders*. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from http://www.ccsso. org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf

Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community*. New York: Crown.

Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal preparation programs. *Teachers College Record, 109*(1), 244-274.

MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2002). Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from http://www.npbea.org/ELCC / ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf

Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist*, 52, 517-535.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sandel, M. A. (1998). *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, N. M., & Simpson, J. (2005). *State policy framework to develop highly qualified administrators*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Taylor, C. (1992). *Sources of self: The making of the modern identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Walzer, M. (1984). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality*. New York: Basic Books.

TEACHER BURNOUT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR IN TURKISH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Cemil Yucel

ABSTRACT

Today's organizations demand people who have the habit of working voluntarily without any need for supervision and control, who tolerate limited resources and negative circumstances, who refrain from being negative, who share expertise with others, and who quest for new developments for the wellbeing of the organization. Being a hard working, patient, altruistic, punctual, collaborative employee mostly depends on not developing a syndrome called burnout. Employee behaviors such as helping others (e.g. supportive actions to assist others and going beyond the job requirements), sportsmanship (e.g. tolerating the work conditions, refraining from complaining), civic virtue (e.g. active engagement in organizational development and improvement) are called Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) (Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Praine, 1999). Such behaviors are critical for organizational effectiveness (George & Brief, 1992; Karambayya, 1990; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Aherne, 1997). Employees who exhibit these behaviors are those who have the dispositional personality characteristics such as agreeableness and conscientiousness (George & Brief, 1992; Konovsky & Organ, 1996). This study investigates whether there is a relationship between teacher burnout and OCB.

INTRODUCTION

The study investigates whether there is a relationship between teacher burnout and organizational citizenship behavior. Burnout is a phenomenon of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion (Freudenberg, 1974). It manifests itself by decreasing job-involvement, depersonalization (isolation), and feeling of reduced personal accomplishment. The feelings of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion are considered to be the results of work stress (Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Carter; 1983). Burnout can be observed among individuals who work with people (Maslach, 1982), and it can be common among people who work in communication intensive professions. Stressful conditions resulting from lack of appreciation and recognition, limited self-development opportunities, isolation from coworkers, limited career advancement opportunities, lack of professional autonomy, low salaries, unmotivated students, heavy work-load, time consuming administrative procedures, low social status of teaching and like are all well-known reasons for teacher burnout (Briggs & Richardson, 1993). The level of burnout can explain why some teachers demonstrate OCB and others not. To make sure that any relation between OCB and burnout is a unique one, other contaminating effects must be ruled out. Therefore; in the present study, an attempt is necessary to rule out some possible effects of other variables. Otherwise any result showing a relation between OCB and burnout can be misleading. Organizational justice, life satisfaction, and self esteem variables were introduced to this study as control variables. OCB may be the result of these variables. Any variance explained by these variables needs to be partialed out. Furthermore, to find unique contribution of burnout, some dispositional characteristics that may have impact on organizational citizenship behaviors need to be considered. Personal values related to work may somehow produce or increase the likelihood of exhibiting OCB. Without partialing the effect of such work values from OCB, any relationship found between burnout and OCB will be misleading. Some of the variance in OCB can be due to these values rather than burnout. These statistical controls are carried out by regression procedures.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

In organizations, it is important for people to work in a harmony. Organizational performance is determined mostly by the state of employees' psychological wellbeing and their interactions. Most of the time official obligations and procedures are not enough for organizational effectiveness. A good employee is the one who goes beyond the official obligations. Behaviors not necessarily required by the job descriptions but beneficial for the organization and other members are defined as organizational citizenship behaviors. "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (OCB) has long been a high priority for organizational scholars (Organ, 1988). Organ (1988, 4) defined OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the

effective functioning of the organization." According to Organ (1988), the operational definition has two types of behaviors: (a) active positive contributions, such as punctuality and attendance beyond what is strictly enforced, as well (b) avoidance from harm to colleagues or organization (sportsmanship), such as refraining from complaints, appeals, and accusations. Organ (1988) suggested that sportsmanship is less appreciated than other behaviors. According to Organ (1988), OCB has 5 dimensions: conscientiousness (e.g. punctuality), sportsmanship (e.g. avoiding unnecessary reactions), courtesy (e.g. giving advance notice), altruism (e.g. helping new comers), and civic virtue (e.g. learning and sharing for the good of organization). Constructs studied in relation to OCB as antecedents are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, interpersonal trust (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), and mood of the employee and organizational justice (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). The construct of OCB is widely studied in relation to other constructs such as job satisfaction, dyadic relationship quality, demographic variables, task characteristics, pay systems, and group characteristics; however, these variables account for approximately 10% of variance in OCB (Barr & Pawar, 1995). Thus, there is a continued need for more studies.

BURNOUT

There are three kinds of burnout (Pierce & Molloy, 1990). The first is the feelings of emotional exhaustion and fatigue. Second is the negative, cynical attitude toward their students. The third is the negative self-evaluation due to feelings of lack of personal accomplishment. Burnout has been considered to be resulting from prolonged exposure to intense emotional stress. Pines et al (1981) add that feelings of helplessness and hopelessness and development of negative attitudes towards work, life and other people are all characteristics of the phenomenon. Teacher burnout also leads to a decrease in the quality of teaching, absenteeism, and premature turnover from the profession (Cherniss, 1980). The phenomenon is a strong predictor of thought of quitting the job (Jackson et al, 1986). Because of limited employment opportunities outside, the majority of the teachers intending to quit the job are "lucked-in" (Garcia, 1981). This fact creates a high level of prolonged stress fed by inordinate time demands, large class size, lack of resources, and limited involvement in decision making (Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, & Bassler, 1988; Cunningham, 1983; Friedman, 1991). Teachers become less flexible towards students, lower expectations from students, and display low commitment to teaching (Cherniss, 1980; Farber & Miller, 1981; Maslach, 1976).

Burnout starts with energy exhaustion. A person feels worn out and unable to find the power to continue daily life. The exhausted person thinks that things will not end as they should . Such person may even quit trying. The employee becomes horrified in the face of going to work one more day. Alienation from other people, insensitivity towards other people's feelings and depersonalization are also common among burnout. Lastly, burnout individuals begin to believe that they are incompetent persons (Cordes & Dougherty, 1992).

If the expectations of teachers are not met in the work environment, it may trigger symptoms of burnout. Such organizational conditions as a reward system, advancement opportunities, friendly climate, and decision making processes are important determinants of burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1992). When expectations and organizational conditions are not met, work stress is inevitable (Iwanicki, 2001). People working in the same organization, however, may experience different levels of burnout. Differences in expectations and personality traits (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993), such as degree of locus of control (Schwab, 2001), are not the same for each person. For instance, people with external locus of control may experience higher levels of burnout than people with internal locus of control (Schwab, 2001). It is important to understand personal and environmental factors that may result in burnout because curing this illness is possible only by isolating and fixing these factors (Schwab, 2001).

CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

The present study contributes to the theory by combining psychological and organizational construct into the same model. It becomes possible to examine the relative impact of individual characteristics and organizational conditions on teachers' role behaviors. To fill the gap in theoretical and empirical knowledge on the patterns of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in school, the aim of this study was to explore the role of burnout, as well as personal and contextual variables. While most theories of burnout focused exclusively on work-related stressors, this research adopts a more integrative approach in which both environmental and individual factors are studied.

METHOD

Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of 1,069 elementary (grades 1-5) school teachers working in the public school system of Usak Province, Turkey. Instruments were distributed to a random sample of 450 teachers in 42 elementary schools over the course of 5 days. The number of instruments returned was 367. Table 1 shows the distribution of male and female teachers in the population and sample.

Table 1:

Distributions of Male and Female Teachers

	Male	%	Female	%	Total
Population	657	61%	412	39%	1069
Sample	211	58%	156	42%	367

Dependent Variable

The study utilized OCB as the dependent variable. Behaviors such as helping others (e.g. supportive actions to assist others and going beyond the job requirements), sportsmanship (e.g. tolerating the work conditions, refraining him/herself from complaining), civic virtue (e.g. active engagement in organizational development and improvement) are considered as outcome variables that are more likely to be influenced by the feelings of teachers such as emotional exhaustion, fatigue, the negative, cynical attitude toward others, and the negative self-evaluation due to feelings of lack of personal accomplishment. OCB also may be influenced by personally held work values and perceived work conditions.

Instruments

To measure burnout and OCB, a set of item pools were generated. Previously, more than seven studies used different versions of the OCB instrument (Unal, 2003; Keskin, 2005; Atalay, 2005; Mercan, 2006; Donder, 2006; Samanci, 2006; Kaynak, 2007; & Samanci, 2007) . Item development started in 2002. Reliabilities and validity improved over the time. The instrument properties were better than most of the instruments available in the literature. The pool of items generated over the years was examined and the best functioning were chosen for a new pilot test.

A pilot study was carried out for item analyses. The items that survive the item analyses, conducted using the pilot data, were subjected to a principal component analysis, conducted using the research sample data. A varimax rotation was used to extract factors. The factor structure resulting from the pilot sample data and in the research sample data were compared. A score on each dimension was calculated for each respondent by adding the teachers' responses to items grouped under each factor. This score was divided by the number of items in the dimension. The procedure yielded a score on each dimension for each teacher.

Likert type scaling was used in each item. For OCB items, teachers were asked to rate themselves for each item. Instructions were as follows: "if we ask your colleagues in your school, how would they describe you?" For OCB items, responses were: My coworkers would say (a) Never behaves like this, (b) Seldom behaves like this, (c) Time to time behaves like this, (d) Most of the time behaves like this, and (e) Always behaves like this. OCB items were grouped under four dimensions. Content and meaning of items in each dimension were examined and named accordingly. Dimensions were named as follows: the first dimension as altruism; the second as civic virtue; the third as conscientiousness; and, the forth as sportsmanship. Overall reliability and reliability for each dimension were found acceptable.

For Burnout items, teachers were asked to rate their feelings for each item. They were asked to choose one of the following for each item: "(1) Never feel like this, (2) Seldom feel like this, (3) Occasionally feel like this, (4) often feel like this and (5) almost always feel like this" Table 3 shows the result of principal component analysis. Burnout items were grouped under three dimensions. Content and meaning of items in each dimension were examined and named accordingly. Dimensions were named as follows: The first dimension as emotional and physical exhaustion; the second as isolation

(depersonalization); the third as diminishing self-accomplishment. Overall reliability and reliability for each dimension were found acceptable.

Table 2:

Rotated Principal Component Matrix (Varimax) for OCB items

When compared to other teachers in the school:	Dimensions			
	Altruism	Virtue	Conscientiousness	Sportsmanship
1. offers more assistance to those who have job related or personal problems	.760			
2. provides guidance for the ways of doing things more	.682	.368		
3. shares his/her expertise and knowledge more	.625		.371	
4. gives motivation and encouragement to other teachers	.613	.501		
5. gives a helping hand to those who fall behind; takes some of their assignments	.462	.452		
6. works extra hours even it is not required		.757		
7. volunteers first without looking around, even for the duties not favored by the most		.705		
8. spends his/her personal time to investigate and develop ideas about how to make school better		.596		
9. reads, searches, and shares about how to improve instruction in school		.585		
10. pays extra attention to be punctual			.774	
11. takes his/her assignment very seriously			.758	
12. does his/her work very systematically and orderly			.702	
13. takes extra steps not to waste school's resources and time		.357	.640	
14. does not make big deal out of routine problems that most people will complain about				.805
15. pays extra attention for not being seen as a person who complains a lot				.773
16. bears negative circumstances and endures disturbances to related school operations	460			.608
Eigenvalue	2.6	2.8	2.7	1.8
% variance	17.82	17.45	16.78	11.40
Alfa	.84	.77	.83	.66
Overall Alfa			.90	

Note: Loadings lower than .35 were intentionally left blank to improve readability

Table 3:

Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) for Burnout Items

	Exhaustion	Component Isolation	Diminished self accomplishment
17. Difficulty waking up	.74		
18. Starting the day with stress	.74		
19. Thoughts like "Can not stand one more school day"	.69		
20. Get bored with your job	.68		
21. Going to work is a torture	.65		
22. Being tensed up, being strained because of work life	.63	.35	
23. Mentally and physically worn out because of work	.60		.52
24. Loose patience towards coworkers, co-workers tests your limits of patience		.80	
25. Suspicious of the intentions of coworkers		.79	
26. Want your coworkers to leave you alone and want not to be bothered	.44	.62	
27. besieged by ill intended coworkers		.56	
28. Your work does not contribute to people as it should be			.80
29. Unable to change things and have no power over results in school			.71
30. Think yourself as incompetent and unable to use your abilities in school			.63
Eigenvalue	3.7	2.5	2.0
% Variance explained (total 61%)	27	18	16
Alfa	.87	.76	.66
Overall Alfa		.90	

Note: Loadings lower than .35 were intentionally left blank to improve readability.

Table 4:

Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) for Justice, Life satisfaction, and Self-esteem

Items	Justice	Life satisfaction	Lack of Self-esteem
31.Our administration is fair running the school	.94		
32.In assignments, schedules, and like, fair-ness is always meticulously followed	.93		
33.All procedures are fair and just in this school	.89		
34.I get satisfaction from life		.91	
35.May days pass with full of joy		.87	
36.I could not be happier than this		.86	
37.I wish I could have more self-esteem			.80
38.I do not like to be in the front line			.80

39.I do not have control over what is happening around me			.74
40.I give up easily when confronted with disagreement from other side			.72
Eigenvalue	2.6	2.4	2.4
Alfa	.91	.86	.76

Note: Loadings lower than .35 were intentionally left blank to improve readability. Items in self esteem dimensions were negatively worded.

A pool of items related to personal work values was tested by utilizing principal component analysis. During the item writing process, each item was written intentionally to fall under a specific value category. The result of the principal component analysis revealed that each item had a high loading on its own dimension as intended. Table 5 shows the items and dimensions. Reliabilities and loadings are acceptable. Teachers were asked to rank the importance of each statement. Responses were ranging from have no importance (1) to have a great importance (5).

Table 5:

Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) for Work Values Items

How important are these for you? (1-5)	Component				
	Self development	Recognition	Friendly environment	Autonomy	Being influential
41. Opportunities to use your abilities	.77				
42. Opportunities for self accomplishments	.76				
43. Opportunities to improve your abilities	.76				
44. Experience success	.71				
45. Contributions acknowledged		.78			
46. Opportunities to show your abilities		.78			
47. Seen as a special person		.78			
48. Get acceptance from others		.73			
49. Opportunities to be visible		.58			
50. People in school get along with each other	.36		.75		
51. Enjoyed coworkers around			.68		
52. Easy to find people to chat with			.67		
53. Friendly environment in work place	.47		.61		
54. Being your own boss				.79	
55. Degree of freedom in your actions				.73	
56. Ability to follow your decisions				.66	

57. Flexibility in work schedule				.56	0
58. Have authority over things					.83
59. People listen to what you say					.74
60. Have a say in decisions	.40	.35			.48
Eigenvalue	3.2	3.1	2.1	2.1	1.9
% Variance explained (total 62%)	16.2	16	11	11	9
Alfa	.83	.84	.70	.70	.74
Overall Alfa			.86		

Note: Loadings lower than .35 were intentionally left blank to improve readability

For each work value item, an item representing organizational conduciveness for the corresponding item is generated during item writing process. These items were subjected to a principal component analysis. For example: while in work values section, teachers were asked "How important for you to have a say in decision making process in your school," in organizational environment section, teachers were asked "to what extend your school is conducive for you to have a say in decision making process."

Table 6:

Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) for Environmental İtems

	Components				
To what extend is your school environment conducive for these? (1-5)	Friendly environment	Recognition	Being influential	Self development	Autonomy
61. Easy to make friends in this school	.81				
62. Like coworkers	.78				
63. Friendly environment	.76				
64. Easy to find people to chat with	.75				
65. People get along with each other	.69				
66. Get acceptance from others		.73			
67. Opportunities to show your abilities		.71			
68. Seen as a special person		.71	.38		
69. Contributions acknowledged		.65			
70. Opportunities to be visible		.55	.44		
71. Have authority over things			.80		
72. Opportunities to lead			.67		
73. Have a say in decisions			.64		
74. People listens to what you say	.41		.63		
75. Opportunities to improve your abilities				.77	
76. Opportunities to use your abilities				.73	
77. Opportunities for self accomplishments				.73	

78. Experience success		.36		.52	
79. Degree of freedom in your actions					.77
80. Ability to act on your own					.71
81. Ability to follow your decisions					.68
82. Being your own boss					.60
83. Flexibility in work schedule			.39		.49
Eigenvalue	3.7	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.5
% Variance explained (total 63%)	16	13	12	11	11
Alfa	.87	.83	.83	.83	.68
Overall Alfa			.92		

Note: Loadings lower than .35 were intentionally left blank to improve *readability*

The Unit of Analysis

For the present study, the unit of analysis is the individual teacher. All variables in this study are concerned with behavior, feeling, or attitudes of teachers. The interest is on how teachers react to feelings of burnout. The study does not utilize school as the unit because it will be very difficult to interpret relationships between aggregate school burnout scores and other variables. Similarly, it is not very useful to aggregate school scores for such variables as personal values, self-esteem and life satisfaction. Finally, using school as the unit would result in a sample size of 42 (number of schools), which would create a problem of getting reliable results from regression procedures due to decreasing n/k ratio.

Research Questions

The following main research question is formulated for this study:

Is there a relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and the level of teacher burnout?

The following sub-research questions are formulated for the study:

1. Is there a relationship between civic virtue and dimensions of teacher burnout?
2. Is there a relationship between altruism and dimensions of teacher burnout?
3. Is there a relationship between conscientiousness dimensions of teacher burnout?
4. Is there a relationship between sportsmanship dimensions of teacher burnout?

RESULTS

The findings revealed that conscientiousness has the highest mean among the OCB dimensions. Among the work values, the highest dimension was self-development. Teachers in this sample value self development more than other work values. The findings suggest that the highest discrepancy is between value attached to autonomy and its realization in the work environment. A similar discrepancy exists between the value attached to self development and its realization in the work environment. The lowest discrepancy exists between value attached to friendly relations and actualization of it in school. For the burnout dimensions, teachers are more likely to feel diminished self accomplishment than exhaustion and isolation.

Table 8:

Correlations among Variables (n = 367

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1. OCB	1.00	.86	.89	.84	.65	.20	.19	-.25	.24	.33	.33	.14	.18	.15	.32	.16	.32	.48	.40	-.22	-.21	-.17	-.25
2. Civic Virtue	.86	1.00	.73	.65	.38	.20	.14	-.19	.22	.26	.22	.09	.09	.06	.26	.15	.34	.44	.38	-.20	-.18	-.18	-.23
3. Altruism	.89	.73	1.00	.66	.42	.17	.13	-.26	.16	.29	.30	.13	.16	.14	.34	.12	.26	.49	.38	-.18	-.16	-.09	-.18
4. Conscientiousness	.84	.65	.66	1.00	.42	.15	.16	-.21	.19	.34	.30	.15	.17	.15	.22	.15	.25	.37	.32	-.22	-.21	-.23	-.26
5. Sportsmanship	.65	.38	.42	.42	1.00	.12	.20	-.12	.21	.17	.24	.09	.15	.13	.21	.08	.20	.21	.21	-.10	-.16	-.08	-.14
6. Years in teaching	.20	.20	.17	.15	.12	1.00	-.03	.11	.00	-.04	-.16	-.13	-.12	-.10	.12	.08	.21	.24	.17	-.09	-.05	-.10	-.10
7. Life satisfaction	.19	.14	.13	.16	.20	-.03	1.00	-.05	.26	.04	.08	.02	.12	-.01	.23	.19	.25	.22	.22	-.22	-.20	-.19	-.24
8. (lack of) Self-esteem	-.25	-.19	-.26	-.21	-.12	.11	-.05	1.00	.06	-.06	-.29	-.20	-.10	-.08	-.14	.04	-.02	-.14	-.16	.34	.39	.24	.38
9. Organizational justice	.24	.22	.16	.19	.21	.00	.26	.06	1.00	.10	-.02	-.01	-.09	-.09	.25	.31	.29	.29	.28	-.24	-.21	-.23	-.27
10. Valuing recognition	.33	.26	.29	.34	.17	-.04	.04	-.06	.10	1.00	.34	.31	.38	.34	.26	.19	.17	.30	.39	-.09	-.12	-.11	-.12
11. Valuing self development	.33	.22	.30	.30	.24	-.16	.08	-.29	-.02	.34	1.00	.35	.48	.44	.21	-.02	.07	.13	.05	-.21	-.22	-.16	-.23
12. Valuing autonomy	.14	.09	.13	.15	.09	-.13	.02	-.20	-.01	.31	.35	1.00	.29	.28	.09	.18	.00	.04	.07	.00	-.04	-.02	-.02
13. Valuing friendly relations	.18	.09	.16	.17	.15	-.12	.12	-.10	-.09	.38	.48	.29	1.00	.36	.36	.06	.09	.17	.05	-.04	-.11	-.08	-.08
14. Valuing being influential	.15	.06	.14	.15	.13	-.10	-.01	-.08	-.09	.34	.44	.28	.36	1.00	.08	-.01	-.06	.09	.06	.00	-.07	-.07	-.04
15. Friendly environment in school	.32	.26	.34	.22	.21	.12	.23	-.14	.25	.26	.21	.09	.36	.08	1.00	.30	.49	.55	.47	-.20	-.29	-.26	-.28
16. Autonomy in workplace	.16	.15	.12	.15	.08	.08	.19	.04	.31	.19	-.02	.18	.06	-.01	.30	1.00	.46	.35	.39	-.21	-.13	-.24	-.22
17. Opportunities for self development	.32	.34	.26	.25	.20	.21	.25	-.02	.29	.17	.07	.00	.09	-.06	.49	.46	1.00	.53	.61	-.22	-.14	-.33	-.25
18. Opportunities for being influential	.48	.44	.49	.37	.21	.24	.22	-.14	.29	.30	.13	.04	.17	.09	.55	.35	.53	1.00	.64	-.18	-.17	-.25	-.22
19. Degree of recognition for contributions made	.40	.38	.38	.32	.21	.17	.22	-.16	.28	.39	.05	.07	.05	.06	.47	.39	.61	.64	1.00	-.15	-.15	-.30	-.21
20. Emotional exhaustion	-.22	-.20	-.18	-.22	-.10	-.09	-.22	.34	-.24	-.09	-.21	.00	-.04	.00	-.20	-.21	-.22	-.18	-.15	1.00	.62	.58	.93
21. İsolation	-.21	-.18	-.16	-.21	-.16	-.05	-.20	.39	-.21	-.12	-.22	-.04	-.11	-.07	-.29	-.13	-.14	-.17	-.15	.62	1.00	.51	.82
22. Diminished self accomplishment	-.17	-.18	-.09	-.23	-.08	-.10	-.19	.24	-.23	-.11	-.16	-.02	-.08	-.07	-.26	-.24	-.33	-.25	-.30	.58	.51	1.00	.76
23. Burnout overall	-.25	-.23	-.18	-.26	-.14	-.10	-.24	.38	-.27	-.12	-.23	-.02	-.08	-.04	-.28	-.22	-.25	-.22	-.21	.93	.82	.76	1.00

Note. Correlations larger than .11 (absolute value) are significant at .05 level

Table 7:

Descriptive Statistics (n=367)

	Mean	Std. Deviation
OCB	3.80	.60
Civic virtue	3.74	.70
Altruism	3.73	.74
Conscientiousness	4.05	.70
Sportsmanship	3.67	.83
Year in teaching	13.92	7.86
Life satisfaction	3.41	.85
(Lack of) Self-esteem	2.36	.80
Organizational justice	3.35	1.09
Valuing recognition	4.01	.70
Valuing self development	4.57	.54
Valuing autonomy	4.17	.68
Valuing friendly relations	4.13	.64
Valuing being influential	4.39	.62
Degree of recognition for contributions made	3.49	.68
Opportunities for self development	3.42	.79
Autonomy in workplace	2.87	.74
Friendly environment in school	3.82	.77
Opportunities for being influential	3.41	.71
Exhaustion	2.31	.75
İsolation	2.18	.75
Diminished self accomplishment	2.64	.76
Burnout overall	2.34	.65

Correlations revealed that OCB is more likely to be related to the opportunities given to the teachers to influence others and have a say in decision making. İt seems that a teacher is more likely to exhibit OCB if he/she sees an opportunity to be visible and have a say in decisions. Also a teacher is more likely to show OCB when he/she see his/her contributions are acknowledged. İt is also evident that teachers valuing friendly environment and self improvement are more likely to exhibit OCB.

Stepwise regression procedures were used to examine the contribution of burnout to OCB behaviors over and above work values of teachers and organizational conditions. It was found that burnout did not account for a significant change in explaining the variance in OCB over and above organizational factors and work values.

The stepwise regression analysis in Table 9 revealed that 39% of variation in OCB is explained by the linear combination of the opportunities for being influential, the degree of value attached to the self development, the degree of value attached to recognition, the degree of recognition for contributions made, the level of perceived organizational justice, years in teaching, gender, and the level of self-esteem. Burnout did not add any explanation in variance on OCB over and above what has already been explained by these variables. This may mean that in the presence of these conditions, the effect of burning out is compensated by values and organizational conditions. The most important variable in this model was the value attached to self-development.

Table 9:

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Overall OCB

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	.713	.329		2.169	.031
Opportunities for being influential	.179	.049	.213	3.645	.000
Valuing self development	.277	.055	.246	5.007	.000
Degree of recognition for contributions made	.123	.053	.138	2.316	.021
Years in teaching	.012	.003	.161	3.508	.001
Organizational justice	.076	.025	.137	3.019	.003
(Lack of) Self-esteem	-.106	.034	-.144	-3.093	.002
Valuing recognition	.104	.043	.120	2.396	.017
Gender	.116	.052	.098	2.229	.026

R^2 =, 39; Adj. R^2 = 37; F = 25.74 p < .000001

The same things can be said for the Table 10 where civic virtue is explained. The difference is the lack of value attached to recognition in the model. In this model, 27% of variance in civic virtue is accounted for by the linear combination of the opportunities for being influential, valuing self development, the degree of recognition for contributions made, gender, years in teaching, organizational justice, and self esteem. Burnout, again, did not add any explanation to the variance of OCB over and above what already has been explained by these variables. This may mean that, even if the teacher is burned out, when she or he feels that things are fair, is recognized for his/her contributions, values self development, is given opportunities to exert influence on things etc., he/she will continue to work extra hours. Even if it is not required, the teachers will volunteer first without looking around for the duties not favored by others, spend personal time to investigate and develop ideas about how to make the school better, and read, search, and share about how to improve the instruction in school.

Table 10:

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Civic Virtue

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	.892	.416		2.147	.033
Opportunities for being influential	.212	.062	.216	3.423	.001
Valuing self development	.238	.066	.180	3.619	.000
Degree of recognition for contributions made	.170	.064	.163	2.642	.009
Gender	.153	.066	.111	2.329	.020
Years in teaching	.012	.004	.137	2.770	.006
Organizational justice	.073	.032	.113	2.289	.023
(Lack of) Self-esteem	-.092	.043	-.106	-2.118	.035

R^2=, 27; Adj. R^2 = 26; F = 18.74 p < .000001

In table 11, 37% of variance in altruistic behaviors is accounted for by the linear combination of opportunities for being influential, valuing self development, self-esteem, gender, degree of recognition for contributions made, years in teaching, and diminished self accomplishment. The difference in this model is the existence of a burnout variable. It seems that diminished self accomplishment still plays an important role over other variables. An interesting finding is that as a teacher feels greater loss of self accomplishment, he/she becomes more altruistic to substitute the feeling. İt may also mean those who show altruism are more likely to be people who feel low self accomplishment.

Table 11:

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Altruism

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	-.071	.443		-.160	.873
Opportunities for being influential	.326	.060	.315	5.419	.000
Valuing self development	.362	.065	.261	5.571	.000
(Lack of) Self-esteem	-.143	.043	-.157	-3.334	.001
Gender	.196	.065	.135	3.027	.003
Degree of recognition for contributions made	.186	.063	.170	2.939	.004
Years in teaching	.010	.004	.105	2.258	.025
Diminished self accomplishment	.104	.046	.105	2.256	.025

R^2 =, 37; Adj. R^2 = 35; F = 27.71 p < .000001

In the model, shown in Table 12, 27% of variance in conscientiousness is accounted for by the linear combination of the opportunities for being influential, valuing recognition, valuing self development, years in teaching, organizational justice, and self-esteem. This may mean that even when a teacher is burned out he/she can still feel that things are fair and values self development. Given opportunities to exert influence on things, he/she will still continue to pay extra attention to be punctual and on time, take his/her assignments very seriously, do his/her work very systematically and orderly, and take extra steps not to waste the school's resources and time.

Table 12:

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Conscientiousness

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	1.302	.383		3.400	.001
Opportunities for being influential	.187	.052	.192	3.605	.000
Valuing recognition	.209	.052	.209	4.041	.000
Valuing self development	.233	.069	.178	3.402	.001
Years in teaching	.013	.004	.147	2.983	.003
Organizational justice	.091	.031	.143	2.914	.004
(Lack of) Self-esteem	-.122	.043	-.142	-2.850	.005

R^2 =, 27; Adj. R^2 = 26; F = 20.76 p < .000001

In the model shown in Table 13, 15% of variance in sportsmanship is explained by valuing self development, organizational justice, opportunities for being influential, years in teaching, and life satisfaction. Even if the teacher is burned out, when there is a feeling that things are fair, he/she values self development. Given opportunities to exert influence on things and be happy with life, he/she will not make a big deal out of routine problems about which most people will complain. The teacher will try to be seen as a person who does not complain a lot and attempts to bear negative circumstances and endure disturbances related to school operations.

Table 13:
Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Sportsmanship

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	.423	.447		.945	.345
Valuing self development	.382	.080	.244	4.762	.000
Organizational justice	.110	.041	.143	2.713	.007
Opportunities for being influential	.140	.066	.113	2.117	.035
Years in teaching	.015	.005	.140	2.704	.007
Life satisfaction	.124	.051	.129	2.447	.015

R^2 =, 15; Adj. R^2 = 14; F = 11.91 p < .000001

From a post hoc perspective, Table 14 shows that 28% of variance in exhaustion is explained by self-esteem, organizational justice, autonomy in the workplace, gender, valuing self development, valuing autonomy in workplace, life satisfaction, and years in teaching. An interesting finding in this model is that as a teacher, who attaches more value to autonomy in working space, he/she is more likely to be exhausted than others who do not see autonomy very important. Those who see autonomy as an important issue are likely to be more prone to emotional and physical exhaustion. In the same model, however, when a teacher perceives that the school fosters autonomy, he/she is not likely to feel exhaustion.

Table 14:
Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Exhaustion

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	3.841	.444		8.655	.000
Lack of self-esteem	.314	.045	.340	7.018	.000
Organizational Justice	-.103	.034	-.150	-3.025	.003
Autonomy in workplace	-.184	.050	-.183	-3.662	.000
Gender	-.211	.068	-.144	-3.092	.002
Valuing self development	-.255	.071	-.181	-3.579	.000
Valuing autonomy in workplace	.145	.056	.128	2.570	.011
Life satisfaction	-.103	.041	-.119	-2.489	.013
Years in teaching	-.010	.004	-.109	-2.297	.022

R^2=, 28; Adj. R^2 = 27; F = 16.99 p < .0000001

Table 15 shows that 24% of variance in isolation is explained by self-esteem, organizational justice, and friendly environment in the school. Table 16 shows that 17% of variance in diminished self accomplishment is explained by self-esteem, organizational justice, and opportunities in school for self development.

Table 15:
Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Isolation

	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	2.510	.227		11.066	.000
Lack of self-esteem	.352	.044	.377	7.963	.000
Friendly environment in school	-.192	.048	-.195	-4.023	.000
Organizational Justice	-.126	.033	-.183	-3.794	.000

R^2 =, 24; Adj. R^2 = 24; F = 37.11 p < .0000001

Table 16.

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Diminished Self Accomplishment

.	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	3.360	.206		16.294	.000
Opportunities for self development	-.262	.049	-.275	-5.398	.000
(Lack of) Self-esteem	.222	.046	.237	4.848	.000
Organizational justice	-.101	.036	-.145	-2.847	.005

R^2=, 17; Adj. R^2= 17; F = 24.37 p < .0000001

On overall, 32% of the variance in burnout is accounted for by the linear combinations of self-esteem, organizational justice, and autonomy in workplace, life satisfaction, and years in teaching, valuing self development, and valuing autonomy in workplace. Again, attaching too much importance to autonomy in school may result in quick burnout. More logically, those who feel burned out may want more autonomy in the work place.

Table 17:

Stepwise Regression for Prediction of Overall Burnout

.	β	Std. Error	Std. β	t	*p*
(Constant)	3.447	.363		9.497	.000
Lack of self-esteem	.305	.038	.382	8.094	.000
Organizational Justice	-.114	.029	-.193	-4.004	.000
Autonomy in workplace	-.156	.042	-.179	-3.700	.000
Life satisfaction	-.096	.035	-.128	-2.753	.006
Years in teaching	-.011	.004	-.140	-3.064	.002
Valuing self development	-.220	.060	-.180	-3.670	.000
Valuing autonomy in workplace	.121	.048	.124	2.553	.011

R^2=, 32; Adj. R^2= 31; F = 23.10 p < .0000001

To examine the unique effects of sets of burnout dimensions, dispositional variables and organizational variables on OCB, a reduced regression procedure was utilized. Results obtained from the reduced regression model are shown in Table 18. It appears that in the presence of dispositional and organizational variables, burnout dimensions operationalized in this study do not contribute to explanation of variance in OCB. If dispositional and organizational variables were not put into the model, burnout dimension would account for 6% of the variation in OCB.

Table 18.

Effects of sets of variables on overall OCB

Set of variables tested against the full model[b]	*P Is contribution significant?*	*effect* $R^2_{full} - R^2_{reduced}$
Dispositional and personal variables Life satisfaction, (Lack of) Self-esteem, Valuing recognition, Valuing self development, Valuing autonomy, Valuing friendly relations, Valuing being influential, Gender, Years in teaching	.000	.12[a]
Environmental or organizational variables Organizational justice, Degree of recognition in school for contributions made, Opportunities in school for self development, Autonomy in workplace, Friendly environment in school, Opportunities in school for being influential	.000	.10[a]
Burnout dimensions Emotional Exhaustion, Isolation, Diminished self accomplishment	.689	.003[a]

R^2_{full} = .39, Adj. R^2_{full} = 36, F_{full} = 11.52, $p < .00001$

a Tested against the full model.

b Predictors in the Full Model: (Constant), yearsofexp, justice, recogvalue, lackselfesteem, gender, lifesatis, autonvalue, lackslfaccomp, enfluenvalue, autoevnrmnt, frienenv, slfdevvalue, isolation, frendvalue, slfdevenv, enfioppu, emotionalexhust, recegoppur.

DISCUSSION

The purpose in the present study was to examine whether the degree of burnout would explain organizational citizenship behaviors beyond the influence of selected work related values and conduciveness of organizational conditions for these values. Although burnout and its dimensions were related to OCB behaviors, in the presence of other personal variables and organizational variables, burnout dimensions did not explain what was already explained.

Individual characteristics as well as organizational related variables should be taken into consideration when studying the OCB and burnout phenomenon. Researchers need to focus more attention on the mediating role of characteristics of organizational context and personality characteristics on burnout to explain OCB. The findings suggested that job and person variables are important factors to consider for burnout prevention and improve teacher outcome behaviors. The study premised that teachers' feelings and perception of organizational conditions are important factors preventing burnout and reducing the negative results of burnout. Burnout can be by-passed by improving organizational settings by aligning them to teachers' work values. The study suggested that perceptions of conduciveness of school environment to values can help reduce the stress workers experience from the work demands. Teachers who perceived their organizations as supportive may feel a sense of greater control over their work. It may thus be posited that extra-role behaviors such as OCB is undertaken by individuals when they see a valued meaningful outcome, when they believe their contributions are valued and encouraged and when the organizational procedures are fair.

Further attempts focusing on individual characteristics to understand the OCB is needed. Studies examining outside work conditions of teachers may be fruitful to explain extra role behaviors. Furthermore, research may look at the effects of groups on OCB.

In so far as planning practices are concerned, planners and implementers should consider creating such an organizational climate that individuals feel at home even on-the-job. Training administrators on understanding teacher behavior may assist with implementation of plans. For plans to succeed, such behaviors as OCBs are invaluable.

The present study had some limitations. These included the small sample size and the difficulty of generalizing the present findings, which are based on a specific sample of teachers in a Turkish cultural

context. Sample size compared to the number of variables examined was a limitation of this study as well. The use of only self-reported and cross sectional data could be another concern. Such use could generate social desirability as well. Researchers can use interviews and anecdotal materials to investigate the issue. İt is also possible that the construct OCB may mean two things at the same time. İt may have positive qualities as literature cites. OCB also may be contaminated by other behaviors, such as showing off and substituting some weaknesses in self-efficacy or self esteem.

REFERENCES

Atalay, I. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Barr, S. H., & Pawar, B. S. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior: Domain specification for three middle range theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 82, 106-112.

Briggs, L., & Richardson, W. (1992). Causes and effects of low morale among secondary teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *19*(2), 87–92.

Brissie, J. S., Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Bassler, O. C. (1988). Individual, situational contributors to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 433-445.

Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff Burnout: Job Stress in Human Service*. CA: Sage.

Cherniss. C. (1980). *Professional burnout in human service organizations*. NY: Praeger.

Cordes, C., & Dougherty, T. (1993). A review and an integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*(4), 621-656

Cunningham, W. G. (1983). Teacher burnout-solutions for the 1980s: A review of the literature. *The Urban Review*, 15, 37-51.

Donder, D. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational bureaucracy*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Farber, B. A., & Miller, J. (1981). Teacher burnout: A psycho-educational perspective. *Teacher College Record*, 83, 235-244.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159-164.

Friedman, I (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 88, 281-289.

Garcia, A. S. (1981). *Predictors of job satisfaction and worker burnout among child welfare workers*. Ann Arbor, Mİ: University Microfilms International.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-329.

Golembiewski, R. T., Munzenrider, R. F., & Carter, D. (1983). Phases of progressive burnout and their worksite covariant. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 19, 461-481.

Iwanicki, F. (2001). Toward understanding and alleviating teacher burnout" *Theory into Practice*, *22*(1) 27-32

Jackson, S. E., Schwab, R. L., & Schuler, R. S. (1986). Toward an understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 630-640.

Karambayya, R. (1990). Contextual predictors of organizational citizenship behavior". In Proceedings, *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, San Francisco, CA, 221–25.

Kaynak, S. (2007). *Teachers' personal characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Keskin, S. (2005). *Teachers' work values and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253-266.

MacKensie, S. B., Podsakoff, P., & Praine, J. B. (1999). Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than salespeople. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27, 396-410.

Masclach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maslach, C. (1976) Burnout. *Human Behavior*, 5, 16-22.

Mercan, M. (2006). *Teachers' work commitment, organizational alienation and organizational citizenship behavior.* Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Pierce, C. M. B., & Molloy, G. N. (1990). Psychological and biographical differences between secondary school teachers experiencing high and low levels of burnout. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60, 37- 51.

Pines, A. M., Aronson, E., & Kafrey, D. (1981) *Burnout: From tedium to personal growth*. NY: Free Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133–51.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Ahearne, M. (1997). Moderating effects of goal acceptance on the relationship between group cohesiveness and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 974–83.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(2) 107–42.

Samanci, S. (2006). *Organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon

Samanci, G. (2007). *Organizational trust and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Schwab, L. (2001). Teacher burnout moving beyond "Psychobabble." *Theory into Practice*, *22*(1) 21-26.

Unal, Z. (2003). *Teachers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master theses. Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

EVALUATING THE LEGAL RIGHTS SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION IN EGYPT: A CASE STUDY

Mahmoud Abbas Abdeen

ABSTRACT

The Legal Rights Support Program (LRSP) is a ten-week project funded by the National Council for Negro Women (NCNW). The project was implemented by AMIDEAST in collaboration with the Salama Moussa Organization (SMO) in the Spring 1999. Its main aims were: (a) to develop the skills, knowledge, and resources of 11 civil society organizations (CSOs), working in one of the provinces of Upper Egypt (Minya), (b) to qualify the CSOs to raise community awareness of children's legal rights in the field of education, and (c) to increase and facilitate community access to its legal rights. In order to achieve these aims, three workshops were conducted on children's rights for education, which were preceded by extensive preliminary work. The research methods adopted in this study were action research, and the descriptive, qualitative method. After analyzing various documents of the project, conducting field visits, interviewing all those in charge, and evaluating the project results and outputs, it was concluded that the project succeeded in attaining its aims with evaluations between good and very good. Nineteen evidences and two case studies were provided to justify the conclusion reached. In order to enhance the positive aspects of the project and redress any deficiencies, some recommendations for future plans were provided.

INTRODUCTION

The Legal Rights Support Program (LRSP) is a ten-week project funded by the National Council for Negro Women (NCNW). The project was implemented by AMIDEAST in collaboration with the Salama Moussa Organization (SMO). It started in April 1999, and ended by the end of June the same year.

The main aim of this project was double fold: (a) to develop the skills, knowledge, and resources of 11 Civil Society Organizations (henceforth CSOs) (See Appendix 1) in Minya, which is considered one of the most important and largest governorates in Upper Egypt. This goal included raising awareness of the legal rights, particularly those of children in the field of education, among their beneficiary communities, and (b) to increase the access of these communities to their legal rights. These CSOs represent an important link in transmitting legal rights awareness to the communities with which they work. Legal rights awareness includes critical awareness of laws relevant to citizens in the enjoyment of a productive, meaningful, safe, and happy life and knowledge of the individuals and bodies responsible for guaranteeing that those laws are respected. Legal rights awareness will empower these communities to identify problems affecting them and know how and where to act to solve these problems.

In order to achieve the main aim, the AMIDEAST and SMO conducted three workshops on the child's rights for education, which were preceded by extensive preliminary work. In order to make evaluation more operationally-oriented, a meeting was held with representatives from AMIDEAST and SMO in the AMIDEAST Office in Cairo in April 1999. The main reasons for holding such a meeting were to:

1. Determine accurately the output and results of the project;
2. Set the project's plan and schedule for task implementation; and,
3. Determine the roles and responsibilities and the way of distributing them.

The anticipated outputs and results (See Appendix 2, Documents No. 3), as put forward by the representative of the two organizations, are as follows:

1. Issuing a Training Kit Model supporting the child's right to education;
2. Providing training on the computer and Internet; and,
3. Issuing a booklet showing the main guidelines of training in the field of the right of a child to an education.

These anticipated results will be dealt with as merely operational objectives. They will be of help in evaluating the project objectively.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this evaluative study included the following:

1. Analyzing the main aim of the project into some subsidiary objectives and identifying the

means used for achieving those objectives. This made the evaluation process more objective and scientific.

2. Evaluating each of these objectives and their means.
3. Providing suggestions for reinforcing the positive results and remedying the negative ones. This would enable these 11 CSOs in the future to work effectively and properly for raising awareness of the legal rights of children to education.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The main research method adopted for this study was action research (Roberston, 2000; Arthar & Buck, 2000; Atkinson, 1994), in addition to the descriptive and qualitative method (Maxwell, 2004; Hostetler, 2005; Howitt & Cramer, 2005; Shaughnessy, et.al., 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994). A variety of tools were used in the process of evaluating this project. These tools included:

1. Examining eight documents of the project (See Appendix 2);
2. Visiting the governorate in which the project was conducted (Minya) on October 24th to 25th , 1999, and conducting 11 interviews (See Appendix 3) with all stakeholders in the project, including a sample of children who participated in the project This was guided by scientific methods in this field (Desimone & Le Floch, 2004; Clark & Schober, 1992);
3. Examining the project outputs, which included the following:
   (1) The Training Kit;
   (2) A computer-training workshop on the Internet; and,
   (3) The training guideline booklet on the legal rights of children to education, based on experiences of 11 CSOs in Minya.

MEANS IMPLEMENTED BY AMIDEAST AND SMO

As indicated previously, the AMIDEAST and SMO conducted three workshops on the child's rights to education, which were preceded by extensive preliminary work. The first workshop was conducted in collaboration with partner societies in Minya in the period from the 12th to the 14th of May 1999. It was attended by three representatives of the nine participating societies (organizations) and representatives of government primary schools. The general framework of the workshop was as follows (See Appendix 2, Document No. 4):

1. An overview of the project (aims, planning, training. etc).
2. A study of the status quo to find the possible means for putting the agreement "Child's right in education" into effect.
3. Exploration of the efforts made to support that right.
4. A collection of the experiences of societies in this field.
5. A presentation of some of the activities related to the child's right to education and the problems involved in such activities.

Some top officials from the Department of Education in Minya participated in this workshop to integrate governmental and non-governmental efforts. The procedures of the workshop were conducted side by side with some other teamwork activities. Evaluation was made on a daily bases.

The second workshop was conducted at Ittsa (a small town in Minya) from June 7-9, 1999. As seen in Appendix 2 (Document No. 5), the contents of the second workshop were as follows:

1. A summary of what was done during the first workshop;
2. The projection of some new concepts on the child's right to education;
3. The presentation of the Training Kit; and,
4. The collection of data for issuing the "booklet" on the child's right to education in the light of the two workshops conducted.

This second workshop focused on the Training Kit. Moreover, it covered "The International Agreement on the Child's Right." A debate was held with a professor of sociology at Minya University on "The Changes in the Egyptian family and Their Reflections on the Child's Status and Education." Intermediate and final evaluation was done during the three-day workshop.

The final workshop in this program was conducted by AMIDEAST in Cairo from June 25-27, 1999.

The purpose of the three-day training was to expose representatives of the CSOs to the Internet and to give them a background on how to research educational and legal issues using the vast resources the Internet affords. Fifteen people representing nine of the CSOs attended the workshop. They received training materials and disks with a wide variety of international NGO links (See Appendix 2, Document No. 7).

MAIN FINDINGS

As a result of analyzing the multiple documents of the project, the field visits, interviews of all those in charge, and evaluation of the project's results and outputs, it can be concluded that the project succeeded in attaining its goals with most scores on the evaluations being between good and very good. In order to justify the conclusions reached, 19 evidences and 2 case studies were provided as follows:

1. Encounters with participants in the first and second workshops showed that those workshops caused them to adopt positive views concerning the child's right to education. Participants became more aware of the child's right in selecting the time and style of learning.
2. Encounters with participants also showed a strong belief in the illiterate child's right to learn.
3. Participants acquired considerable benefits, particularly concerning ways of conducting dialogue, producing collective work, and managing groups of people.
4. The meeting held between workshop organizers and participants led to the integration of efforts, which have been previously scattered.
5. The presence of some government officials talking objectively on education instilled a feeling of freedom on tackling any issue. The officials' talk on the rights of children to an education evidenced a desire for more positive work.
6. The presence of a university professor addressing participants brought more objectivity to the discussions. This fact aroused the interest of all those concerned and fostered awareness of the children's rights.
7. The fact that careful and collaborative planning played a major role in making the workshops a success has raised the awareness of participants as to the importance of good preparation and planning.
8. Positive results were further enhanced by connecting the outcomes of both workshops.
9. The presence of representatives from government schools, as well as others from non-governmental institutions, maximized the importance of close cooperation in the field of child's right everywhere, especially in schools, streets, and homes.
10. Reviewing the international and local laws in the field of child's rights shed the light on the wide scope of interest in this issue. Comparing the international codes to the local ones proved most beneficial.
11. The computer-training course given by AMIDEAST to 15 trainees fostered their skills in dealing with new technology.
12. The researcher's encounter with some students in the Egyptian Society for Child's Protection showed a desire by those students to be a part of the dialogue. The students were so open to talking about their school problems. Their main concern, in fact, was to get high grades, rather than looking forward to any other goals. They were very enthusiastic about the Training Kit. The director of the Society and another teacher attended the workshops. They benefited greatly in the fields of computer and the child's rights.
13. Another visit was to El-Fagr Al Gadid (New Dawn) School, which is a UEAED affiliate. The researcher interacted with a group of primary and preparatory school students to probe their problems and to explore their opinions on a future school. This meeting showed an increasing desire by students to pursue higher education, to avoid physical punishment, to use computers, and to stop cheating at exams. They frankly expressed both positive and negative aspects of their school.
14. There was a relative balance in man/women participation in the Minya workshops, as well in computer training courses. Twenty one women attended the first workshop out of a total number of 38 participants. Computer training courses in Cairo were attended by 6 women out of a total participation of 15, which was a very positive ratio given the fact that women had to travel from

Minya to Cairo (around 250 kilometers one way).

15. The researcher spent some time with students at a literacy class at Catholic Copts School. His attention was drawn to the following points:
    (1) Literacy classes provided not only principles of literacy and learning but also were extended to some lessons in folklore.
    (2) Folklore was used to support the concept of a child's right. Children's songs expressed their problems, such as their tiring work in fields and danger of wild animals that might happen to attack them at night.
    (3) Some drawings made by children were hung on the Salama Moussa Organization's wall. They expressed their rural simple life and their future hopes.
16. The researcher visited the literacy center (27 girls and 3 boys) in Abougharir village (Abuqurkas), which is a Salama Moussa affiliate. The following was observed:
    (1) Facilitator- (instructor) student relationships were very strong. Facilitators admitted that they benefited from and applied the knowledge they got from the workshops.
    (2) Children carried out many activities including drawings, which were many and varied. A drawing showed a girl's rejection of her family's strict orders of housework; another expressed a girl's annoyance at being excluded from school for exceeding the age limit, while a third boasted of being capable of reading a letter.
    (3) Children were speaking their minds with no restrictions at all. They called for more learning and more activities. Facilitators were democratic enough to tolerate all ideas.
17. The project played a major role in bringing together both NGOs and government officials, who expressed their readiness for assistance. The Education Department in Minya put its potentials at the disposal of some societies (e.g. Salama Moussa). Salama Moussa committed itself, in return, to transport Nozol Elshorafaa school students to El-Dawoodiya School to allow a good use of recreations available only at the latter school. According to the booklet, some of these societies contributed in building new schools, adding more floors to small schools, and repairing and maintaining other schools.
18. Concerning improving CSO advocacy skills, the project showed a fairly good success under the limits of time available. The following are some of the evidences:
    (1) The presence of a large number of representatives from CSOs and public schools was considered a means of advocacy.
    (2) The fact that representatives belonged to many governmental and non-governmental institutions was a good means of propagating ideas on child's rights.
    (3) A university professor's participation in one of the workshops and his discussion with participants was bound to widen the scope of propagation.
    (4) Issuing a guidebook on children's right to education served the purpose of advocacy at large.
    (5) Children's drawings and dramatic works were essential in raising awareness.
    (6) Experimenting and distributing the Training Kit to a number of societies widely advertised the principle of child's rights.
19. Concerning strengthening the CSO organizational bases, it seems clear that the workshops held in Minya and Cairo and the issuing of Training Kits have increased the skills of CSO representatives, particularly regarding problem-solving and problem diagnosis. This was manifested more clearly in small-scale rather than major societies. Old major societies always offered training to their members, unlike the minor societies, which found an opportunity in training only with workshops. The Egyptian Society for Child Protection was an example of minor societies, whereas Salma Moussa, UEAED and KARITAS are examples of major ones. A need was felt to increase the number of beneficiaries from the training. The number of those involved was very limited; only 10 Societies were involved out of a total number of more than 100 in Minya.

CASE STUDIES

The researcher limited himself to two case studies, which were the closest to the project's outputs. They were (a) the Training Kit, and (b) the proposed training guide (Booklet) inferred from some Societies' experiences.

The Training Kit

The *Training Kit* was considered the most prominent output item, which has undergone some steps in preparation, experimentation, modification and application. The researcher followed up on a video of the experimentation procedures of the second workshop in Minya. The Training Kit in its final form consisted of three wood boards (50X70 cm). Each of them was divided into 30 pieces, which when assembled together would read as one of the following principles:

1. We have a right to education to the highest degree.
2. We have a right to freedom of expression.
3. We have a right to avoid physical punishment.

Each of these principles is expressed in words and magnificent caricature. Salama Moussa Organization (SMO) was given permission to reprint UNICEF's book entitled *We have Rights*.

Training Kit Accompanying Tools

1. Little board for training before using the big one;
2. Three pictures, each representing a principle of child's rights;
3. Three (50X70 cm) white sheets of paper for children to draw;
4. Colored cards containing no drawings to be used on the problem tree;
5. Instructions card; and,
6. Twenty cards, each divided into three sections covering the items of the Child's Rights Agreement.

Training Objectives

1. Exploring the concepts of right to education;
2. Student's exercising the right of participation and free expression;
3. Prospecting the problems concerned with the children's right to education; and,
4. Proposing solutions to any problems concerning children, taking into consideration their own views.

The Group Targeted

1. 7-14 year-old children classified in groups incorporating 7 to 10 children each, or literacy class students; and,
2. The game can be done with adults as well (teachers-activators), if questions are adapted.

Having checked the procedures of game experimentation, watched the video tape, observed a group of children using it, and encountered the preparation group on October, 25, 1999, the following was noticed by the researcher:

1. Facilitators were competent enough in stimulating the student's enthusiasm for a collaborative assembling of the game.
2. Students were encouraged to discuss the drawings and the rights they expressed.
3. The idea of a problem tree was a creative one.
4. Students were encouraged to find solutions for problems; however, some of the students' proposals were revolutionary and very extreme.

It is worth mentioning here that the researcher applied the Training Kit to some primary and preparatory students in Ismailia (Researcher's residential place); the Training Kit proved to be excellent, enhanced students' activities, and fostered their desire for a dialogue.

THE FUTURE OF THE KIT

Points for Improvement of the Kit

The researcher proposes the following points to improve the Training Kit:

1. Simplify the words, principles, and statements used.
2. Cut down the number of pieces to 25 instead of 30.
3. Increase the number of boards from three to as many as 15 to encompass some other principles.
4. Use simple standard Arabic rather than colloquial in introducing the child's rights.
5. Exchange the Training Kit with government primary and preparatory schools in Minya and other governorates.
6. Generalize the idea of the Training Kit to cover such other subjects as Algebra.

The Booklet

The 43-page booklet includes the experiences of 10 CSOs and 10 government schools, working in collaboration with three of those CSOs in the area of children's right to education. This booklet is a beneficial result of the project with its three workshops and pre- and post-work. It is divided into three main sections (chapters). Chapter One summarizes the history of the participating CSOs. Chapter Two includes two lectures (studies). The first is by Mr. Salah Nasr, Director of the Education Department in Minya, on *The problems of education and efforts made to solve them*; the second is by Dr. Mohamed Abdel Rashed, Professor of Sociology at Minya University, on *The changes in the Egyptian family and their reflections on a child's status and education*. Chapter Three tackles the expertise of CSOs in dealing with a child's right to an education and raising the awareness of local people toward children's rights.

Revising the contents of the booklet, the following was observed by the researcher:

1. The booklet is a good documentation work of the whole project.
2. Scientific methods were observed in preparing the booklet: data collection and the classification process were accurately done.
3. The cooperation between government institutions and CSOs is an exemplary example and worthy of being copied.

The researcher recommended publishing the booklet. Attention needs to be drawn to two important points: (a) the booklet needs language checking because some misprints were noticed, and (b) the statistics used in Dr. Abdel Rashed's study need to be updated; most statistics date back to as late as 1980.

PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES

Despite the positive points detected in this project, there were some adverse aspects. These include:

1. In view of the complicated goals to which the researcher aspired, the relatively short time of the project was quite inadequate.
2. The fact that participants belonged to different affiliations and professions sometimes created some discrepancy; yet, that was, at other times, of value to the richness of expertise gained.
3. Achievement follow-up was poor in the period between the first and second workshops in Minya.
4. Some CSO members stated that sometimes projects funded by some different institutions were overlapping and lacking coordination.
5. Time available for dialogue and discussion was sometimes too limited.
6. The timing of the second workshop in Minya was overlapped with the time set for examinations in government schools. The school representatives, therefore, were not able to attend.
7. The actual number of CSOs participating was 10 rather than 11, as was planned. For example, the Save Child Organization missed both the first workshop and the computer workshop and participated in the second, while Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services (CEOSS) missed the second workshop, and participated in the first and the computer session.
8. Channel 7 of the national Egyptian TV almost played no role in covering or raising awareness to the activities made by CSOs in the Minya governorate.
9. Only 10 out of 100 CSOs in Minya participated in the project, which is a poor figure.

SUSTAINABILITY

Despite the substantial efforts made during the workshops held with the Training Kits, sustainability of such work inside these CSOs is not guaranteed due to their poor potentials, especially the small ones. Occasional activation workshops would prove valuable in ensuring sustainability in this important field.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This project emerged from the main aim, which was stated earlier. Some subsidiary objectives and anticipated results sprang out of this main aim.

AMIDEAST ventured to achieve this aim in collaboration with the Salama Moussa Organization (SMO) by conducting workshops, devising the Training Kit, and issuing a useful booklet. In view of checking the projects' documents, making field visits, conducting 11 interviews, and evaluating the projects' output and results, it can be stated that the project attained its goals with a rough evaluation between good and very good.

Overall, the program achieved the objectives set out in the proposal, as well as the following positive aspects not originally called for in the proposal:

1. Linkages were created between the Ministry, the school teachers, and the CSOs, which could provide a basis for further work in this area.
2. The Training Kit was expanded in use outside its original purposes, to include areas like literacy class and schools.

To reinforce and enhance the positive aspects and redress the deficiencies, the researcher recommended the following:

1. Widening the usage scope of the Training Kit to cover additional principles of a child's right to education.
2. Applying the Training Kit to some tough scientific subjects to make learning more interesting. Algebra is one of them.
3. Increasing and enhancing the participation of more CSOs; it is recommended to continue along with the ten CSOs already participating and attempting to include some new members from other CSOs.
4. Issuing and distributing the project's booklet and redressing the relevant defects referred to earlier.
5. Setting up a plan for visit exchanges among the CSOs.
6. Seeking the advice and opinion of CSOs concerning any future plans.
7. Publishing and distributing the International Agreement on Child's Rights and the Egyptian law of the Child's Right, among all CSOs. The Ministry of Education should do the same in all schools.
8. Coordinating the schedules set for all social service projects to avoid distraction and lack of focus.
9. Forming a follow-up team to report to AMIDEAST and NCNW on the project's effects taken by CSOs. It is recommended that the Salama Moussa Organization take charge.
10. Notifying Channel 7 of the Egyptian TV to assume its responsibilities toward the question of a Child's right to an education, as this Channel played a very limited role in circulating ideas. (Notification can be made through the Ministry of Information.)

REFERENCES

Arhor, J., & Buck, G. (2000).Learning to look through the eyes of our Students: Action research as a tool of inquiry. *Educational Action Research*, *8*(2), 327-339.

Atkinson, S. (1994). Rethinking the principles and practice of action research: The tensions for the teacher-researcher. *Educational Action Research*, *2*(2), 383-401.

Clark, H. H., & Schober, M. F. (1992). Asking questions and influencing answers. In J. M. Tanur (Ed.). *Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Desimone, L. M., & LeFloch, K. C. (2004). Are we asking the right questions? Using cognitive interviews to improve surveys in educational research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26*(1), 1-22.

Hostetler, K. (2005). What is "good" education research? *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 16-21.

Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2005). *Introduction to research methods in Psychology.* London: Pearson Education Limited.

Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher, 33*(2), 3-11.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robertson, J. (2000). The three Rs of action research methodology: Reciprocity, reflexivity and reflection-on- reality. *Educational Action Research, 8*(2), 307-326.

Shaughnessy, J. J., Zenchmeister, E. B., & Zenchmeister, *J. S.* (2006). *Research Methods in Psychology* (7th ed.). Boston: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

APPENDIX 1

List of 10 CSOs participating in the project*

1. Jesuits & Freres, Minya
2. Coptic Catholic Bishopric, Minya
3. Upper Egypt Association for Education & Development (UEAED), Minya
4. Coptic Evangelical Organization for Social Services (CEOSS), Minya
5. Association for Women's leaders for Comprehensive Development, Minya
6. CERITAS, Minya
7. Egyptian Society for Child's Protection
8. Salama Moussa Organization for Education and Development
9. Prinic Tadrouce Organization
10. Save Child Organization

* The actual number of CSOs participating was 10 rather than 11 as was planned.

APPENDIX 2

List of documents of the project

1. AMIDEAST project proposal description
2. Background papers on AMIDEAST
3. Report on "Staff Workshop" Organized by AMIDEAST and Salama Moussa Representatives, during the period April 27-29, 1999, in the AMIDEAST office, Cairo.
4. Report on the first workshop on *The legal rights of children to education* held in Minya, May 12-14, 1999.
5. Report on the second workshop on *The legal rights of children to education* held in Minya, June 7-9, 1999.
6. Checking up on the videotape concerning the Training Kit experimentation period during the second workshop in Minya.
7. Report on *The workshop of computer training on Internet*, conducted by AMIDEAST in Cairo, June 25-27, 1999.
8. *Evaluation scope of work* written by NCNW.

APPENDIX 3

The Activities of the Field Visit to Minya October 24-25, 1999.

1. Visiting the Egyptian Society for Child's Protection, meeting with the director (Nadia Barsoum) and teacher (Ahlam), and talking with children to discuss their views. After that the researcher watched children using the Training Kit.
2. Meeting with Mr. Salah Nasr the Director of the Educational Department in Minya and Mrs. Nahed Saber the Financial and Administrative Director.
3. Meeting with Dr. M. Abdel-Rasheed, the Professor of Sociology in Faculty of Arts, Minya University, who has conducted a study entitled *The changes in the Egyptian family and their*

reflections on child's status and education.

4. Multiple meetings with Mr. Emad Tharwat of Salama Moussa Organization.
5. Visits to Salama Moussa Organization on 24th and 25th of October 1999. A special meeting was held with the team that prepared and tried the Training Kit, and another was held with participants in the workshops.
6. A visit to an illiteracy-eradicating center in Abougharir Village in Mansafis, Abuqurkas. A meeting was held with children (27 girls, 3 boys) and two facilitators. Free-expression drawings made by the children were examined.
7. A meeting with Mr. Adel Farouk Sobhy, the Director of CARITAS, Minya
8. A meeting with Mr. Magdy Aziz, the Director of Upper Egypt Association for Education and Development in Minya (UEED).
9. A visit to Catholic Copts School, which is affiliated to U.E.A.E.D in Beni Ebeid. The researcher met with students in one of the literacy classes and attended a lesson on folklore songs. The researcher observed how the children's choral songs expressed their views.
10. A visit to El-Fagr Al Gadid (New Dawn) School, which is also a UEAED affiliate. The researcher encountered a group of primary and preparatory school students to probe their problems and views on a future school. The researcher also met the school's Vice- Principal, Mr. Nady Mossaad, who had attended two workshops.
11. A meeting with Mr. Anna Ghoneim of AMIDEAST, who conducted the Internet workshop in Cairo.

INVITATION TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

The editor of *Educational Planning*, a refereed journal of educational planning issues, invites the submission of original manuscripts for publication consideration. *Educational Planning* is the official journal of the International Society for Educational Planning. The audience of the journal includes national and provincial/state planners, university faculty, school district administrators and planners, and other practitioners associated with educational planning.

The purpose of the publication is to serve as a meeting place for scholar-researcher and the practitioner-educator through the presentation of articles that have practical relevance to current issues and that broaden the knowledge base of the discipline. *Educational Planning* disseminates the results of pertinent educational research, presents contemporary ideas for consideration, and provides general information to assist subscribers with their professional responsibilities.

Manuscripts preferred for inclusion are those from practitioners, reports of empirical research, expository writings including analyses of topical problems, or case studies. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed.

The following criteria have been established for the submission of manuscripts.

STYLE: All formatting should adhere strictly to the current guidelines set in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.

LENGTH: The manuscript, including all references, figures or illustrations, charts, and/or graphs, should not exceed 20 pages. In addition, an Abstract (between 150-500 words on a separate sheet of paper) describing the focus of the manuscript should be included at the beginning of the manuscript.

WORD PROCESSING: SINGLE-SPACE all text using TIMES NEW ROMAN with a 10 point type. Headings and sub-headings should be in ARIEL with a 10 point type. Provide 1.0 inch margins top and bottom, and 1.5 inch left and right, with 1.0 inch header and 1.0 inch footer. The body of the manuscript must be no wider than 5 ½ inches to fit the paper. Lengthily tables, drawings, and charts or graphs should be scaled to the dimensions given and should preferably be camera-ready.

FORM of SUBMISSION: Send the manuscript to the Editor electronically in Microsoft Word as an attachment to an email. The email address is: lindal@gwu.edu

The manuscript should include the following:

Title Page

Title of the manuscript

Date of Submission

Author(s) name, mailing address, telephone number, email address, and fax number

Biographical sketch not to exceed 75 words

Abstract

An abstract not to exceed 500 words on a separate page

Body of the Manuscript

Text of the manuscript not to exceed 20 pages, including references, tables, etc.

If the manuscript does not meet the guidelines exactly, it will NOT be reviewed and will be returned to the author.

Author(s) name or any other identifying information should not be included on the abstract or the manuscript. Authors are responsible for copyright clearance and accuracy of information presented and submission implies that the same manuscript has not been submitted t other publications.

Editorial reviewers and editors will review all manuscripts. Points of view are those of the individual authors and not necessarily of ISEP.

Please send manuscripts to: Dr. Linda K. Lemasters – lindal@gwu.edu

For more information about ISEP go to: www.isep.info

Thirty-Eighth Annual Conference of the
International Society for Educational Planning

Istanbul, Turkey
October 16-18, 2008

Conference Registration $350.00 USD
Includes:
Conference Registration & Membership
Breakfasts
Luncheons
Journal Subscriptions

To Register Visit: www.cpe.vt.edu/isep

For further information contact:
Selahattin Turan, Conference Chair
sturan@ogu.edu.tr

Conference Hotel
Golden Horn Hotel
Sultanahmet
Single Rooms - €68
Double Rooms - €78
Telephone: +90.212.518.1717
www.goldenhornhotel.com/iletisim.php
email: info@goldenhornhotel.com
Mention ISEP

ISEP
MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION FORM
(Please Print)

Name: _____
Last First Middle

Organization/Department _____

Mailing Address: _____

City **Province/State**

Postal Code **Country**

Email_____

Fees: Professional Membership and Subscription to Educational Planning = $100.00 USD
Student Membership and subscription to Educational Planning = $50.00 USD
Payment by check, money order, or Purchase Order required with application.

RETURN MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION AND PAYMENT TO:

Dr. Glen I. Earthman
Secretary/Treasurer, ISEP
2903 Ashlawn Drive
Blacksburg, VA 24060-8101
USA