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The main purpose of this study was to compare the significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

The participants of this study were 96 teachers from No. 26 Basic Education High School at Mandalay, Myanmar during the academic year 2015-2016. This study was designed as quantitative and comparative study. Data in this study was gathered using the research instrument which was the questionnaire with 5 Likert scale that consisted of two parts; Part I investigated the participants’ demographics and Part II compared the teachers’ perception that was adapted from Williams (2014).
based on Thomas R. Guskey’s (2000) *Five Levels of Professional Development Evaluation model*. The data collected from the survey was analyzed by descriptive statistics; Frequency & Percentage, Mean, Standard Deviation and comparative study; One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The transformed data of this study showed that teachers from No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay had “positive” perceptions towards their school’s development activities. However, the comparative analysis described that there were no significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, and grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Though the research findings revealed no significant differences with positive teachers’ perceptions, it would give some ideas to create a professional development encompassing teachers’ multiple viewpoints. In order to organize better professional development in the future, the school administrator should prepare the development activities at more convenient time with resources and topic that matches the teachers’ needs. Value and practice the evaluation in every school development process with effective principal leadership at school. In this way, professionally organized learning environment where teachers’ wants, needs meet could be created and it will make the students learn successfully.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the contents including background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives and research hypothesis. The theoretical framework and conceptual framework, which is used for this study will present with proper explanation. The scope of the study, significance of the study, and terms use in the study will define in this chapter.

Background of the Study

In today’s knowledge society, quality education has been a critical topic for every nation’s development. Talking about education, schooling lies at a very essential role, as it is a process of changing people’s behaviors and to develop morality and personality. Educational reformers have also noted that the impacts of schooling bring improvement of society that benefits all citizens and all reforms; political, social, and economical. When we consider about education reform movement, it cannot be successful itself, or be recognized, without the teachers. Teachers are the main cores of educational development because in reality teachers are the people who will determine lessons to be introduced, attempted, and included in the classroom experience (Lucilio, 2009).

At the same time, many questions upraise regarding to teachers’ competence when considering about the quality of teaching and learning process. Teachers might have received initial teacher education before entering into their career or might have learnt from their career experience. However, such teachers’
personal experience alone is not sufficient for today’s learners’ development because learners in schools around the world will face a very different future from previous generations. Therefore, standards of teaching and learning need to improve continuously to ensure that the learners can be successful in the future (Organization for Economics and Co-operation Development, 2009b).

As the quality of teacher is the most important determinant of student performance, school are now increasing emphasis on improving the capacities of teachers in order to improve student learning indirectly. A growing numbers of researcher assumed that improving teacher knowledge and teaching skills is required to increase students’ learning outcomes. Therefore, in most of the developed countries, school leaders upgrade teachers’ quality through professional development programs in continuing way. Professional development has seen as the key factor to prepare teachers to become effective, competent and knowledgeable for today’s classroom. Lowden (2003) noted that teachers need skills and continuing professional development to keep up the changes in todays’ society. As professional development in schools is critical for country’s improvement and educational reform, the way teachers see on its impacts also better to be studied. Therefore, schools should prepare to invest their efforts in effective professional development program for teachers and provide effective evaluation in order to organized professional development activities or programs which is, beneficial and significant for teachers’ needs.

Local context of this study, in Myanmar, education is highly regarded as an essential part of life for every citizen. In Myanmar, the Ministry of Education mainly provides education with the vision: To create an education system that will generate a learning society able to face the challenges of the Knowledge Age (Ministry of Education, 2012). According to the Ministry of education, Myanmar
education can be categorized into - the basic education and the higher education. Basic education in Myanmar is divided into three types, namely, (1) Government basic education (2) Monastic basic education and (3) Private basic education. All governmental high schools are named in the format of - No. (x), Basic Education (Primary/Middle/High) School, (Township name), (Division/District). For tertiary educational, government provides all of the universities and institutes in Myanmar.

Concerning with teacher professional development, most of the teachers in public high schools receive initial teacher education before they enter their profession. However, to combat the 21st century learning demands, Myanmar education system has not well prepared the teachers’ quality in substantial way, for all types of schoolings (Kavinda, 2014). Similarly, there are not many in-service teachers’ continuing development or training at both public and private Myanmar schools. Some Myanmar model schools offer teacher professional development in their schools with their own additional plans. Nevertheless, little is realized the importance of demonstrating and justifying the results of school’s professional efforts. No matter reformation of education has been considered as crucial in order to transform a democratic nation, research and evaluation regarding to teachers’ professional development concerns is still very limited.

According to Lowden (2003) study, evaluation of professional development in schools is essential to the improvement of teacher knowledge, skills, instructional pedagogy and student achievement. Therefore, this researcher chose a transparent public high school, No. 26 BEHS, Mandalay that is currently providing in-service teacher development and appreciated to conduct this study to identify teachers’ perceptions, which will be helpful for their teachers’ development.
Statement of the Problem

The interest of improving quality of education has grown increasingly in every nation of this 21st century competitive world. Many researchers assumed that the best way that the country’s education can survive and sustain quality in this era of change could be through on-going development of the teacher profession.

In Myanmar, chalk and talk instruction, repeating and rote memorization of teaching has been practicing for several decades up to now. This researcher determined that Myanmar teacher shouldn’t only stick to the old way of “chalk and talk” teaching method. Teachers should prepare creative and innovative learning environment for students to meet the 21st century learning needs. It is very important for the schools to encourage their teachers to improve their ability in order to facilitate 21st century learners.

Therefore, teachers in both public and private schools should receive not only initial training of content knowledge, skills in teaching but also ongoing professional development of up-to-date teaching-learning process. However, through out this researcher personal observation, schools and institutes in Myanmar have provided a few in-service continuing professional development programs or activities. The principal and school administrators are seemed less aware on the value of the continuous professional development of teachers and their responsibility to involve and facilitate in changing process of Myanmar education. As teachers are the architects of the classroom, professional development is the accelerator of teacher quality in all phases of advancement. Moreover, very little is known about evaluation can lead to organize the effective continuing professional development. Thus, the school leaders need to realize development needs for promoting or motivational
factors that encourage the on-going professional development, which can improve teacher profession more effectively.

These are precisely the reasons of why this researcher analyzed the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development. Moreover, according to the researcher personal observation, this research has not previously been conducted in No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay in Myanmar. Therefore, this research tried to identify the demographics of teachers, to determine the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development program and to compare the differences of their perceptions according to their demographics. This researcher expected that the study’s focus and investigations will help principals, administrator and teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School and other Myanmar schools to see the importance of in-service continuing professional development and how evaluation can support its effectiveness in substantial way.

Research Questions

The following are research questions for this study.

1. What are the demographic profiles of the teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?

3. Are there any significant differences of the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?
Research Objectives

The following are the research objectives for this study.

1. To identify the demographic profiles of the teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

2. To determine the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

3. To compare the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Research Hypothesis

There are significant differences of the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Theoretical Framework

In the course of this study, the researcher set out objectives that helped out in the identification of the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay. In meeting these objectives, the researcher utilized the model, developed by a Professor of Educational
Psychology in the College of Education at the University of Kentucky, Thomas R. Guskey’s *Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation*.

In Guskey’s (2000) professional development evaluation model, five critical stages or levels of respondents’ information were considered. These levels were adopted from Kirkpatrick (1959, as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 78), which was widely applied in business and industry. The five levels of this model included: (1) *Participants’ Reactions*, (2) *Participants’ Learning*, (3) *Organization Support And Change*, (4) *Participants’ Use Of New Knowledge And Skills And* (5) *Student Learning Outcomes*.

**Level (1) Participants’ Reactions:** The first level of professional development evaluation focuses on teachers’ reactions to their professional development experience. Primarily, this level is concerned with the teachers’ satisfaction on schools’ development programs. The questions address at this level were on whether or not teachers engaged. Teachers’ feedback at this level is designed for professional development specialists to modify the design and delivery of programs or activities in better ways (Guskey, 2000).

**Level (2) Participants’ Learning:** Guskey (2000) mentioned that in addition to enjoying the activities, he hoped teachers’ learnt something from their experience. Thus, the second level, participants’ learning, focuses on measuring the acquisition of new knowledge or skills that teacher attained. This section serves to validate the relationship between what was intended and what was achieved in terms of professional development.

**Level (3) Organization Support And Change:** At level 3, the focus moved to the entire school organization. This level provides questions that helped analyze organizational support and change in a specific school or district. These include
exploring the teacher perceptions regarding to organizational characteristics that could lead them change: how supportive the school policies are, the strength of leadership in the school, quantity of resources, and the climate and culture in the school.

*Level (4) Participants’ Use Of New Knowledge And Skill:* For Level four, Guskey (2000) turned his attention to whether/how participants apply newly acquired knowledge and skills in the class. Participants will be asked whether they felt the new knowledge and skills would lead change in their teaching practice and whether they felt new teaching practices acquired during their training help students attain knowledge and skills that would result in increased student achievement.

*Level (5) Student Learning Outcomes:* Level five is addressing the main goal of professional development in education, because it impacts on student learning outcomes. Improvements in student learning are possible only when professional development activities focus specifically on learning and learners. This level allows professional development leaders to set high expectations and help establish more precise criteria for success. The findings gather at this level could be used to improve all aspects of the professional development such as progress-design, implementation, follow-up, and continuation for the future (Guskey, 2000).

Nevertheless, any of the five levels presented above can be done well or poorly. This is because the success will depend on the information gathered at each level but it can help improve school’s professional development programs.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual frameworks of this study framework was based on the research objectives set for this study, including the integrated variables from Guskey (2000) Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation and the related literatures on professional development. The dependent variable of this study included the Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation, whereas, the independent variables were the demographics of teachers: gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience. The two groups of variables were summarized in the framework that follows.

![Conceptual Framework](Image)

**Figure 1:** Conceptual Framework
Scope of the Study

This study was conducted in June 2015 at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

There were some reasons for selecting this High School. No. 26 Basic Education High School is one of the best performing Myanmar public high schools in Mandalay. The significant of this school was the school principal planned and operated some activities and programs in terms of encouraging his schoolteachers’ professional development. This made his school successful and different from other public schools in Mandalay. Although there were only a few numbers of public schools providing teacher development, this school stood a high position with achievement among other public schools in Mandalay, Myanmar.

This study measured all of the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar according to their demographics during the school academic year 2015-2016.

Definitions of Terms

Followings are the operational terms used in studying teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Demographics refer to the characteristics of teachers from No. 26 Basic Education High School based on their gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of work experience.
- **Gender** refers to male and female teachers who are currently working in the academic year 2015-2016 at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

- **Age** refers to the life span of the teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar from birth until the present. There are four age groups of teachers in survey questionnaire including (1) Below 40 years, (2) 40 – 50 years and (3) 51 years and above.

- **Grade level currently teaching** refers to the level of class that the teacher is currently teaching or appointed at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar. In survey questionnaire, there were three groups of grade levels which teachers were currently teaching in the academic year 2015-2016 including (1) Grade 1 – 5 (Primary), (2) Grade 6 – 9 (Lower Secondary) and (3) Grade 10 – 11 (Upper Secondary).

- **Years of teaching experience** refer to the number of years the teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar has taught for. Teacher teaching experiences were grouped into four such as (1) 15 years and below, (2) 16 – 25 years, (3) 26 – 30 years and (4) 30 years and above.

**Five Critical Levels Of Professional Development Evaluation** refers to the five levels of gathering information about effectiveness of professional development and it is arranged from simple to complex.

- **Participants' Reaction** refers to the level that focuses the teachers' satisfaction on the professional development in their school. This was measured by survey items 1 to 6.
- **Participants’ Learning** refers to the level at which the teachers acquired the intended knowledge and skills through professional development offers by school. This was measured by survey items 7 to 10.

- **Organization Support And Change** refer to the level of school supports for professional development by allocating resources and incentives, which lead to change. This was measured by survey items 11 to 14.

- **Participant’s Use Of New Knowledge And Skills** refer to the level of which extent the teachers apply acquired new knowledge and skills in their teaching. This will be measured by survey items 15 to 19.

- **Student Learning Outcomes** refers to teachers’ perception of how their learning through professional development impacts students’ performance and achievement. This was measured by survey items 20 to 27.

**No. 26 Basic Education High School** refers to the name of public high school providing basic education under the Basic Education Department of Ministry of Education in Myanmar.

**Professional Development** refers to the process of teacher development to increase the better achievement of students. This included initial teacher education, induction, and in-service training opportunities through out a professional career.

**School’s Professional Development** refers to formal trainings and other informal activities organized by school itself. It included: refreshment training, workshop, group discussion, principal monitoring and feedback, in order to enhance and update the teachers’ quality.

**Teachers’ Perceptions** refer to the attitudes or point of view of the teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar towards schools’ professional development.
Significance of the Study

As there was no previous research emphasis on this study at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar, the findings would be beneficial for school administrator/principal, teachers, and students largely. It would also bring advantages to other public schools and the future researcher as well.

This research could help school principal of No. 26 Basic Education High School to see the real situation and give some useful ideas/information as the school principal appreciates every opportunity comes up for the school improvement. The study also presented a review of literature with useful information about some advisable professional development delivery models and the evaluation levels to gain quality teachers and teaching.

This study could possibly allow the teachers to present their perceptions on school’s professional development program and make self-evaluation on the skills and knowledge received from school’s professional development. Therefore, this study might bring better opportunities for teachers’ career development.

Students would bring benefits from the performance of well-trained or well-prepared teachers in terms of effective instructions and profession through schools’ professional development.

This study would guide other similar public schools in Myanmar focusing on teacher development and trying to initiate teacher enhancement activities.

This study would let future researchers receive useful information and apply knowledge of professional development for their study in other schools or organizations or in other countries. As knowing the needs of teacher could offer positive advantages for the group that mentioned above, many future researchers from
different nations and countries are encouraged to conduct the similar research more in their own context.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The aim of this study is to investigate teachers’ perceptions of schools’ professional development based on Williams (2014) professional development questionnaire and Guskey’s (2000). Guskey’s instruments were structured on five critical levels of professional development evaluation to investigate teacher improvement. A review of related literature is provided in various sections of this chapter.

The earlier part of this chapter provides a brief explanation of professional development, the most common professional delivery models, effective characteristics, benefits and implementation designs work best for professional development. The middle part focuses on nature of professional development evaluation, principal evaluation models, five-critical-level evaluation and the previous studies of teachers’ perception towards school’s professional development. The last part presents the general overview of basic education in Myanmar, teacher professional development in Myanmar, historic background and professional development of No.26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay.

Professional Development

In education, professional development (PD) is generally defined as a wide range of specialized programs intended to promote teachers, administrators and other practitioners’ competence, knowledge, and proficiency based on the latest studies (Organization for Economics and Co-operation Development, 2009a).
Professional Development can be described by many forms of educational experiences through formal education to informal learning in terms of individual development, initial teacher education and induction, in-service programs with other training opportunities and preparation for retirement. Guskey (2000) mentioned that every educational reform emphasized on qualified professional concerned. Therefore, professional development is necessary for educators and school leaders at all levels, as many modern educational reforms required them to take new roles and succeed in their responsibilities.

It is true that knowledge is expanding at a fast rate so that the career of teaching is becoming more and more challenging (Perraton, Creed, & Robinson, 2001). Many researchers assumed that traditional teaching pedagogies are inadequate to effectively educate today’s students. Moreover, the role of teacher is also changed and nowadays most teachers facilitate a variety of roles different form what they took previously. Teachers also have to be counselors, educational leaders, manager, coaches and even facilitators. Meanwhile, new innovation of Information and Communication Technology integrated teaching has emerged and in some areas has being replaced besides the traditional chalk and talk method of teaching. Therefore, just initial teacher education only is not enough for 21st century modern classrooms; for example, in-service teacher continuing professional development of utilizing new techniques of teaching with advanced technology should be required to set up by schools.

Thus, professional development is not just an event; it should be seen as ongoing process (Harwell, 2003). Currently, Continuing Professional Development (CPD), life long learning is becoming a great concern in many countries around the world. Early and Bubb (2004) noted CPD as maintaining and improving the prior
knowledge, skills and personal competence, which will require throughout a teacher’s profession. As knowledge is expanding day by day, teachers should keep abreast of such emerging knowledge and prepared to use it continuously. So, it is important to aware that appropriate follow-up activities are a must to do after every activities of professional development (Guskey, 1998 as cited in Guskey, 2000).

The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) has set up 12 professional learning standards in 2001 to give some directions for improving quality of educators’ development at all levels. The standards were revised in 2011 and moved from 12 standards (2001) to 7 key statements that can be identified as most essential for effective professional learning. The following table shows standards crosswalk for professional development (Hirsh, 2012).

Table 1

Standards Crosswalk For Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Standards for professional learning</th>
<th>2001 Standards for professional learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
<td>Learning Communities, Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data-Driven, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Designs</td>
<td>Design, Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation:</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Equity, Quality Teaching, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is a short explanation about 7 new standards of professional learning that will increase teachers’ effectiveness and students achievement (Learning Forward Professional Learning Association, 2015)

**Learning Communities**: Learning communities are usually job-embedded and will organize regularly, frequently and are aligned with school goals. All members commit to continuous professional improvement, collaborative responsibility, create transparent and authentic settings that strengthen their improvement and students achievement.

**Leadership**: Skillful school principals or leaders who will promote capacity for learning and leading, create support systems and structures for teachers’ development are required.

**Resources**: Require allocating, monitoring and coordinating the resources such as men, money, material, knowledge, technology, and time resources in order to attain students’ and educator learning goals.

**Data**: The data about students, educators and school system will be analyzed, assessed and evaluated from multiple sources in order to increase its quality and effectiveness.

**Learning Designs**: Integrating several factors such as learning theories, research, and models of human learning into planning and design of professional learning affects its quality and promote active engagement.

**Implementation**: The major goals of professional development are making changes in educators’ instruction and raising students’ engagement. Therefore, effective professional learning requires study on change process and sustains support for implementing professional learning for long-term change in practice.
Outcomes: The content of professional learning should align its outcomes with student curriculum and educator performance standards in order to increase students' learning.

All of the 7 standards are equally important to lead professional development for intended results. There are 4 key areas that are concerned to increase professional effectiveness which include:

1) **Educators** at all levels.
2) **Effectiveness** to upgrade educators’ capacity.
3) **Results** about all measures.
4) **All students** for the matter of equity ensuring that all of them are successful by meeting in high-quality professional learning.

Therefore, Hirish (2012) mentioned that standards are essential in defining what the effective professional learning, what can ensure that all educators achieve the competence they need to be successful and from their it can ensure all students’ success.

Professional Development Delivery Models

There are many types of strategies for teacher professional development in substantial ways. Some professional development may include a top-down approach, where the school leadership provides direct training for teachers. Some may encompass observation and feedback techniques. Some may be more teacher-centered, whereby teachers may be assigned mentors, coaches, or work in peer-to-peer settings. The most commonly used Guskey’s (2000) seven major categories of professional development delivery models are discussed in greater details below.
Training – A trainer or groups of trainers who distribute ideas and skills through different kinds of activities usually manage the training. The best training of continuing development is organized with clear objectives regarding to trainees’ awareness, knowledge, skills development, attitudes, and use of new modern classroom pedagogies. Guskey and Peterson (1996, as cited in Williams, 2014, p. 24) noted that the training of sharing perceived knowledge and skills with a large group of educators is most productive and cost-effective. This is because it provides all participants with a shared knowledge base and a common vocabulary. Training formats involve: large group presentations and discussions, workshops, seminars, institutes of teacher education, demonstrations, role-playing, simulations, course offerings and microteaching.

Similarly, theory, demonstration skills, teaching practice, feedback, and workplace coaching need to engage in participants’ needs and expectations (Guskey, 2000). Therefore, training can be assumed as most efficient and cost effective way of delivering professionalism, with little choice or individualization.

Observation/Assessment – The method of observation/assessment of professional development is defined by collegial or peer observation and providing teachers with constructive feedback on their teaching performance. The prompt examples of this method are peer coaching and field supervision. This method focuses on monitoring teachers’ lesson planning, instructional practices, and class management.

Involvement in a Development/Improvement Process – Another category of professional development includes developing or reviewing curriculum development, structuring new aspects, planning ways to enhance teaching methods, or solving problems. Guskey and Peterson (1996, as cited in Williams, 2014, p. 24)
claimed that being involved in development and/or improvement processes, participants enhance of their content knowledge and skills, collaborative working and decision-making abilities. It would be more effective, if participants in the development/improvement process have information and skills so that they can make proper decisions.

**Study Groups** – The next category of professional development of Guskey (2000) is study groups, which includes the entire school, for example, of solving some of common problems. Participants are gathered into teams of 4-6 and work together a period of time, for example, solving a particular aspect of the problem. Groups should be well organized and provided with proper amount of duration to accomplish. This is because one of the members can dominate others, if the groups are not carefully structured.

**Inquiry/Action Research** – Guskey’s (2000) constructivist theory of inquiry/action research presented the statement that teachers should be thoughtful, inquiring, and enthusiastic to find solution of problems by searching answers to the questions concerned. This kind of development program usually follows: problem selection, collection of problem related information, research study on the problem, determination of possible ways for achieving targets, implementation, and recording results. This helps enhance the connection among theory, practice and findings from research, however, it consumes large amount of time.

**Individually Guided Activities** – Every teacher has individual professional goals and strategies for achieving those goals. Effective individual activities identify the individual needs or interest, develop a plan to meet those needs, distributing learning activities, and evaluating whether learning has met the goals or interests targeted. The strong point of this model is its flexibility and opportunity of
choice and individualization. Guskey (2000) added that this model provides format for teacher self-analysis, personal reflection, and thoughtful decision-making with regard to improvement in student learning.

**Mentoring** – Lastly, another common professional development is mentoring. This method is used for transferring knowledge and provides supports from an experienced educator to a less experienced educator. Therefore, it is highly individualized and offers opportunities for both mentor’s and mentee’s professionalism. Guskey (2000) believed that mentoring provides opportunities for the mentor and the mentee to discuss professional goals, exchange ideas through effective practice, reflection on current education trends, and develop strategies for improvement.

**Benefits and Essential Characteristics of Effective Professional Development**

Guskey (2000) mentioned that some teachers viewed professional development as a sign of deficient knowledge and skills of educators, especially classroom teachers. However, many researches found that effective professional development activities can bring benefits to educators and administrators at all levels. Mizell (2010) stated that effective professional development earns three significant outcomes: (a) educators will acquire new knowledge and skills throughout their involvements; (b) educators will employ things they have learnt in order to improve instructions and leadership capacity; and (c) students’ achievement will increase as educators apply skills and knowledge they learned in professional development.

Records and Information Management Professionals Australasia (RIMPA) (2004) remarked that ongoing development activities ensure:

- Maintaining teachers’ competence
• Updating prior knowledge and skills
• Attaining new additional knowledge and skills

Kloosterman (2013) the founder of the continuing professional development website also mentioned the benefits that bring by continuing development can:

• Ensure the abilities to keep pace with the current standards or up to date with changing educational trends.
• Ensure to maintain and enhance the knowledge and skills teachers need.
• Help to make a continuous meaningful contribution to the school and students.
• Help advance the body of knowledge and technology within teaching profession.

According to Guskey (2000) notion, effective professional development focus on teaching and learning, emphasize on individuals and entire school change, manage the changes that aligned to schools’ vision statement, and support ongoing professional development that is systematically embedded in workplace. Mizell also suggested that educators’ effectiveness of professional learning could be measured through some particular techniques such as evaluation, formal test, monitoring and observations, video recordings, and interviews. Professional development will be worth the cost when administrators become better leaders and when teachers become more competent so that students will achieve at higher levels (Mizell, 2010).

Therefore, in order to make professional development effective, it is needed to consider three important characteristics. Professional development is a process that is (1) intentional (2) ongoing (3) systemic (Guskey, 2000).
(1) **Professional Development is an Intentional Process**

Mostly professional development activities are planned and scheduled without a clear idea of what they are intended to accomplish or how progress will be measured. The activities must be designed to bring positive change and improvement instead of random, unrelated ones with no clear direction. So, true professional development -

(a) Begins with purposeful and intentional process based on clear visions and goals

(b) Ensures the goals are worthwhile

(c) Determines the ways to assess the goals

(2) **Professional Development is an Ongoing Process**

To keep abreast with knowledge and understanding of new knowledge, educators at all levels must be continuous learners throughout their entire career life. Many teachers and administrators regard professional development as special event on some particular days or with some hours during the school year. Other think it can be attained through enrolling a graduate courses, which could also be, give some credits for work service and salary. But, Guskey (2000) stated that variety of development occurs every time teachers teach the lesson, read the educational materials, they have been observed for their performance, or talk with other teachers. They can continuously analyze, reflect on their current teaching and explore new adoption by themselves rather viewing professional development as special event.

(3) **Professional Development is a Systemic Process**

Good professional enhancement is a systemic process that considers all levels of the organization that required for improvement. Systemic approach
(1) **Professional Development is an Intentional Process**

Mostly professional development activities are planned and scheduled without a clear idea of what they are intended to accomplish or how progress will be measured. The activities must be designed to bring positive change and improvement instead of random, unrelated ones with no clear direction. So, true professional development -

(a) Begins with purposeful and intentional process based on clear visions and goals
(b) Ensures the goals are worthwhile
(c) Determines the ways to assess the goals

(2) **Professional Development is an Ongoing Process**

To keep abreast with knowledge and understanding of new knowledge, educators at all levels must be continuous learners through out their entire career life. Many teachers and administrators regard professional development as special event on some particular days or with some hours during the school year. Other thinks it can be attained through enrolling a graduate courses, which could also be, give some credits for work service and salary. But, Guskey (2000) stated that variety of development occurs every time teachers teach the lesson, read the educational materials, they have been observed for their performance, or talk with other teachers. They can continuously analyze, reflect on their current teaching and explore new adoption by themselves rather viewing professional development as special event.

(3) **Professional Development is a Systemic Process**

Good professional enhancement is a systemic process that considers all levels of the organization that required for improvement. Systemic approach
recognizes professional is for everyone who affects student learning. Many schools, for example, have begun to realize that benefits of including parents in various professional development activities. Without a systemic approach, organizational variables can delay the improvement, even individual aspects of professional development are done right. Therefore, systemically designed professional development is not only just for individual improvement, but also for the organizational capacity improvement in order to solve problems and renew itself (Guskey, 2000).

**Three Implementation Designs Work Best for Teachers’ Professional Development**

Generally, professional development can be best designed to implement into three forms: district-wide, site-based and an integrated design (Guskey, 2000 & Lucilio, 2009).

**District-wide designs** foster a broader vision of enhancement. This kind of professional development provides additional opportunity for sharing knowledge and resources it will allow educators to broaden their perceptive. Moreover, it also offers chances for collaboration across district school levels and improves educators’ efficiency in sharing their ideas, expertise and common interests which is limited for site-based approaches.

**Site-based designs** of professional development are contextually relevant and pay more attention to those who directly involved in the local school community. For example, decisions about professional development goals, content, models and evaluation procedures seem more contextually relevant than district-wide approach. The voice of parents, and community members is important in site-based process.
**Integrated designs** are the combination of positive aspects of district-wide and site-based designs with the purpose to produce a professional development program that begins from district school level to individual school level development. A proper combination of large-scale and context-specific designs has potential benefits of improving efficiency and effectiveness of professional learning.

These are some brief information about best-performed professional development implementation.

**Evaluation in Professional Development**

The earlier part of Chapter II discussed that professional development was an intentional, ongoing, and systemic activity that could be delivered in a variety of forms. But not all forms of professional development are equally effective or equally valid under all conditions or in all contexts. To better understand the specific effects of professional development programs and condition of its effectiveness, it was necessary to pay more attention on the topic of evaluation or evaluating teachers’ perceptions towards professional development (Guskey, 2000). Evaluation could be initiated with many forms just as there are different development programs. Some would apply to formal programs and other may rather job embedded. For example, they may be related mainly to improve a program, effectiveness, knowledge, motivations, or to respond some political pressures (Rossi, Lipsey & Freeman, 2004).

A useful operational definition of evaluation most people agree with was: *Evaluation is the systematic investigation of merit or worth* (The Program Evaluation Standards (2nd ed) as cited in Gudkey, 2000, p. 41). According to Guskey’s suggestion, professional development programs or activities should be selected on the basis of worth as well as merit and evaluations should be designed to consider both as
well. This can be because the importance of evaluating professional development programs and activities is to determine their quality and to gain directions to improve them by appraising and judging (Guskey, 2000).

Every evaluation should be conducted for clear and explicit reasons. The reasons of evaluation may different from one context to another; however, all of the good evaluations are purposeful and well organized. This means, systemic good evaluation require determining whether the goals of professional programs are aligned or the improvement toward those goals is being accomplished requires systemic evaluation. Generally speaking, good evaluations of professional development are the result of considerate planning, good questions, and knowing ways to find valid answers. Therefore, systemic good evaluations offer solid, meaningful and reliable information about making deliberate and responsible decisions for development process and impacts (Guskey, 2000).

Generally, there are three main purposes of evaluation, which are categorized into three. Practically, most of the evaluations are structured to achieve all of these purposes, no matter the kind of change in each stage emphasis on during the evaluation process. The three major types of evaluation are planning evaluation, formative evaluation and summative evaluation.

**Planning Evaluation**

Planning evaluation normally prepares before a program or activity sets up or may be continuing for some particular aspects. It is structured to give administrators or educators in program development and implementation, an explicit understanding of the goals that are to be accomplished, the procedures that will be used and the determinants that will be used to measure success. Therefore, planning
evaluation includes assessment usually on the basis of specified goals, the overall evaluation plan, the time that plan can be executed and availability of materials. Moreover, it involves participants’ characteristics assessment, thorough context analysis, and the applicable information collection. Well-designed needs assessments are conducted through observations, formal and informal assessments, interviews, analyses of school wide or individual classroom data, student assessment results, and examination of current research evidence.

Sometimes, the purpose of planning evaluation of can described as preformative evaluation, which means preventive evaluation (Scriven, 1991 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 56-57). This helps decision makers see whether the inputs are headed in the right direction producing the desired results. It also analyzes and diagnoses the obstacles that might affect upcoming evaluation stages. Thus, evaluation of planning helps other evaluation purpose meet efficiently and timely way.

Formative Evaluation

Formative evaluation takes place during the process of a program or activity. It intended to provide information for guiding program improvement such as whether functions are going as planned and whether progress is being made as it expected (Scriven, 1967 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 58). This is because formative evaluations are designed to help organize the program to perform better by focusing on the conditions for success, addressing issues necessary for success and considering the ways of improvements. Scriven also noted that successful formative evaluation done at several points in a program or activity’ development life can highly reduce the length of the final evaluation report. Therefore, in order to keep formative evaluation
efficient and avoid disappointments, employ formative evaluation in early period of the final, overall evaluation.

**Summative Evaluation**

Summative evaluation occurs at the end of a program or activity. It usually determines whether the targeted expectations are met, as its intension is to provide program organizer and decision makers with summary of the judgments on overall program performance. Summative evaluation answered the question about the things that were accomplished, the consequences, the final results, and, in some situations, the justified cost benefits. Summative evaluations present significant decisions about the program continuation, resources allocation, reconstruction, or some legal actions. Thus, the findings of such evaluation describe important information to avoid careless conclusions through relatively formal written reports.

From these descriptions of planning, formative and summative evaluation, it is clear that each has a unique purpose and role, and all three are vital in the evaluation process. Important decisions need to be made before a program or activity begins to ensure its appropriateness and adequacy, during development and implementation to improve and strengthen its effectiveness and at completion to judge its final worth and determined its future. All of three types are evaluations can help improve a program's efficiency, effectiveness and essential to a meaningful evaluation.
The Principal Models of Professional Development Evaluation

The evaluation experts have developed different evaluation models based on their various theoretical point of view and conceptual perceptive. Each of these have their own unique advantages and notable constrains. Nevertheless, they provide formant for planning and conducting evaluations that are effective in different ways. The following are the most applicable models of professional development evaluation.

Tyler's Evaluation Model

Ralph W. Tyler, developed one of the earliest and influential models of evaluation and conducted it in his work during 1930s and 1940s. Tyler (1942 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 49) believed that every evaluation process needed to have well-defined and clear objectives and educators were required to continually re-examine the importance and meaning of the goals they set. This is because these objectives can become outline for content materials, procedures for instructions and preparation guidelines for tests or assessments. His evaluation model was simple, easy to understand or follow and relatively provided direct information for educators. Tyler's model offered essential qualities, which were lacking in other prior evaluations such as clarity, directions and objectivity to evaluation process.

Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model

Kirkpatrick (1959 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 55) developed a very different evaluation model, based on his research, for judging the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of industrial supervisory training programs in business world. His evaluation has four levels namely (1) Reaction evaluation, (2) Learning evaluation, (3) Behavior evaluation, and (4) Results evaluation. The first level determined the
level of participants' satisfaction towards the program they experience. The second level examined participants' learning growth including knowledge, skills and attitudes. The third level observed the extent and the type of participants' behavior change at the end of training. The fourth level considered the overall improvement of participants or program. Several researcher have suggested to modify Kirkpatrick's model and a number of critics have been argued. However, its simplicity and practicality make this model fundamental of program evaluation in business industrial.

Mctfessel and Michael's Evaluation Model

Mctfessel and Michael (1967 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 50) developed an evaluation model, almost 20 years after Tyler's evaluation. Their model was extended from Tyler's in two important ways. First of all, it focused on the inclusion of various counties throughout the evaluation process. Secondly, their model extended the data collection methods that might be used in evaluations. They outlined eight steps of evaluation, which are essential for broad-based entire school community involvement in evaluation process. They also suggested the different alternative ways of collecting relevant evaluation data also broaden the utility of evaluation outcomes.

Scriven's Goal-free Evaluation Model

Scriven (1972 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 53) developed the goal-free evaluation model, which was designed to counter the limitation found in goal-oriented model. Emphasizing on the goals exclusively can restrict evaluation processes and cause ignorance for some important outcomes. His goal-free model focuses on the actual outcomes rather than on intended outcomes so that such evaluations identified
or noted possible unexpected outcomes. Thus, it is clear that both goal-free and goal-oriented evaluations are commonly exclusive. In the other words, in some cases, they supplement and complement each other. According to Scriven (1972 as cited in Guskey, 2000), it is important to consider intended goals for a program or activity, however, determination of unintended outcomes are also essential in evaluations.

**Hammond’s Evaluation Model**

Hammond (1973 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 50-53) evaluation is an extended model from Tyler’s work that Hammond planned in more detailed structure for evaluation. He believed it is not only important to determine whether the intended program’s goals were achieved or not, but also it is necessary to examine the reasons why these goals are accomplished or why some are not. He developed a three-dimensional model to manage the various explorations of why questions or factors that affect on goal attainment. The three dimensions of Hammond’s evaluation model are (1) *Instruction* (characteristics of the program), (2) *Institution* (characteristics of the individuals or groups participated in the program) and (3) *Behavior* (characteristics of the program objectives). Hammond’s evaluation model provided useful structure to organize evaluation questions, however, for generating questions, every participant of the 90 cells for all 3 dimensional factors would make an evaluation extremely complicated. The model still serves as a useful evaluation tool for evaluating important issues, success or failure, and what are not addressed in earlier models.
Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation

The evaluation model developed by Guskey (2000) included five stages or levels that are critical to collect the information of teachers’ professional development experience. They are (1) participants’ reaction, (2) participants’ learning, (3) organization support and change, (4) participants’ use of new knowledge and (5) skills and student learning outcomes.

As this researcher described in Chapter 1- Theoretical framework, these levels are adaptation of Kirkpatrick (1959 as cited in Guskey, 2000, p. 55) with the purpose of judging the value of supervisory training programs, which was widely applied in different business settings. However, it was limited use in education because of inadequate descriptive ability which is lack of addressing “why” questions though it included a broad range of “what” questions. To resolve that inadequacy, Guskey (2000) redesigned five-level-evaluation model, which the research will apply in this study. In this model, the levels are ordered from the simple to the more complex ones (Guskey, 2000). The following is the description of each of the levels in the model and their importance in the evaluation process with some crucial questions and examples.

Level 1: Participants’ Reactions

The very first level of Guskey’s five-level-evaluation determines the teachers’ satisfactions by means of their regards on professional development that they experienced. This is the simplest and easiest level of evaluation and most of the teachers commonly experienced of it. The questions of this level mainly focus on how much the participants enjoyed their development programs such as formal presentations, workshops, seminars, trainings and institutions. The questions related
to participants’ feedback are grouped into three categories including content questions, process questions, and context questions.

**Content questions** addressed some particular points such as whether the amount of time spent is convenient, whether the chosen materials are helpful and whether the instructor is knowledgeable and effective.

**Process questions** addressed the questions concerning with structure and format of the activities, and how well these are engaged with participants’ learning.

**Context questions** generally addressed the setting of the development experience. The experienced professional educators consider the importance of paying attention on basic human needs. According to Maslow’s Needs Hierarchy (1943), the basic needs level must satisfy before progressing other higher level of needs (McLeod, 2007). Therefore, basic need factors such as, a pleasant environment with comfortable facilities including suitable room temperature, table and chair arrangement, and the choice of refreshment are additionally considered in Guskey’s evaluation model.

At this level, collection and evaluating participants’ reactions is easier than other levels. Questionnaires are distributed and information on teachers’ reactions will generally gather at the end of the activity. The questionnaires are designed with rating-scale items and some open-ended response questions with the combination of three types of questions so that teachers can give more personalized feedback on them. Guskey stated that assessing teachers’ initial satisfaction with the experience would provide useful information for enhancing the professional program design and delivery methods in more suitable ways. Moreover, participants’ positive reactions are helpful for higher-level evaluation results.
Level 2: Participants' Learning

Level 2 will investigate what the participants actually gained lead to any changes in their knowledge, skills, and in some cases attitudes, through professional learning experience. There are three main reasons for collecting evidence on participants’ learning because these data validates the relationship between the intentions and achieve that acts as a primary indicator of effectiveness and is vital to implementation. Guskey noticed that knowing what participants learnt is also important because this would indicate the specific outlines prior to the beginning of next professional activity.

For this level, information will be gathered through any type of measurement based on the learning goals and objectives of the development program. Sometimes, information can be collected at the end of an activity but it rarely can be completed with a standardized form. This could be pencil-and-paper evaluation in order to assess whether participants can describe the importance of what they have learnt and give examples of how these might possibly be integrated in classroom instructions. This could also be done by participants’ demonstrations of diagnosing and solving the variety of given classroom conflicts with fair and applicable solution. In addition, oral or written personal reflections, or participants assembled portfolios could be helpful for examining their attainments. Analyzing of these information provide basis concepts for upgrading the content, format, and organization of the professional development plans. The evidence on participant’s learning provides the basis for making the necessary changes whatever the case comes up.
Level 3: Organization Support and Change

Every educational organization can support high-quality teachers not just through adequate pay but also by providing an environment in which teachers work as professionals (Organization for Economics Co-operation Development, 2011). Organizations have powerful influence on all aspects of professional development. Therefore, at Level 3 data on how organization support and change will be focused. This is stressed because organizational matters are key variables to the success of any professional development efforts. Without a systematic organizational approach, it also can delay success, even the individual aspects of professional development are done right.

There are many different ways of organization support that are leading to change. However, they are varied in their importance, the form of professional development and the goals of a particular program or activity. The questions that address at Level 3 that are essential to evaluation processes are as follow: (a) origination policies, (b) resources, (c) protection from interference, (d) openness to experimentation and lightness of fears, (e) collegial support, (f) principal’s leadership and support, (g) higher-level administrator’s leadership and support, (h) recognition of success, and (i) provision of time.

Collecting information at this level is more complicated than Level 1 and 2. Procedures also differ depending on the goals of the program or activity. They may involve observations, investigation of district or school records, examination of the minutes from committee meetings, questionnaires, structured interviews, personal reflections and participants’ portfolios.
Level 4: Participants' Use of New Knowledge and Skills

At Level 4, central questions in evaluating development activities are more like, whether or not new practices those teachers' experiences affect their career practice and how well these new skills are used. Therefore, it is clear that participants' use of new knowledge and skills is one of the vital elements in professional development evaluations. Assessing participants' use of new knowledge and skills seems a simple task, however, more complicated than it was anticipated. For collecting relevant information, the most important thing at this level lies on the clear specification of indicators. There are four particular challenges need to be focus for successful evaluations. They are (a) establish accurate indicators to make actions to take place, (b) determine both quantity and quality of the selected indicators, (c) sufficient time, and (d) adequate flexibility for contextualization.

Generally speaking, at this level, gathering information on participants' application of new knowledge and skills needs practically comparable methods. These methods may vary depending on both content of development and context in which the newly acquired education will be employed. The goals of the program or activity will be considered, followed by the selection of methods. The most accurate information comes from direct observations, either with trained observers or by reviewing video or audiotapes. The data collection methods involve questionnaires, structured interviews, oral or written reflections, teachers' journals and portfolios.

However, information at this level cannot be gathered and analyzed at the end of the programs. Investigating on their uses must be conducted after a period of sufficient time, allowing participants to reflect on what they have learned and adapt the ideas and practices what they have newly acquired to their setting. This is because such implementing new practice is dynamic and continuous process, and the
evaluation may need to be done at several points in time. Finding of this level offer data on current levels of use and can help reconstruct future plans to facilitate better and more consistent implementation.

**Level 5: Student Learning Outcomes**

The purpose of evaluation at Level 5 is to assess, interpret, and judge the impacts of teachers’ professional learning on students’ learning outcomes. So, the questions typically addressed are; Did teachers’ professional development experiences benefit students learning? Did these experiences lead to students’ improvement and change in behaviors?

The particular outcomes at this level typically derive from the goals that are stated for professional development effort. Moreover, the evaluators can also consider the possibility of certain unintended consequences, which could be positive or negative. In addition, students’ learning outcomes also can be grouped into three broad categories such as cognitive outcomes, affective outcomes, and psychomotor outcomes, which mean students’ learning goals also involve the development of new ways of thinking, feeling and acting.

Therefore, gathering information of student learning outcomes can or should include a variety of ways. Students’ cognitive indicators include standardized or classroom assessment of students’ performance and achievement, evaluating students’ portfolios, marks or grades, and school records. Furthermore, assessment on students’ affective (attitudes and beliefs) and psychomotor outcomes (actions and behaviors) learning outcomes can be considered as well. Examples include assessments of students' self-concepts, study habits, school attendance, homework completion rates, or classroom behaviors. The information that gathered at this level
will be going to used to focus and enhance every aspects of professional development process; planning, implementation, follow-up and continuation.

All of the five levels of evaluation can be done well or poorly, convincingly or laughably. The information collected from each level is particularly important and can help improve professional learning. However, many have found that the efficiency at one level is nothing effective at the next. Although success at an early level may be necessary for positive results at the next higher one, it is clearly not sufficient. Therefore, each critical level is important on its own way.

Previous Studies of Teachers’ Perceptions towards School’s Professional Development

This research found only a few studies of evaluating teachers’ perceptions about their job-embedded or school provided professional experience. Many researches have been done for exploring the effective professional models, impacts of professional development and more studies focus on pre-service teacher professional development rather than in-service continuing development. All of the researches were conducted in international context, which means no researches conducted in this researcher’s local context. Besides, the previous studies were conducted more for the Doctoral degree than Master’s level. It is difficult to get the similar thesis topics that are theoretically or conceptually related. However, the following are some of the most alike researches that were previously accomplished.

Lowden’s (2003) dissertation focused on evaluating professional development run at two school districts in New York State. Lowden collected the data from K-12 teachers in eleven public high schools from two districts, which has the similar demographics. There were six research objectives and the major concerned
was to determine the relationship between district wide professional development and teachers' change. According to the gathered data, there was a significant positive relationship between Guskey's evaluation model and the way teachers' perception about their development experience and their performance changes. The highest correlation ($r = .471$) was found in Level 4 (participants' use of new knowledge and skills) and the lowest ($r = .244$) in Level 1 (participants' reaction or satisfaction).

The finding of Lowden's study showed that 68% of the teachers in survey indicated that they were aware of the goals of their professional development, 31.3% indicated that they were not aware of them. 73% of respondents form Lowden's study indicated that their district's plan is linked to students' achievement, the remaining 24% were not sure and 3% said no. Moreover, 43.9% of teachers responded that district's professional development activities are aligned to the teachers' evaluation process while 23% said it was not and 35.6% were not sure for that. Therefore, Lowden assumed that implementing a highly effective professional development required clear goals aligned to students' achievement, job-embedded on-going plan, both formal and informal evaluations and utilizing technological integrated resources. She recommended the future researcher to do further research on the impact of professional development on student achievement and teachers' perceptions of professional evaluation process.

In Williams' (2014) dissertation, the classroom teachers' perceptions concerning their professional development experiences had been explored as quantitative study based on the Guskey's evaluation work by using Lowden's (2003) questionnaires. Teachers from a large western school district in the United States of America took part in her study. William addressed three primary research objectives and major concern was to determine whether there were significant differences
regarding how teacher perceived their professional development experiences based on three selected demographics, years of experience, elementary teachers from Title I vs. Non-Title I schools and teaching position (elementary, secondary, or auxiliary). However, the result of her survey showed that there were no significant differences for all of her research objectives.

Her survey indicated that the most common type of professional development evaluation is observation and teachers’ assessment by the school administrators with formal feedback. The most frequent type of development is done through presentations, and attending graduated courses. As her study provided also open questions mainly for lack of time, irrelevance and lack of input, (13%) addressed about lack of input, (15%) mentioned time and (48%) mentioned irrelevant topics of their professional experiences. She found out the reason that only very few teachers (32%) had input into decision-making process for professional development and most of the teachers are unhappy about such irrelevant situations. Thus, she noted that effective principal or administrator leadership with supportive and cooperative behavior is the best practice that school leaders should have. They can create the professionally organized learning environment where teachers want, need are met and students learn to success. She also recommended future researchers to not only to consider teachers’ but also to principals’ perceptions of professional development and conduct with mixed qualitative and quantitative methods.

Ivey’s (2008) thesis also evaluated a job embedded professional development program of a seven-month duration at 8 schools in southeastern North Carolina. She made need assessment for Lincoln Academy’s reading and writing professional development program. Her study based on the National Staff Development Council standards and employed Guskey’s evaluation levels to analyze
the program’s achievement. Both formative and summative evaluations were conducted to gather data including interviews, surveys and student assessment during the seven-month period. Analysis of data illustrated that professional development that is job embedded, sustained in nature, employs input from stakeholders and is facilitated by community partnerships, can be a medium for school change in both students and teachers.

According to her survey (100%) of teachers replied that they had a clear understanding of the program goal in terms of their in-service development is relevance to their needs. 86% of teachers felt the program was helpful in teaching writing at their classrooms. This was because one of Lincoln’s goals was to create a professional development program that would build a stronger collaborative learning community. She also recommended the inclusion of parental involvement is important and implement professional development with the goals that are clear, connected with standards. She concluded that curriculum and instructional specialists use professional development defined and built in such a way as a vehicle of delivery for institutional growth and development.

Taking all of the previous studies presented above, it makes clear to this researcher that job-embedded professional development that aligned with the standards, with clear goals and is of a significant duration has the capacity to create systemic change for both teachers and students.

An Overview of Myanmar Basic Education System

The local context of this research, Myanmar, used to stand as one of the best education systems in Southeast Asia. Under the control of the military dictatorship for over 50 years, however, now one of the least developed countries with
weak education system (Hayden & Martin, 2013). In Myanmar, education is mainly responsible by the Ministry of Education with the vision to create an education system that will generate a learning society capable of facing the challenges of the Knowledge Age (Ministry Of Education, 2012). There are mainly three types of schooling such as public schools, private schools and monastic schools which providing both formal and non-formal education.

The structure of Myanmar Education is divided into two parts: Administrative structure and Academic structure (Ministry Of Education, 2013). Myanmar National Education Committee formed by the new government and chaired by Union Minister of Education sets up policies and administrative guidance on education. Under Ministry of Education, there are two main education sub-sectors: Basic Education and Higher Education subsectors. This research will emphasize on Basic Education rather than Higher Education sub-sector.

In the Union of Myanmar, every basic education school is under the administration of the Ministry of Education. Basic education is managed by three Basic Education Learning Departments: Basic Education I (Upper Myanmar, Mandalay), Basic Education II (Lower Myanmar, Yangon) and Basic Education III (Office for schools in Yangon city area). The three Basic Education departments and the Department of Educational Planning and Training supervise according to the directions of Basic Education Council, which involved Basic Education Curriculum, Syllabus and Textbook Committee, and Teacher Education Supervisory Committee (Ministry Of Education, 2013 & UNESCO-IBE, 2010).

All of the children start the formal schooling at the age of 5. Myanmar Basic Education is structured in 5 : 4 : 2 structure consisting of five years of primary schooling (from grade 1 to 5), four years of middle or lower secondary schooling
(from grade 6 to 9) and two years of high or upper secondary schooling (from grade 10 to 11). At the end of Primary (Grade-5), Lower Secondary (Grade-9) and Upper Secondary (Grade-11), students usually sit the state or district wide National Examination (UNESCO-IBE, 2010). All of the public schools in Myanmar are named in the format of "No. (x), Basic Education (Primary/Middle/High) School, (Township name). The classes are normally over-sized with around 40 to 60 students.

Table 2

*Academic Structure of Basic Education System*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of School</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>5+ to 7+</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper 2</td>
<td>8+ to 9+</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Lower 4</td>
<td>10+ to 13+</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper 2</td>
<td>14+ to 15+</td>
<td>10 to 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Department of Educational Planning and Training, MOE, 2013)

The number of public basic education schools is increasing. According to Ministry of Education (2013), the number of schools is as follow,

Table 3

*Number of Basic Education Schools in Myanmar*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Education High Schools</th>
<th>2,351</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education Middle Schools</td>
<td>3,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education Post-Primary Schools</td>
<td>6,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education Primary Schools</td>
<td>28,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from Ministry of Education (2013) indicated that at Basic Education schools there were 273,516 numbers of teachers working in different parts of Myanmar and teaching 8,200,595 students. Moreover, the Private Schools Registration Law has been imposed by the Parliament and as the result there are 21 private Basic Education schools has been established.

Under the supervision of new female Minister of Education, Dr. Daw Khin San Yee, educational seminars, workshops, and consultations have been held very often discussing ways to improve, strengthen and upgrade all levels of education to meet the needs of the changing economic and political situation (SEAMO, 2015). According to the vision of Myanmar education, two new working groups, Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) in 2012 and Education Promotion Implementation Committee (EPIC), which was followed by in late 2013 were established. The establishment of CESR is to review or recommend regarding to the reformation of Myanmar education system while EPIC is for drafting policies for implementation of education reform. CESR and EPIC will cooperate and present overall integrated plan to implement Myanmar’s education reform (Myanmar Comprehensive Education Sector Review, 2013). That showed Myanmar is stepping forwards for its education transformations.

Htay (2013) also posted that Ministry of Education was trying to raise the enrolment rate and the completion rate of basic education for all school-age children. 2011 statistics had shown that there was around 85% enrolment rate with over 81% of completion rate. Furthermore, the Thirty-Year Long-Term Basic Education Development Plan (2001-02 FY to 2030-31 FY) was implemented in order to promote education access and the quality of Basic Education (Kyaw, 2013). Myanmar
Constitution (2008) Act (336) also mentioned that (a) every citizen has right to be educated; (b) every child has right to be given basic education as compulsory; (c) every scholar or educator has right to conduct research freely and creatively in various area including science, arts and culture and others. Therefore, in recent years, Ministry of Education Myanmar put more efforts to upgrade primary schooling as free compulsory education for all school-age children. In September 2015, 12 new initiatives in Education reform, which will implement during 2015-2016, were announced and mainly they will increase Myanmar Education Budget by approximately 10% (Myanmar Comprehensive Education Sector Review, 2015) and much of it will spend on Basic Education sector than others. Therefore, this researcher hope that Myanmar Education especially Basic Education sector will see the progress if the Government surely implement all of the plans presented above for the betterment of Myanmar people.

Brief Introduction to Teachers and Professional Development in Myanmar

Public Basic Education Schools

Teachers in Myanmar are being respected as the Buddha, the monk, the scriptures and parents, one of the “five gems”. The teachers are the great models in Myanmar communities. Traditionally they are regarded as leaders or developer for their own community in both rural and urban areas. They are often seen as major distributors in religious and social movements at the community level or national level (Tin, 2000).

In Myanmar, the Ministry of Education is the main provider of education and training, especially in the areas of basic education, teacher education and higher education. Teacher professional development is provided in both pre-service and in-
service ways. Teacher pre-service education for teaching in basic education, B.Ed, can be obtained in two types of institutions, namely Education Colleges (ECs), of which there are 20 in the country, and 3 Institutes of Education (IOEs).

In the endeavor to create a modern developed nation, teachers are crucial players and teachers in Myanmar have great potential to act as agents of change for country’s education development. Though they have to work under very difficult circumstances with little remuneration or reward, most teachers do good work. However, Myanmar teachers are highly conservative as they are being got along well with traditional way of teaching. While retaining traditional values, they should be aware of current education trends, and willing to accept changes or adapt the demands of a dynamic, modern society. There is also a saying in Myanmar, The lotus rises as the level of the water rises, which means teachers are the water and the lotus is the country’s education. This pointed out the need of upgrading teaching profession in order to lift up country’s education standard (Tin, 2000).

Following the nation-wide seminars of 1998 and 1999, it mentioned that the Ministry has initiated reform programs intended for;

- Improving the quality of teacher education and training courses and re-introducing pre-service courses at the newly upgraded Colleges of Education;
- Implementing staff updating and improvement program in the universities, institutes, Degree College and Colleges (Tin, 2000).

As the concept of on-going professional development is becoming popular, Myanmar Ministry of Education also conducted some refresher courses for teachers in basic education. In a broad sense of Continuing Professional Development, M.Ed and M.Phil and PhD were offered by IOEs as in-service teachers for Myanmar education progress (Soma, 2013).
Most recently, according to a speech in the Asia-Pacific Regional Education Conference 2014, Minister of Education presented the upcoming initiatives to enhance teachers' professionalism. Working group was formed for teacher education, preparing to set up the National Teacher Education Council and formulating teacher education policies for all education sectors. In addition, as there were still limited and insufficient continuing professional development programs, she aimed to strengthen the programs fostering teachers' and teacher educators' productive abilities (Yee, 2014).

As teachers are at the center of Myanmar's educational philosophy, Ministry of Education try encouraging to improve the professional competency of teachers in order to attain betterment of the future of the Myanmar citizens. Therefore, during this transaction period of Myanmar education movement, this researcher hopes to investigate the perceptions of teacher and highlight the value of on-going in-service professional development to the school community that is concerned, through this study.

**Historical Background of No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay**

All Myanmar public basic education schools are named by number and this research was conducted at No. 26 Basic Education High School, one of the well-known public schools in researcher’s hometown, Mandalay, Myanmar. In the beginning around 1983, the school was established as a primary school by the first principal, U Thit Lwin (B.Sc, B.Ed). Later, it was promoted to a high school. Currently, the school is leading by the sixth principal, Dr. Thant Htike Soe (B.Sc(Hons.), M.Sc, M.Res, Ph.D), who is devoting his efforts in school overall improvement, since 2007.
The school is (6.303) acre wide and there are (14) school buildings with (69) classrooms. According to (2014 - 2015) academic year, there are (113) teachers, including the principal, providing education to (2244) students: (1014) high school students, (847) middle school students and (430) primary school students. Although the school is situated on the outskirts of Mandalay where all students are from middle and lower class families, the school is famous under the supervision of its principal.

Unlike others, the current principal is a flexible instructional leader, decentralizing his management and always looking forwards for his school teachers’ and students’ development. He takes great care of teachers’ and students’ motivation, emphasis on interactive and innovative teaching, and building positive relationship with community. Moreover, the principle built (75) toilets and practices hand-washing habits, as he believes this is one of most important service that a hygienic school should have. In addition, he also manages the school snack shops for selling nutritious food and makes sure the school environment to be clean by providing garbage bins with 3Rs (Reuse, Renew, Recycle) concern. He arranges the school lab rooms such as Biology Lab, Physic Lab, Chemistry Lab, Multimedia and Computer Lab, lively and attractive with teaching aids to catch up the ASEAN school level. The school also has a small library with (11042) books, systematically borrowing the students. The school has a place for the students to play sports such as football, volleyball, netball and even playing cricket that was trained by President of Cricket Association in 2008.

Furthermore, the principal teaches his students to appreciate the nature and care the environment so that students of every grade level have their own plantations, growing some vegetables and other plants. The principal’s idea is to create his school a green land with pleasant environment in the dry zone of central Myanmar, Mandalay. Therefore, this school has been visited by vice president of
Myanmar and was honored the first prize of “Eco Friendly Green Environment School” by Ministry of Forestry in 2009, by Ministry of Electricity in 2010, by Prime Minister of Mandalay in 2011, by Minister of Municipal in 2012 and by Prime Minister of Mandalay 2013 respectively. On the other hand, the school is producing academically outstanding students every year for district and national assessments.

The information presented above is the most significant activities and performances, which make No. 26 Basic Education High School uniquely standing among public schools in Mandalay, Myanmar.

School’s Professional Development at No. 26 Basic Education High School

School’s professional development activities organized by the principal are the most significant feature of No. 26 Basic Education High School. The principal arranges professional enhancement programs for his teachers in both formal and informal ways.

As Myanmar public school teachers do not have much free time to attend formal training, the principal usually organize and monitors intensive refresher training for teachers which usually last 3 to 5 days in summer holidays before the school starts for the next academic year. The major concern was to in line with one of the EFA National Action Plan (2003-2015) and Myanmar EFA goals, to improve all aspects of basic education including capacities of teachers, education personnel and curriculum, the principal focuses on upgrading teacher skills as possible as he could (The Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar Ministry of Education, 2012). Besides of training course required by government, such school-embedded trainings also upgrade teachers’ content instructional skills integrated with up to date teaching methodological knowledge.
On school days, teachers normally have weekly and monthly discussion as collaborative work in order to make lesson plan and share instructional strategies. The principal also arranges computer classes, and English proficiency classes randomly by groups of teachers at school. Recently, with the support of Ministry of Education (Upper Myanmar), five teachers are being sent to British Council, Mandalay for attending teachers' training course.

Moreover, in 2012, teachers were lectured the production of homemade dishwasher and hand washing soap at school lab. This showed that this school has qualified school support: laboratories, which are alive for both teachers and students.

Although the principal provides such fantastic development activities, he cannot pay much attention on evaluating the teachers’ perceptions towards their professional experiences. Teachers’ performance was assessed informally by principal monitoring, mentoring and monthly reports. Nevertheless, he notices that in today’s knowledge world, the system of schooling should be inclusive, informative and progressive continuously. Therefore, he willingly accepted this researcher to gather information and by doing so, he will examine the better ways to improve the teachers’ quality through this study finding.

Summary

All in all, the body of this chapter demonstrates that it is important to better understand the nature of professional development, its delivery process, effective characteristics and ways of implementing it. In order to do so, educators should examine what is working and not working for districts, schools, educators, parents, and most importantly, students. All the 21st century school leaders should aware of implementing good evaluations and, therefore, this researcher discussed
applicable information about evaluating teacher development programs in this chapter. The way of how evaluation models had been transformed, the finding of previous researchers and the most common evaluation model of Guskey (2000) were also presented. Additionally, the background information about local context regarding to Myanmar Basic Education system, Myanmar teachers development and the school this study will take place were also described.

The next chapter of this study provides a description of the methods used to collect data using Williams (2014) professional development questionnaire based on Guskey's (2000) previous instruments. Chapter III will help structure the findings that follow in Chapter IV on teachers' perceptions of their professional development experiences.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher will present the research methodology to find out teachers’ perception towards school’s professional development program based on their demographics. The process of research methodology includes the research design, population, research instrument, validity and reliability, collection of data, data analysis, and summary of the research process.

Research Design

This main purpose of this research was to compare teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basis Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

This research was designed as a quantitative and comparative study. Lowden’s (2003) Questionnaire based on Guskey’s (2000) Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation was adopted as the research instrument for data collection. This researcher used descriptive statistics and comparative method to determine the research objectives.

The research questionnaires include two parts. The first part of the questionnaire was questioning the demographics of teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience. The second part was designed to evaluate the teachers’ perception towards school’s professional development and to compare their perception according to their selected
demographics through five levels – (1) Participants’ reaction, (2) Participants’ learning, (3) Organization support and change, (4) Participants’ use of new knowledge and skills and (5) Student learning outcomes.

**Population**

This study compared the perceptions of teachers according to their demographics at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar. Thus, the respondents of this study were all of the teachers who are currently working in academic year 2015-2016 at Mandalay No. 26 High School. As the researcher included all teachers from school, the total population of this study was 96 teachers.

**Research Instrument**

The questionnaire was used as the primary instrument for this study. The research questionnaire consisted of two main parts.

Research questionnaire **Part I** surveyed the demographics of the teachers including respondents’ (1) gender, (2) age, (3) grade level currently teaching and (3) years of working experience, which was based on the real situation of teachers at No. 26 Basic Education I High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Questionnaire **Part II** was adapted from the study of Williams (2014) on “Teacher Perception Towards Professional Development Experiences” that she adopted it from Lowden (2003) “Evaluating The Effectiveness of Professional Development”. This part of questionnaire surveyed the perceptions of the teachers towards school’s Professional Development according to respondents’ demographics. For this part, there are totally 27 questions under 5 evaluation levels. Questions 1 to 6 were used to measure Level (1) Participants’ reactions. Questions 7 to 10 were used to
demographics through five levels – (1) Participants’ reaction, (2) Participants’ learning, (3) Organization support and change, (4) Participants’ use of new knowledge and skills and (5) Student learning outcomes.

**Population**

This study compared the perceptions of teachers according to their demographics at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar. Thus, the respondents of this study were all of the teachers who are currently working in academic year 2015-2016 at Mandalay No. 26 High School. As the researcher included all teachers from school, the total population of this study was 96 teachers.

**Research Instrument**

The questionnaire was used as the primary instrument for this study. The research questionnaire consisted of two main parts.

Research questionnaire **Part I** surveyed the demographics of the teachers including respondents’ (1) gender, (2) age, (3) grade level currently teaching and (3) years of working experience, which was based on the real situation of teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Questionnaire **Part II** was adapted from the study of Williams (2014) on “Teacher Perception Towards Professional Development Experiences” that she adopted it from Lowden (2003) “Evaluating The Effectiveness of Professional Development”. This part of questionnaire surveyed the perceptions of the teachers towards school’s Professional Development according to respondents’ demographics. For this part, there are totally 27 questions under 5 evaluation levels. Questions 1 to 6 were used to measure Level (1) Participants’ reactions. Questions 7 to 10 were used to
measure Level (2) Participants’ learning. Questions 11 to 14 were used to measure for Level (3) Organizations support and change. Questions 15 to 19 were used to measure for Level (4) Participants’ use of new knowledge and skills. Questions 20 to 27 were used to measure for Level (5) Students learning outcomes.

Table 4

**Breakdown of the Survey Instrument (Professional Development)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Participants’ Reactions</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Participants’ Learning</td>
<td>7 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Organizations Support and Change</td>
<td>11 – 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>15 – 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>20 – 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants responded their perceptions towards school’s professional development program by ticking in the box that best matched their perceptions. Table 5 describe the corresponding values for the 5-point likert scales based on the criterions ranging from 5 to 1 with interpretation of 5 = Strongly Agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree and 1= Strongly Disagree.
Table 5

**Criteria of Scale Interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.51 - 5.00</td>
<td>Very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>Very Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity and Reliability**

The research instrument of this study was adapted from Williams (2014), which was originally from Lowden (2003). This questionnaire was validated by the first researcher Lowden running pilot study and approved by juries and curriculum committee members.

In Williams (2014) study, Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the instrument’s reliability. This questionnaire resulted in an overall value of .84, which indicates strong reliability. Therefore, this researcher used this questionnaire for her study investigating teachers’ perception in No. 26 high school in central Myanmar, Mandalay. This researcher carried out the reliability analysis of the questionnaire collected from 96 teachers. Overall Cronbach’s Alpha was computed for all 5-evaluation levels and the alpha of the questionnaire in this study was .768, which was regarded as reliable.

**Translation of the Instrument**

As the questionnaire was distributed to teachers in Myanmar public high school, this researcher translated the questionnaire from English to Myanmar in
order to make Myanmar teachers with different demographics easily understand. In other words, it supported this research survey and findings more reliable and valid. For translation process, this researcher requested three Myanmar teachers who have reliable background of English and Myanmar language translation, checking and approving it. The questionnaire translation approval forms of the three Myanmar teachers were presented in Appendix C.

**Collection of Data**

To collect research data from the respondents, a proper way of data gathering process was followed. First of all, the researcher made an appointment with the principal from No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar to request permission for the implementation of this study. Then this researcher set a schedule to deliver the questionnaires to the teachers of No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

With the help of the school principal, the survey questionnaires were distributed on the 9th of June 2015 and collected on the 10th of June 2015 with 100% valid return.

Table 6

*Data Collection Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tentative Date</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th March, 2015</td>
<td>Request permission from the Principal of No. 26 Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st April, 2015</td>
<td>Proposal Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-10th June, 2015</td>
<td>Distribution and Collection of Survey Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th August, 2015</td>
<td>Tabulation and computation of Data ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

This study used the appropriate statistical tools to analyze and interpret the collected data from the teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

For Research Objective 1: Frequency and Percentage was used to identify the demographic profiles of the teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and work experience.

For Research Objective 2: Mean and Standard Deviation was used to determine the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development program.

For Research Objective 3: One-way ANOVA was used to compare the significant differences of the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of working experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
Table 7

**Summary of the Research Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Source of Data or Sample</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To identify the demographic profiles of teachers including gender, age, grade</td>
<td>96 teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part I</strong> - questioned the demographic profiles of the respondents including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To identify the perceptions of teachers towards school’s professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To compare the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of</td>
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</tr>
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<td>teaching experience.</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the research findings and information collected from 96 participants (total targeted population) with 100% valid returned questionnaires. The researcher personally went to No. 26 Basic Education High School at Mandalay, Myanmar, explained and asked teachers to complete the survey on the 9th and 10th of June, 2015. The participants filled up their demographics such as gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience, and rated their perceptions towards school’s professional development at their school. Findings of this research were interpreted and presented by the following three research objectives.

1. To identify the demographic profiles of teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

2. To identify the perceptions of teachers towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

3. To compare the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development program according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience.
Findings for Research Objective One

Research objective one was to identify the demographic profiles of teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar. Therefore, frequency and percentage were used to present the teachers’ demographics.

Table 8

The Numbers of Teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay
Categorized by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 above revealed the first demographic factor, gender of the teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay. The result showed that 4.2% of the respondents were males and 95.8% were females. Therefore, the numbers of female teachers were more than that of male teachers.
The Numbers of Teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay

Categorized by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 40 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 50 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years and above</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 showed the numbers of teachers categorized by age. The age of respondents was grouped into three groups: Below 40 years, 40 – 50 years and 51 years and above. The result pointed out that 25% of respondents were below the age of 40 years, 27.1% of teachers were 40 – 50 years, and 47.9% were 51 years and above teachers. According to the research finding, there was the biggest proportion of teachers who were age of 51 and above while teachers of below 40 years were the smallest. Therefore, the majority of respondents were 51 years and above teachers.

Table 10

The Numbers of Teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay

Categorized by Grade Level Currently Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Currently Teaching</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1-5 (Primary)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6-9 (Lower Secondary)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10-11 (Upper Secondary)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 presented the teachers’ current grade level of teaching. In term of this, 20.8% of respondents were teaching at Primary form Grade 1 to 5 while 33.3% were at Lower Secondary from Grade 6 to 9 and 45.8% were at Upper Secondary from Grade 10-11. The result showed that the least number of teachers were teaching at Primary and the most teachers were teaching at Upper Secondary.

Table 11

The Numbers of Teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School Mandalay, Myanmar Categorized by Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 years and below</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 25 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years and above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presented the findings of teachers’ years of teaching experience. Out of 96 teachers, 32 teachers (33.3%) had 15 years and below of teaching experience, 13 teachers (13.5%) had 16 – 25 years of teaching experience, 33 teachers (34.4%) had 26 – 30 years of teaching experience and 18 teachers (18.8%) had 31 years and above of teaching experience. The research finding revealed that there was the biggest number of teachers who had 26 – 30 years of teaching experience while teachers with 16 – 25 years of teaching experience were the least.
Findings of Research Objective Two

The research objective two was to identify the perceptions of teachers towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

For this research objective, researcher developed research questionnaire part II that had five levels of evaluation with 27 question items. The five levels included, Level 1- Participants’ Reactions from Question 1 to 6, Level 2 - Participants’ Learning from Question 7 to 10, Level 3 - Organizations Support and Change from Question 11 to 14, Level 4 - Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills from Question 15-19 and Level 5 - Students Learning Outcomes from Question 20 to 27. Research findings for objective 2, for each evaluation levels, were presented in the following tables: Table 12, Table 13, Table 14, Table 15 and Table 16 respectively.

Table 12
Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development for Evaluation
Level-1 at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development in my school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meet my needs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is non-threatening</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Is offered at a time convenient for me</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Is time well spent</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Is offered by instructors who are knowledgeable and effective</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Is generally a positive experience</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 indicated the total mean scores of evaluation Level-1, teachers’ reactions in term of their overall satisfactions on the school professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School. The total mean scores 3.98, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50, were interpreted as positive, according to the scale interpretation criterions. This was assumed that teacher at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar felt positive for their school professional development.

Among six question items of Level-1, the teachers described school professional development was generally a good experience with the highest mean score of 4.12 and the lowest mean score was described as 3.62 for the convenience of time school professional development program was offered.

Table 13

Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development for Evaluation Level-2 at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of professional development, I have learned:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Practical instructional strategies</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 New knowledge and skills</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The theory behind the practice</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 New concepts connected to prior knowledge</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicated that the total mean scores of evaluation Level-2, teachers’ perceptions towards the level of acquired knowledge and skills that they
intended to learn from the school professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School. The total mean scores 3.92, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50, were interpreted as positive, according to the scale interpretation criterions. This was assumed that teacher at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar agreed they acquired certain amount of intended knowledge and skills from school professional development.

From six question items of Level-2, the highest mean score was 4.11 which described teachers learnt some useful practical instructional and the lowest mean score was described as 3.84 for gaining the new knowledge and skills and the understanding of theory behind the practice from school professional development program.

Table 14

Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development for Evaluation

Level-3 at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development in my school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Has a positive impact on the organization as a whole</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Has a positive impact on the culture and climate in my school</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Is often conducted during the school day</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Leads to in-service credit or a stipend</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 indicated that the total mean scores of evaluation Level-3, teachers’ perceptions towards the level of support and resources that they received from school and how it impacted for their professional progress at No. 26 Basic Education High School. The total mean scores 3.90, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50, were interpreted as positive, according to the scale interpretation criterions. This was assumed that teacher at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar received sufficient amount of school support and resources for school professional development.

Within four question items of Level-3, the highest mean score was 4.21 which described school professional development program had a positive impact on the whole organization and the lowest mean score was described as 3.31 for the low perceptions for in-service credit or a stipend through professional development.

Table 15

Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development for Evaluation Level-4 at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After I have participated in the professional development, I usually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 indicated that the total mean scores of evaluation Level-4, teachers’ perceptions towards the level of extents that teachers were applying new knowledge and skills in their teaching. The total mean scores 3.90, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50, were interpreted as positive, according to the scale interpretation criterions. This was assumed that teacher at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar received sufficient amount of school support and resources for school professional development.

Among five question items of Level-4, the highest mean score was 4.03 which described they experienced or participated with new instructional strategies when they went back to their classes and the lowest mean score was described as 3.92 in term of their commitments to new teaching strategies was a little low after professional development.

The following table, Table 16 indicated that the total mean scores of evaluation Level-5, teachers’ perceptions towards their professional development impacts students’ performance and achievement. The total mean scores 4.13, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50, were interpreted as positive, according to the scale interpretation criterions. This was assumed that teacher at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar received sufficient amount of school support and resources for school professional development.
Table 16

Teachers' Perceptions Towards School's Professional Development for Evaluation

Level-5 at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, my professional development impacts my students in the following ways:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 It makes a positive impact on my students' learning</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Student achievement increases</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Students are more engaged in learning</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Students are involved in their own learning</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Classroom management has improved</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Student achievement has risen on state or district assessments</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Student achievement has risen on teacher or classroom assessments</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Students' confidence as learners has improved</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within four question items of Level-5, the highest mean score was 4.27 which described the teachers felt that their students' achievement generally increased and the lowest mean score was described as 4.03 that their professional development impacted some improvements for student achievement on state or district assessments.
Table 17

Summary of Overall Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluating School’s Professional Development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As reported by data analysis, table 17 showed that the overall total mean scores of five evaluation levels for teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development were 3.98, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50. According to scale interpretation criterions, the result was interpreted as teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay had positive perceptions towards their school’s professional development.

At the same time, table 12 showed detailed information about total mean scores of teachers’ perceptions for each evaluation level. The total mean scores of Level 1 - Participants’ Reactions were 3.94, Level 2 - Participants’ Learning were 3.92, Level 3 - Organizations Support and Change were 3.90, Level 4 - Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills were 4.03 and Level 5 - Students Learning Outcomes were 4.13.

Among 5 evaluation levels, the highest mean score 4.13 was found in Level 5, which indicated that teachers agreed with the concept of teachers’
professional learning has positive impacts on students’ learning achievement. In the mean time, the lowest mean score 3.90 was found in Level 3, which indicated that teachers had low perceptions regarding to organizational or school supports that could lead them change.

Findings of Research Objective Three

The research objective three was to compare the significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Formerly, this study was intended to compare teachers’ perceptions according to their gender that included in Objective 1. However, according to the findings (see Table 8) the number of female teachers (94) outnumbered the male teachers (2). Therefore, one of the demographics gender was excluded in Objective 3 in term of not meaningful to compare since female has already dominated male perceptions.

For this research objective, the research questionnaire part II that was based on Guskey’s five levels of evaluation with 27 question items was used to investigate the overall comparison of teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience. One-way ANOVA was utilized to analyze and compared means for this objective.

There were three main demographics comparing teachers’ perceptions on their school’s professional development program. Therefore, research findings were presented in three tables, Table 18, Table 19 and Table 20.
Table 18

Comparison of Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar According to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.830</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.916</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 indicated the comparison of teachers’ Perceptions of school’s professional development and teachers’ age. Based on the research objectives of this study and the findings of previous researchers, this researcher set up the research hypothesis, “There is a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar according to their age”. According to the findings of data analysis of this study in the above table, it was shown that the probability significant value was .779, which was bigger than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, this result was interpreted, as there was no significant difference of teachers’ perceptions towards their school’s professional development according to their age at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
Table 19

Comparison of Teachers' Perceptions Towards School's Professional Development at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar According to Grade Level Currently Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Currently Teaching</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.144</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.916</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 showed the comparison of teachers’ Perceptions of school’s professional development and teachers’ grade level currently teaching at. Based on the research objectives of this study and the findings of previous researchers, this researcher set up the research hypothesis, “There is a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar according to their demographics: grade level currently teaching”. According to the findings of data analysis of this study in the above table, it was shown that the probability significant value was .099, which was bigger than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, this result was interpreted as there was no significant difference of teachers’ perceptions towards their school’s professional development according to their grade level currently teaching at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
Table 20

Comparison of Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar According to Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.505</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.916</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 demonstrated the comparison of teachers’ Perceptions of school’s professional development and teachers’ years of teaching experience. Based on the research objectives of this study and the findings of previous researchers, this researcher set up the research hypothesis, “There is a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar according to the years of teaching experience”. According to the findings of data analysis of this study in the above table, it was shown that the probability significant value was .491, which was bigger than .05 level of significance. Therefore, this result was interpreted as there was no significant difference of teachers’ perceptions towards their school’s professional development according to their years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the researcher presents a brief summary of entire study including the research objectives, hypothesis, and research methodology. It will then follow by the study’s findings, conclusion of this research, discussion about the important findings and describing recommendations for the school and future researchers.

Summary Of The Study

The purpose of this study was to survey the demographic profile of teachers, their perceptions towards school’s development program and to compare the teachers’ perceptions according to their demographics such as age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience.

The local context of this study was at No. 26 Basic Education High School, one of the well-known public schools in researcher’s hometown, Mandalay, Myanmar. There were some research on investing teachers’ perceptions and professional development in other countries, however, there was no previous research in the area of central Myanmar, Mandalay.

The total population of this study was 96 teachers who are currently working in the academic year 2015-2016 at selected school mentioned above. This research has three objectives and they were as follow.

3. To identify the demographic profiles of the teachers including gender, age, and grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
4. To determine the teachers' perceptions towards school's professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

5. To compare the significant differences in the teachers' perceptions towards school's professional development according to their demographics age, and grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

This research had one hypothesis: there are significant differences in the teachers' perceptions towards school's professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

As this study was designed as a quantitative and comparative study, descriptive statistics and comparative method was used to determine the research objectives. A questionnaire that contained two parts, Part I for surveying demographics of teachers and Part II for investigating teachers' perceptions adapted from Lowden (2003), was used as primary instrument for this study to evaluate teachers' perceptions. A total of 96 surveys were distributed to 96 teachers at selected school and the data was collected by this research with 100% valid returned rate.
Findings

1. Teachers' Demographic Profiles:

1.1 Gender: The research findings for gender showed that there were 2 male teachers (4.2%) and 94 female teachers (95.8%) at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay.

1.2 Age: According to the findings, 46 teachers (47.9%) were in the age of 51 years and above, followed by 26 teachers (27.1%) who were between 40 to 50 years old and 24 teachers (25%) were below the age of 40 years No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay.

1.3 Grade Level Currently Teaching: Research findings showed that 44 teachers (45.8%) were teaching at Upper Secondary (Grade 10-11), 32 teachers (33.3%) were teaching at Lower Secondary (Grade 6-9) and 20 teachers (20.8%) were teaching at Primary (Grade 1-5).

1.4 Years Of Teaching Experience: 33 teachers (34.4%) had 26 – 30 years of teaching experience, 32 teachers (33.3%) had 15 years and below teaching experience, 18 teachers (18.8%) had 31 years and above teaching experience and 13 teachers (13.5%) had 16 – 25 years of teaching experience respectively.

2. Teachers' Perceptions Towards School's Professional Development At No. 26 Basic Education High School In Mandalay, Myanmar:

2.1 The total mean scores of teachers' perceptions towards school's professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School were 3.98, in the range of 3.51 – 4.50. This result was interpreted as teachers had positive perceptions towards their school's professional development.
2.2 In the case of teachers’ perceptions for five evaluation level, the total mean scores of Level 1 - Participants’ Reactions were 3.94, Level 2 - Participants’ Learning were 3.92, Level 3 - Organizations Support and Change were 3.90, Level 4 - Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills were 4.03 and Level 5 - Students Learning Outcomes were 4.13. The total mean scores for each level were in the range of 3.51 - 4.50, which showed teachers had positive perceptions towards their school’s professional development.

2.3 Among 5 evaluation levels, the highest mean score 4.13 was found in Level 5, which indicated that teachers’ professional learning had positive impacts on students’ learning achievement and the lowest mean score 3.90 was found in Level 3, which indicated that teachers had low perceptions regarding to organizational or school supports that could lead them change. However, both of the mean scores were in the interpretation range of positive.

3. Teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, and grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar:

3.1 Based on the findings of data analysis, the probability of significant value between teachers’ perceptions and their age was .779, the probability of significant value between teachers’ perceptions and their grade level currently teaching was .099 and also the probability of significant value between teachers’ perceptions and their years of teaching experience was .491. As the significant value of age, grade level currently teaching, years of teaching experience were bigger than the .05 level of significant, there were no
significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings derived by data analysis of this study.

1. Teachers’ Demographic Profiles:

1.1 Gender: According to the results, the number of female teachers (94) were significantly more than that of male teachers (2) at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay.

1.2 Age: Generally, most of the teachers were in the age of 51 years and above and the age between 40 to 50 years old while below the age of 40 years were the least. Therefore, the majority of teachers were in the age of 40 years and above at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay.

1.3 Grade Level Currently Teaching: Based on research findings, the least number of teachers were teaching at Primary (Grade 1-5) while more teachers teaching at Upper Secondary (Grade 10-11) or Lower Secondary (Grade 6-9).

1.4 Years Of Teaching Experience: The research finding revealed that most teachers had 15 years above of teaching experience while small numbers of teachers had 15 years and below of teaching experience. Generally, this indicated that teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay were experienced and skillful teachers.
2. Teachers’ Perceptions Towards School’s Professional Development At No. 26 Basic Education High School In Mandalay, Myanmar:

2.1 Overall, teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School was interpreted as positive perceptions.

2.2 Result for each evaluation level also showed teachers had positive perceptions towards their school’s professional development.

2.3 Findings out of five evaluation levels, majority of teachers thought their professional learning had positive impacts on students’ learning achievement and they gained new knowledge and skills from it. Meanwhile, teachers had low perceptions regarding to their school supports that could lead them change. Nevertheless, research result from all of the evaluation level indicated as positive perceptions.

3. Teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, and grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar:

3.1 In the case of comparing the teachers’ perceptions and their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience, the probability of significant value for those comparisons were bigger than the .05 level of significant. Therefore, there were no significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar.
Discussion

1. What are the demographic profiles of the teachers including gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?

(1) Gender: In this study, the research findings showed that the number of female teachers exceeded the number of male teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay, Myanmar. As soon as research findings indicated this result, the researcher made an informal discussion with an educator from one of the township level MOE offices in Mandalay (personal communication, July, 2015). According to his service experience as an educator at Upper Myanmar public basic education subsector, he assumed two main reasons of why the female teachers were generally more than male teachers. The very first reason might be Myanmar culture, as teaching seemed to be an occupation more suited with female than male in Myanmar society. Generally, people in Myanmar thought that female were more patient, kind and teaching was a graceful prestigious job for female. Findings of Kavinda (2014) also indicated that female teachers had higher competency than male teachers in Myanmar. So, it can be assumed more female chose teaching as profession than male teachers in Myanmar public high schools. Secondly, majority of the male population in Myanmar was considered as the breadwinner of their family. In Myanmar, although teaching is a noble job, the earning wouldn't meet the ends for a family to survive well. Therefore, this could be another reason most of the male chose a well-paid job rather than teaching profession unless they passionate in teaching.

(2) Age: According to data findings from this study, the majority of teachers were in the age of 51 years and above (47.9%) followed by the teachers in
the age of 40-50 years (27.1%) at No. 26 Basic Education High School, Mandalay. The data showed that only one third of the teacher population (25.0%) was the younger generation of teachers in the age of below 40 years. Similarly, Kavinda (2014) also stated his findings that most teachers in public Myanmar high schools were old. Besides, according to personal communication with an educator who was mentioned above, this could generally be the nature of public high schools in Myanmar. Teachers in Myanmar public high schools were promoted by their in-service years and their content knowledge of subject area they concerned. Therefore, as a high school, there might be more number of older teachers than the younger ones. In addition, for the matter of the inadequacy of skilled teachers, some teachers work till to the retired age, 60 years, although they may have over 30 years of teaching experience (personal communication, July, 2015).

(3) Grade Level Currently Teaching: From the research findings, it can be seen vividly that majority of teachers were teaching at Upper Secondary (44 teachers) and Lower Secondary (32 teachers) while very small number of teachers were teaching at Primary level (20 teachers). As it mentioned in Chapter 2, there were some reasons why most public high schools in Myanmar had more teachers in Secondary than in Primary. One of the reasons might be that in lower primary from Grade 1 to 3, one teacher took care of the whole class teaching all round subjects. But then in Upper Primary from Grade 4 to 5, mostly there might be one or two teacher for each subject. Moreover, through researcher personal schooling experience and observation on students list at No. 26 Basic Education High School (academic year 2015-2016), there were fewer classes in Primary than in Secondly levels. Another reason would be that both Secondary levels had subject teachers for each class level.
and there were more classes in Secondary level as more students were in Secondary than in Primary.

(4) Years of Teaching Experience: According to the finding, this study found that most teachers (34.4%) had 26 – 30 years of teaching experience, followed by 15 years and below of teaching experience (33.3%), then 31 years and above of teaching experience (18.8%) and the least was 16 – 25 years of teaching experience (13.5%). Generally, in Myanmar, a teacher with about 15 years of teaching experience could be assumed as an experienced teacher. Therefore, based on the findings it could be considered that there were many experienced teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School Mandalay, Myanmar. In addition, as this researcher mentioned previously, there might be more experienced teachers teaching in high school level because they were trained and promoted by their in-service years of teaching experience. Surprisingly, there were a few numbers of teacher who had 31 years and above teaching experience. These teachers might have been working as public teachers since their young age and some of them might be retired soon. It could be assumed that a lot of older teachers were probably not so updated in teaching knowledge compared with less experienced younger ones. However, they were expert in teaching for their own subject areas and efficient in using of their teaching methods as they had many years of teaching experience (Huyen, 2003 & Kavinda, 2014).

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?

Level (1) Participants’ Reactions: This is the first level of Guskey’s five-level-evaluation. The questions of this level mainly focus on how much the
participants enjoyed their development programs such as formal presentations, workshops, seminars, trainings and institutions (Guskey, 2000). The questions were based on three categories including questions of the amount of time spent, the chosen materials, the instructor, the convenience of activities and the setting of the development experience.

According to the findings, evaluation Level (1) of teachers’ reaction or enjoyment towards their school development program was interpreted as teachers had positive perspectives for their school development program at No. 26 Basic Education High School. In the previous study, Lowden (2003) stated that teachers felt non-threatening, the instructor was also knowledgeable and it was generally a positive experience, however, there was very low teachers’ reaction on time convenience and meeting their needs. In this study, although teachers felt they had positive experience and their needs had met, they had low satisfaction for time convenience and the instructor’s effectiveness, which was quite similar with Williams (2014).

Level (2) Participants’ Learning: This evaluation level investigated what the participants actually gained lead to any changes in their knowledge and skills through professional learning experience. Guskey (2000) pointed out that knowing what participants learnt is important because this would indicate the specific outlines prior to the beginning of next professional activity.

In the previous study of Lowden (2003), the teachers felt that they had learnt new knowledge, skills and concepts connected to their prior knowledge. Williams (2014) also presented that teachers in her study learnt not only the new knowledge and skill but also the theory behind the practice because of professional development. In this study, although teachers considered that they learnt more practical instructional strategies and new concepts connected to their prior knowledge,
they considered they did not gain much of new knowledge and skills or theory behind the practice. Therefore, this could be assumed that topics for professional development might be less relevant or similar training might be set up repeatedly. According to Killion’s (2002 as cited in Lowden, 2003) report, effective, meaningful professional development should provides opportunity for teachers to increase their knowledge and should notice not to spend too much time on the topics they had already been trained on.

Level (3) Organization Support and Change: Level 3 was data on how teachers’ responses related to organization support and change. This is important because organizational matters are key variables to the success of any professional development efforts. Without a systematic organizational approach, it also can delay success, even the individual aspects of professional development are done right.

Overall, finding from this study indicated that teachers at No. 26 Basic Education High School Mandalay received school support and resources that would lead positive changes in school. They thought school development program had positive impact on the school, its culture and climate with the highest scores, which was similar to both previous researchers, Lowden (2003) and Williams (2014). However, in this study teachers responded that they had no ideas upon school’s stipend or in-service credit. In a contrary, findings of Lowden (2003) and Williams (2014) who conducted their studies in United States of America showed that teachers’ professional experience leads to in-service credit or stipend. Therefore, this researcher personally assumed that public schools in Myanmar might not have this practice because most of the schools do not usually employ evaluation so that it might be less possible to give credit or stipend for skillful teachers’ performance.
Level (4) Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills: At Level 4, central questions were more like whether or not new practices were useful for their career practice and how well new skills are used. Participants’ use of new knowledge and skills is one of the vital elements in professional development evaluations. This included statements related to experimenting new instructional strategies, noticing positive changes in teaching, commitment to new methodologies and making changes.

Teachers in this study responded that they practiced the new instructional strategies, made some changes in their teaching and noticed their positive changes in their teaching. But the findings also revealed that teachers did not usually carried out new teaching strategies. There might have some reasons to cause this response. According to this researcher personal schooling experience and observation, class size of Myanmar public high schools were oversized classes with about over 40 students. Therefore, sometimes it would be difficult for teachers to apply the new teaching strategies exactly they had learnt from development activities. Moreover, some of the pedagogical practice could be adapted to Myanmar context while some might be challenging, as they may need particular resources or class environment. For these reasons, this researcher assumed that it would be better to choose and coach the teaching strategies, which could fit well for the context of the school.

Level (5) Student Learning Outcomes: The purpose of evaluation at Level 5 is to assess, interpret, and judge the impacts of teachers’ professional learning on students’ learning outcomes. So, the questions typically addressed teachers’ professional development experiences benefit students learning, achievement in assessments, changes in behaviors and teacher classroom management.

In this study, teachers believed that their professional development experience had positive impact on student learning. Teachers indicated that overall
students’ achievement was increased and they gained confidence as they felt they were improved. Teacher classroom management seemed to be improved more as students seemed more engaged in their learning. Meanwhile, Lowden (2003) and Williams (2014) stated their finding in evaluation Level (5) was positive. However, teachers in this study responded lowest for student achievement on state or district assessment and classroom assessment, which was similar in Lowden (2003). This could be inferred that there are three National Examination in Basic Education system. As mentioned in Chapter 2, at the end of Primary (Grade-5), Lower Secondary (Grade-9) and Upper Secondary (Grade-11), students usually sit the state or district wide National Examination (UNESCO-IBE, 2010). Therefore, teachers from other grade levels might not have very high perceptions on the increase of student achievement in state or district assessment.

3. Are there any significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar?

In this study, researcher compared the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience.

From the result of testing the research hypothesis, it revealed that the probability significant score of comparing teachers’ perceptions by their age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience are greater than 0.05. Therefore, the research hypothesis was rejected which means there were no significant differences in the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development.
according to their demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience at No. 26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar in the academic year 2015-2016.

As this study compared teachers' perception of school development program according to their selected above demographics, this researcher assumed that there might be some factors that seemed to manipulate the teachers' perceptions.

One of the factors might be the age of teachers. Based on the findings, there were significantly bigger numbers of older generation teachers than that of younger generation who were in the age of below 40 years. As mentioned in discussion section about demographics for research objective 1, this was seemed to be the nature of Myanmar public high school for having more old generation teacher and some old teachers might be working though they were old enough to retired. According to this researcher personal experience and observation, most of the old teachers in Myanmar may less likely to aware of the nature and value of research. Some might just work for their family survival. Therefore, majority may give so called responses without taking proper determination and it may affect this study result.

Another possible factor might be the years of teaching experience. This could be because findings showed that more teachers are old, teaching in higher-grade levels with many years of teaching experience. Majority of teachers had 16 years and above of teaching experience and even there were (18) teachers who had 31 years and above of teaching experience. Therefore, this might be assumed that most of them were very experience and it could be difficult to follow the new strategies that were delivered in professional development activities. Their attitudes might be rooted in
what they used to believe and might have tendency of difficulty to change and reveal their own perceptions.

The previous researcher Williams (2014) also conducted a dissertation study of "Teachers' Perceptions of Professional Development Experiences" based on the Guskey's evaluation work by using Lowden's (2003) questionnaires. As mentioned in Chapter 2, William addressed three primary research objectives and major concern was to explore whether there were significant differences regarding how teacher perceived their professional development experiences based on three selected demographics such as years of experience, elementary teachers from Title I vs. Non-Title I schools and teaching position (elementary, secondary, or auxiliary). She used Independent Samples t-test for her objective 1 and 2, and One-way ANOVA for her objective 3. However, her transformed data indicated that there were no significant differences for all of her research objectives.

While two of these comparative research data showed no significant difference between the selected demographics, Lowden (2003) stated that there was a significant positive relationship between Guskey's evaluation model and the way teachers' perception about their development experience and their performance changes. The strongest correlation was found between how participants evaluated their use of new knowledge and skills (Level 4) and how far their development experience impact on students' achievement (Level 5).

Though this study found no significant differences in the teachers' perceptions towards school's professional development according to their selected demographics, all of the responses indicated positive teachers' perceptions. Therefore, this researcher considered that teachers had better to participate more in researching to
know the value of research and should aware that result could support their future needs through their responses in survey.

Recommendations

1. Recommendation for School Administrators

The finding of this study showed that the teachers’ perceptions towards professional development were very important. Although there were no significant differences between teachers’ perceptions and their selected demographics: age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience, teachers responses described that their in-service professional development is beneficial for their career. According to findings from five evaluation levels, teachers seemed to have high positive perceptions their application of new knowledge and skills from their professional experience and their development impacts students’ performance. But the result indicated that teachers have inconvenience in some issues such as time, resources, type and topic of professional development. As one question item in Level 5 also showed neutral that professional development in their school might pay less attention stipend and in-service credit. Therefore, all of the above findings suggested that school administrators should take great concern on those factors and organize better professional development in the future.

School administrators should practice more preparation for setting professional development, for example, teachers’ need assessment and the design of effective approaches suitable for teachers. Most common type of professional development evaluation should be practice through observation, teachers’ performance assessment, students’ achievement, school administrator’s feedback and evaluating the weakness of current development for the betterment of the future.
development. Moreover, teachers’ development through presentations, attending seminars and graduated courses should also be encouraged (Lowden, 2003). It is critical to aware that all of the professional development should be on-going process. Value and practice the evaluation in every school development process. In addition, it is also suggested that school leaders should practice effective principal or administrator leadership with supportive and cooperative behavior at school. In this way, school administrators can create professionally organized learning environment where teachers wants, needs are met and students learn successfully (Williams, 2014).

2. Recommendation for Teachers

In the case of recommendation for teachers, all teachers are suggested to participate more actively in professional development program in order to improve their competency and self-efficacy. Personally, this research advises teachers in Myanmar schools to open their mind showing off their perceptions, share ideas to others without little or no hesitations. This will be helpful for organizing future professional development program, which meet the needs of teachers, applicable and improve their profession.

3. Recommendation for Future Researcher

Future researcher are strongly recommended to conduct research concerning with teacher professional development in this era of change. Based on this research limitation, future researcher should conduct similar research in other places with bigger size of sample. More diverse demographic factors such as education background, training experience should also consider to include in survey.
Future researcher should conduct with mixed qualitative and quantitative methods to get more accurate answers. According to this study finding, the future researcher is recommended to do further research either comparative or relationship study on teachers’ perceptions of professional development and the impact of professional development on student achievement. Furthermore, it is also recommended to consider principals’ perceptions of professional development.

All in all, current study could be employed in different school organization and could be modified for future researchers in Myanmar to conduct more effective and accurate research.
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APPENDICES
Dear Teachers,

The purpose of the two survey questionnaires is for Masters’ thesis conducted by Khin Nandar Chit from Assumption University of Thailand. The objective of this study is to investigate the teachers’ perceptions towards school’s professional development at No.26 Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar. This questionnaire included two main parts.

Part I contains demographic questions such as gender, age, grade level currently teaching and years of teaching experience. Part II contains five levels of evaluation that the teachers can freely express your perceptions or evaluate your school provided professional development activities. Here, all forms of teacher development such as weekly or monthly group discussion for particular subject area, principal observations, computer or English proficiency arrangements, workshops and summer refresher courses will be determined.

Although the data will be analyze, individual information will be confidential and the result will be examined only for documentation in this study. Achievement of this study relies on honest responses. Therefore, in order to accomplish this study successfully with correct data, please help answering all the questions with honest responses.

Thank you very much for your precious time cooperating with me to survey your perceptions towards school’s professional development.

Yours sincerely,

Khin Nandar Chit
Part I: Information about the demographic profiles of the respondents.

Directions: Please tick in the box ☑️ according to what is true to you and fill in the following form.

1. Please specify your gender.
   - Male
   - Female

2. Please specify your age.
   - Below 40 years
   - 40 - 50 years
   - 51 years and above

3. In what grade level currently are you teaching?
   - Grade 1-5 (Primary)
   - Grade 6-9 (Lower Secondary)
   - Grade 10-11 (Upper Secondary)

4. Please specify your years of teaching experience.
   - 15 years and below
   - 16 - 25 years
   - 26 - 30 years
   - 30 years and above
Part 2 – Questions about the teachers’ perception towards school’s professional
development program

Directions: Please read each statement. Tick [ ] the level of description which best
describe your perceptions towards school’s professional development program. Please
tick only once for each item.

Note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ Reactions Statement (Evaluation Level 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development in my school:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Meet my needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is non-threatening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Is offered at a time convenient for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Is time well spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Is offered by instructors who are knowledgeable and effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Is generally a positive experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participants’ Learning Statement (Evaluation Level 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Because of professional development, I have learned:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Practical instructional strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 New knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The theory behind the practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 New concepts connected to prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organization Support and Change Statement (Evaluation Level 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development in my school:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Has a positive impact on the organization as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Has a positive impact on the culture and climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Is often conducted during the school day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Leads to in-service credit or a stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills Statement (Evaluation Level 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After I have participated in the professional development, I usually:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Go back and experience or participate with new instructional strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Implement/ apply new instructional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Become committed to new teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Not positive changes in my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Make long lasting changes in my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Learning Outcomes Statement (Evaluation Level 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally, my professional development impacts my students in the following ways:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 It makes a positive impact on my students’ learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Student achievement increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Students are more engaged in learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Students are involved in their own learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Classroom management has improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Student achievement has risen on state or district assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Student achievement has risen on teacher or classroom assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Students’ confidence as learners has improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

The Questionnaire (Myanmar Version)
(လ) - စိတ်ဝင်စားပါသည်။

(ရ) - ကြေညာမှုများသည် ကိုယ်စားလှယ်အားကို သိရှိနေစေရန် သင်ကြားသည်။

(တ) - အားလုံးကို အရေးပေါ်ပေးသည့်အခါ သင်ခန်းတို့ကို သိရှိနေစေရန် သင်ကြားသည်။

(ခ) - သိရှိနေစေရန် သင်ကြားသည်။

(က) - သင်ကြားသည်။
အမျိုး (၁) - အိတ်အားလုံးသရုပ်ဆောင်ရွက်သူများ၏ ပြည်ထောင်စုအား အရပ်/အဆောင်ရွက် နိုင်ငံရေးရရှိသောအားအာရှများကို

ထုတ်လုပ်သည်အားလုံးကို ရှာဖွေရာ အရပ်/အဆောင်ရွက် နိုင်ငံရေးရရှိသောအားအာရှများကို ဖြစ်စေချင်သည်။ ထုတ်လုပ်သည်အားလုံးကို အရပ်/အဆောင်ရွက် နိုင်ငံရေးရရှိသောအားအာရှများကို ဖြစ်စေချင်သည်။ ထုတ်လုပ်သည်အားလုံးကို အရပ်/အဆောင်ရွက် နိုင်ငံရေးရရှိသောအားအာရှများကို ဖြစ်စေချင်သည်။ ထုတ်လုပ်သည်အားလုံးကို အရပ်/အဆောင်ရွက် နိုင်ငံရေးရရှိသောအားအာရှများကို ဖြစ်စေချင်သည်။

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>၁</td>
<td>၂</td>
<td>၃</td>
<td>၄</td>
<td>၅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၁</td>
<td>၂</td>
<td>၃</td>
<td>၄</td>
<td>၅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

မေးခွန်း/အဖွဲ့အစည်း စာရင်း (မေးခွန်း ၂၃ - ၅၀)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>၁</th>
<th>၂</th>
<th>၃</th>
<th>၄</th>
<th>၅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>၁</td>
<td>၂</td>
<td>၃</td>
<td>၄</td>
<td>၅</td>
<td>၆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>မွေးဖွားအရေအတွက်/သူငယ်အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များကို အသစ်အတွက် ရေးမှု (အိမ်ရာ အရာ-၀)</td>
<td>၀</td>
<td>၁</td>
<td>၂</td>
<td>၃</td>
<td>၄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၁ ကြက်ကလေး၊ အမှားနှင့် အားကန်မှုများတွင် ရေးမှုကို ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၂ ထိုအရာ အခြေခံ စုစောင်အရာများ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၃ ကြက်ကလေးမှ အရေအတွက် ရာခိုင်နှင့် ထိုအရာ အခြေခံ စုစောင်အရာများ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၄ ကြက်ကလေးမှ အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များကို ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>မွေးဖွားအရေအတွက်/သူငယ်အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များကို အသစ်အတွက် ရေးမှု (အိမ်ရာ အရာ-၀)</th>
<th>၀</th>
<th>၁</th>
<th>၂</th>
<th>၃</th>
<th>၄</th>
<th>၅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>၅ ကြက်ကလေးမှ (ကြက်ကလေးအရာ) များတွင် အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၆ ကြက်ကလေးမှ အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။ (ကြက်ကလေးအရာ) ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၇ ကြက်ကလေးမှ အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၈ ကြက်ကလေးမှ အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။ (ကြက်ကလေးအရာ) ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>မွေးဖွားအရေအတွက်/သူငယ်အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များကို အသစ်အတွက် ရေးမှု (အိမ်ရာ အရာ-၀)</th>
<th>၀</th>
<th>၁</th>
<th>၂</th>
<th>၃</th>
<th>၄</th>
<th>၅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>၉ ကြက်ကလေးမှ (ကြက်ကလေးအရာ) များတွင် အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၁၀ ကြက်ကလေးမှ (ကြက်ကလေးအရာ) များတွင် အရေအတွက် တက္ကသိုလ်များ ကြည့်ပါ။</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(စာ) အသစ်အတွက် ရေးမှုကို ကြည့်ပါ။
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Translation Approval Form (1)

Date: 20th December, 2015

To whom it may concern

Khin Nandar Chit (Student ID: 5625498) has adapted this survey questionnaire to be used in her thesis, which is a fulfillment for her Master of Education Degree in Educational Administration.

It has been prepared originally in English and later translated into Burmese to be distributed to the target group of respondents.

This is to certify that the Burmese translation is thorough and accurate in accordance with its original content.

Sincerely,

Aye Aye Thinn
(Master of Arts in English, Yangon University, Myanmar)
ID: 500097
Lecturer, Institute for English Language Education
Assumption University
Thailand
Email: ayeayethinn@asu.edu
Translation Approval Form (2)

Date: 29th May, 2015

To whom it may concern,

This is to certify that the questionnaire translation of Ms. Khin Nandar Chit (ID: 5629498), who is doing Masters' Thesis in Educational Administration at Assumption University of Thailand. I have read her statement of purpose with great care, and I have had many discussions with her about her thesis and questionnaire, which is very interesting and supportive for improvement of teachers' professional skills. The questionnaire seems to be both worthwhile and feasible, and grammar usage and translation has been checked and made necessary corrections.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ms. Nang Shwe Zin Kyaw
Assistant Lecturer
Defense Service Technological University
Pyin Oo Lwin Township
Mandalay, Myanmar
Email: kywenangshwezin@gmail.com
Translation Approval Form (3)

Date: 31 July, 2015

To Whom It May Concern

This is to certify that the questionnaire in the Burmese version utilized by Khin Nandar Chit (ID: 562-9498), a postgraduate student of M.Ed in Educational Administration, Assumption University, with a purpose of surveying on Teachers' Perceptions toward School Professional Development according to their demographics at No. (29) Basic Education High School in Mandalay, Myanmar, has accurately been revised and determined that it is factually consistent with its original English version.

Sincerely,

Naw Aye Min Min Oo
(MA in English Language Teaching, Assumption University, Thailand)
Lecturer
English Department, Liberal Arts Program
Myanmar Institute of Theology
reecithymerry@gmail.com
(+95)975006840, (+95)794149620
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Personal Profile

Name of Researcher - Khin Nandar Chit@Chit
Date of Birth - 11.02.1985
Gender - Female
Nationality - Myanmar
Ethnicity - Chin
Religion - Christian

Education Background

**BA English (2004)**
(University of Distance Education, Mandalay, Myanmar)

**MA English (2010)**
(Yadanabon University, Mandalay, Myanmar)

**DELT (Diploma in English Language Teaching) (2008)**
(University of Mandalay)

Current Study

**MEd. EA – Master of Educational Administration (2015)**
Assumption University, Hua Mak Campus, Bangkok, Thailand.

Professional Training

**DIT (Diploma in Information Technology) (2003)**
ECCD Training (Early Child Care Development Training) (2004)

Professional Experience

Preschool teacher - 2002-2007 (ILBC Mdy.)

Young learners teacher - Summer 2011 (NELC Mdy.)

Primary school teacher - 2011-2012 (CPEC Mdy.)

Community Involvements

- I used to work / am working for my Christian community by helping our pastors preaching children bible lessons and leading youth activities.

- I participated in off-campus activities such as volunteer teaching in migrant school in Bangkok. (School-visit activities.)

- I worked as an intern supported by Intern Asia program, at a community based school in Hpha-an, Karen State for two months during my last summer break (2014).

- I am also a member or mentee of WEdu mentorship program for developing women leadership.