

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**

**OPINIONS OF TEACHERS IN ALBERTA  
CONCERNING STAFFING PRACTICES**

by



**MARGARET LAGAN HAUGHEY**

**A THESIS**

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION**

**EDMONTON, ALBERTA**

**FALL, 1972**

## ABSTRACT

The study sought to describe teachers' perceptions of various staffing practices. In particular, teachers were asked their opinions of:

1. consultative services as provided by in-school, central office and regional office personnel;
2. other services usually available from in-school and central office personnel;
3. the location of these services; and
4. areas of preferred allocation of future staff.

Mail-back questionnaires were used to obtain data from 1558 Alberta teachers who constituted 78.6 percent of the sample approached, in 88 schools throughout the province. The schools were chosen on the basis of representativeness by grade level, location, type of jurisdiction, and school size.

Results of the study indicated that teachers were divided in their opinions of the adequacy of numbers of central office consultative personnel, with the majority of rural teachers perceiving the numbers of central office personnel as being insufficient. The majority of teachers felt that there were insufficient in-school personnel to provide consultative services.

Of those teachers who saw central office and in-school consultative services as being available, over half used these services and considered them to be valuable.

Over one-third of teachers expected to use most regional office services, and in particular, services relating to subject area consultation, curriculum and instructional innovation, media and staff development.

Teachers were generally satisfied with the numbers of in-school administrative and library aide personnel. They were generally dissatisfied with the numbers of teacher aides and laboratory assistants, and divided over the adequacy of numbers of personnel providing pupil guidance and/or counselling, audio-visual and clerical services.

Teachers thought that guidance and audio-visual services could be more effectively performed if located mainly in schools. "Teaching," "special education consultants" and "pupil guidance and counselling" were the three areas chosen by teachers as those to which additional staff should be assigned.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks are due to Dr. E.A. Holdaway for his ready and extensive assistance throughout this study.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of systems analyst, Mrs. Christiane Prokop, and the contributions of all those who participated in the testing of the instrument and the collection of the data.

Thanks are extended to committee members, Dr. J.H. Young and Dr. F. Enns, for their advice and recommendations.

The financial assistance provided by the Minister of Education is acknowledged and appreciated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
THE PROBLEM . . . . .	3
Statement of Problem 1 . . . . .	3
Statement of Problem 2 . . . . .	5
Statement of Problem 3 . . . . .	7
Statement of Problem 4 . . . . .	7
Statement of Problem 5 . . . . .	7
Justification of the Study . . . . .	8
DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . . .	9
Central Office Consultative Services . . . . .	9
In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	9
Regional Office Services . . . . .	9
Teachers . . . . .	10
ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS . . . . .	10
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	12
ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE AND THE SUPERVISORY COMPONENT . .	12
SUPERVISION AND CONSULTATION . . . . .	15
RESEARCH STUDIES ON CONSULTATION . . . . .	19
Central Office Personnel . . . . .	19
In-School Personnel . . . . .	22
Teachers' Perceptions of Consultative Services . . .	25
SUMMARY . . . . .	27

## Chapter

## Page

3.	RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	28
	RESEARCH INSTRUMENT . . . . .	28
	Choice of Type of Instrumentation . . . . .	28
	Instrumentation . . . . .	29
	Validity and Reliability of the Instrument . . . . .	30
	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES . . . . .	30
	TREATMENT OF THE DATA . . . . .	31
	DELIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS . . . . .	33
	SUMMARY . . . . .	33
4.	DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE . . . . .	34
	COMPARISON OF SAMPLE AND POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS . . . . .	37
	SUMMARY . . . . .	40
5.	TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONSULTATIVE SERVICES . . . . .	44
	SUB-PROBLEM 1.1 . . . . .	44
	SUB-PROBLEM 1.2 . . . . .	47
	Responses Classified by School Position . . . . .	49
	Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span . . . . .	49
	Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education . . . . .	51
	Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System . . . . .	53
	Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School . . . . .	55
	SUB-PROBLEM 1.3 . . . . .	57
	SUB-PROBLEM 1.4 . . . . .	59

Chapter	Page
	viii
Responses Classified by Grade Level Taught . . . . .	59
Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught . . . . .	61
Responses Classified by Sex of Respondents . . . . .	63
Responses Classified by Age of Respondents . . . . .	63
Responses Classified by Years of Post- Secondary Education . . . . .	66
SUB-PROBLEM 1.5 . . . . .	68
SUB-PROBLEM 1.6 . . . . .	70
Responses Classified by Grade Level Taught . . . . .	70
Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught . . . . .	70
SUB-PROBLEM 1.7 . . . . .	73
SUB-PROBLEM 1.8 . . . . .	75
Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education . . . . .	75
Responses Classified by Grade Level Taught . . . . .	77
Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught . . . . .	79
SUB-PROBLEM 1.9 . . . . .	82
SUB-PROBLEM 1.10 . . . . .	89
Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span . . . . .	89
SUB-PROBLEM 1.11 . . . . .	89
SUMMARY . . . . .	91
6. PRESENTATION OF DATA RELATED TO AUXILIARY SERVICES . . . . .	94
SUB-PROBLEM 2.1 . . . . .	94
SUB-PROBLEM 2.2 . . . . .	98

Chapter	ix
	Page
Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span . .	98
Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System . . . . .	102
Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education . . . . .	106
SUB-PROBLEM 2.3 . . . . .	110
SUB-PROBLEM 2.4 . . . . .	117
Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School . . . . .	117
Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span . .	124
SUB-PROBLEM 2.5 . . . . .	131
SUB-PROBLEM 2.6 . . . . .	134
PROBLEM 3 . . . . .	137
Sub-Problem 3.1 . . . . .	139
PROBLEM 4 . . . . .	141
Sub-Problem 4.1 . . . . .	141
PROBLEM 5 . . . . .	144
Sub-Problem 5.1 . . . . .	146
Responses Classified by School Position . . . . .	146
Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span .	148
SUMMARY . . . . .	148
7. SUMMARY . . . . .	151
Restatement of the Problem . . . . .	151
Research Methodology . . . . .	151
Review of the Findings . . . . .	152



	x
Chapter	Page
8. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	159
FURTHER RESEARCH STUDIES . . . . .	163
REFERENCES . . . . .	165
APPENDIX	
INSTRUMENT USED FOR DATA COLLECTION . . . . .	172

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean Numbers of Central Office Supervisory Personnel . . .	16
2. Total Numbers of Staff in Central Office Supervisory Positions for 132 School Systems Grouped by Type of Jurisdiction . . . . .	17
3. Analysis of the Consultative Function . . . . .	20
4. Distribution of Responses . . . . .	32
5. Classification of Teachers in Sample by Grade Level Most Commonly Taught . . . . .	35
6. Classification of Teachers in Sample by Subject Area Most Commonly Taught (N = 1558) . . . . .	36
7. Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics by Grade Level Most Commonly Taught . . . . .	38
8. Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics by Subject Area Most Commonly Taught . . . . .	39
9. Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics by Number of Years of Post-Secondary Education and Teaching Experience . . . . .	41
10. Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics by Position Held in the School . . . . .	42
11. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	45
12. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Position, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	48
13. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	50

## Table

## Page

14.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	52
15.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in the School System, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	54
16.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in the School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services . . . . .	56
17.	Estimates by Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	58
18.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	60
19.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	62
20.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Sex, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	64
21.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Age, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	65
22.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71 . . . . .	67
23.	Estimates by Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971 . . . . .	69

## Table

## Page

24.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971 . . . . .	71
25.	Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971 . . . . .	72
26.	Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	74
27.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	76
28.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	78
29.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	80
30.	Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services in (1) Subject Area Consultation and (2) Program Evaluation . . . . .	83
31.	Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services in (1) Staff Development and (2) Educational Research . . . . .	84
32.	Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services in (1) Media and (2) Instructional Curriculum Innovation . . . . .	85
33.	Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services in (1) Pupil Guidance and/or Counselling and (2) Intercultural Education Programs . . . . .	86
34.	Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, Indicating Expected Use of Regional Office Services . . . . .	90

Table	Page
35. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services . . . . .	92
36. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide (1) Guidance Services and (2) Staff Development Services . . . . .	95
37. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services . . . . .	96
38. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide (1) Guidance Services and (2) Staff Development Services . . . . .	99
39. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services . . . . .	100
40. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School System, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Guidance Services . . . . .	103
41. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School System, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Staff Development Services . . . . .	104
42. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School System, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services . . . . .	105
43. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Guidance Services . . . . .	107
44. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Staff Development Services . . . . .	108

Table	Page
45. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services . . . . .	109
46. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Administrative Services . . . . .	112
47. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Audio-Visual Services and (2) Guidance Services . . . . .	113
48. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services . . . . .	114
49. Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services . . . . .	115
50. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Administrative Services . . . . .	118
51. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Audio-Visual and (2) Guidance Services . . . . .	119
52. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services . . . . .	120
53. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services . . . . .	121
54. Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Administrative Services . . . . .	125

## Table

## Page

55.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Audio-Visual Services and (2) Guidance Services . . . . .	126
56.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services . . . . .	127
57.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services . . . . .	128
58.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Guidance, Staff Development, and Audio-Visual Services . . . . .	133
59.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Certain Services . . . . .	135
60.	Percentages of Teachers Stating that Selected Services Should Be Relocated from Central Offices to Schools (N = 1558) . . . . .	138
61.	Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Position, Stating that Selected Services Should Be Relocated from Central Offices to Schools . . . . .	140
62.	Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Extent to which their Effectiveness and/or Efficiency Is Reduced by Involvement in Non-Instructional Duties (N = 1558) . . . . .	142
63.	Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent to which their Effectiveness and/or Efficiency Is Reduced by Involvement in Non-Instructional Duties . . . . .	143
64.	Percentages of Teachers Choosing Areas of Staff Allocation for Assignment of Extra Staff. . . . .	145

Table

Page

65. Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Position, Choosing Areas of Staff Allocation for Assignment of Extra Staff . . . . .	147
66. Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, Choosing Areas of Staff Allocation for Assignment of Extra Staff . . . . .	149



## Chapter 1

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

#### INTRODUCTION

A number of studies (Gill, 1967; Blowers, 1969; Vithayathil, 1969; Lepatski, 1970; Duboyce, 1970; Gregory, 1972) on staffing ratios and school system size in Western Canada have been completed recently at The University of Alberta.

While these studies concentrated on the administrative component, Gill (1968:2) did point out that systems of the same size tended to have similar numbers and types of supervisors, a finding noted earlier by Sparby (1960:65).

Holdaway (1971:33) in reporting the results of an examination of school systems in seven major metropolitan areas in Western Canada, concluded that "a direct relationship was generally noted between the [proportional] size of non-instructional staff categories and system size." Larger systems tended to have larger percentages of their staff in central office and total non-instructional areas than was the case in smaller systems. This result supported Blowers' finding (1969: 129) in a longitudinal study of forty-one Western Canadian urban school systems, that "in general the number of supervisors increased as the size of the school system increased."

In the latest research project in this series, Blowers (in process) has found that the numbers of supervisory personnel in the

school jurisdictions of Alberta varied between none and sixty in the instructional and program area. The provision of consultative services is generally regarded as being essential to the continued professional development of teachers and the improvement of the instructional program. Consequently, it might be expected that a variation in the number of personnel available to provide auxiliary services would be reflected in teachers' opinions of the adequacy of numbers of non-instructional personnel employed in their school jurisdiction to provide such services.

Burnham (1961) has suggested that in order to reduce their work to manageable levels, supervisors often concentrate their efforts on the young, the inexperienced and the inept. Similarly Humphreys (1971:31) concluded from a study of Ontario consultative services, that consultants are most needed "where the teachers are either inexperienced or have been away from their own formal education for some time."

Heller and Hartley (1971:370) considered that teacher effectiveness, however it was measured, was related to the formal and informal environment within which the teacher worked. They also stressed that since central office supervisors are not oriented towards the school:

they may be perceived as representing the 'establishment' interests; have infrequent contact with individual schools. . . . and they may be removed from the problems associated with the normal running of a school building.

Teachers' opinions of the provision and value of auxiliary services may, then, be influenced by factors such as their age, the

extent of their training, and the length of time they have been on a school staff.

### THE PROBLEM

This study described Alberta teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of personnel, the extent of use and the value of various services provided by central office, in-school and regional office personnel.

#### Statement of Problem 1

What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers, extent of use and value of consultative services provided by central office, in-school and regional office personnel?

Sub-problem 1.1 What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of (a) central office personnel and (b) in-school personnel available to provide consultative services?

Sub-problem 1.2 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of personnel to provide consultative services associated with:

1. position held in the school,
2. grade level span of the school,
3. number of years of post-secondary education,
4. length of employment in the school system, and
5. length of employment in the present school?

Sub-problem 1.3 How often did teachers use central office and in-school consultative services in the 1970-71 school year?

Sub-problem 1.4 To what extent are differences in teachers' use of central office and in-school services associated with:

1. grade level taught,
2. subject area taught,
3. sex,
4. age, and
5. number of years of post-secondary education?

Sub-problem 1.5 How often did teachers use central office and in-school consultative services in the first two months of the 1971-72 school year?

Sub-problem 1.6 To what extent are differences in teachers' use of consultative services associated with:

1. grade level taught, and
2. subject area taught?

Sub-problem 1.7 What are teachers' perceptions of the value of central office and in-school consultative services?

Sub-problem 1.8 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the value of consultative services associated with:

1. number of years of post-secondary education,
2. grade level taught, and
3. subject area taught?

Sub-problem 1.9 To what extent do teachers expect to use the following regional office consultative services:

1. subject area consultation,
2. program evaluation,
3. staff development,
4. educational research assistance,
5. media (library/audio-visual),
6. assistance in curriculum and instructional innovation,
7. pupil guidance and/or counselling, and
8. program planning assistance in intercultural education?

Sub-problem 1.10 To what extent are differences in teachers' expected use of regional office services associated with the grade level span of the school?

Sub-problem 1.11 How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of central office and in-school consultative personnel?

Statement of Problem 2

What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy or numbers of personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, audio-visual, library aide, administrative, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?

Sub-problem 2.1 What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, and audio-visual services?

Sub-problem 2.2 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel associated with:

1. grade level span of the school,
2. length of employment in the school system, and
3. number of years of post-secondary education?

Sub-problem 2.3 What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel to provide administrative, audio-visual, pupil guidance and/or counselling, library aide, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?

Sub-problem 2.4 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel associated with:

1. length of employment in the present school, and
2. grade level span of the school?

Sub-problem 2.5 How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, and audio-visual services?

Sub-problem 2.6 How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel to provide administrative, audio-visual, pupil guidance and/or counselling, library aide, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?

Statement of Problem 3

Which services, presently located in central office, would teachers consider could be more effectively performed if based in schools?

Sub-problem 3.1 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the location of services associated with position held in the school?

Statement of Problem 4

To what extent do teachers consider that their effectiveness and/or efficiency is reduced by their involvement in duties which might be performed by non-certificated personnel?

Sub-problem 4.1 To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of their involvement in non-instructional duties associated with grade level taught?

Statement of Problem 5

To which instructional or non-instructional areas would teachers prefer additional staff to be assigned?

Sub-problem 5.1 To what extent are differences in teachers' choice of allocation of staff associated with:

1. position held in the school, and
2. grade level span of the school?

Justification of the Study

Despite the present emphasis on accountability, and the rising cost of education, few studies have been undertaken to discover how the services provided by non-instructional personnel are viewed by teachers. Since a tendency exists for the proportion of instructional personnel to decrease and the proportion of non-instructional personnel to increase with increasing system size (Holdaway, 1971), the use of services provided by non-instructional personnel might also be expected to show an increase as system size increases.

By providing comparisons between the extent of use and perceived value of central office and in-school consultative services as seen by teachers, the study was expected to indicate a need for redefinition of the role of the central office consultant and provide some information regarding the optimum number of central office consultative personnel in a school jurisdiction.

The study also provided information concerning teachers' expected use of regional office services. This information was considered of value in helping to define the role of regional office personnel.



## DEFINITION OF TERMS

Since the emphasis of the study was on consultation rather than on supervision, consultation was defined in each instance.

### Central Office Consultative Services

Consultative services provided by central office personnel were considered to be those services which help teachers by providing assistance with respect to the content, processes, or outcomes of their teaching. No attempt was made to differentiate between these services on the basis of source of request.

The personnel to provide these services might occupy various positions in a central office, for example, superintendent, assistant superintendent, supervisor of instruction, program consultant, or elementary coordinator. Since personnel from such a wide variety of positions could offer consultative services, the study concentrated on the services provided rather than on the official position of the personnel providing the service.

### In-School Consultative Services

These services were defined as being instructional assistance provided by other in-school personnel.

### Regional Office Services

Six regional offices of education were established by the Department of Education in Alberta to provide decentralization of some of the services previously provided by the central office of the Department of Education in Edmonton. They went into full operation in

September, 1971. At the time of completion of the questionnaire, few teachers would therefore have used regional office services. The sub-problem examined teachers' expected use of selected services available from regional offices. The services listed in sub-problem 1.9 were taken from literature provided by the Department of Education.

### Teachers

Although referred to as teachers throughout the study, the sample included all in-school personnel holding a teaching certificate.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This chapter has presented a brief outline of the research area, statements of the problems and sub-problems, and definitions of the terms used in the study.

A review of related literature including the supervisory component, supervision and consultation, and Canadian studies on consultation is provided in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology of the study, the data-collection procedures and the statistical analysis used.

The sample is described and compared with the population data obtained by Ratsoy (1970) in Chapter 4.

In Chapter 5, a description of the responses to problem 1, concerning consultative services, is given.

Chapter 6 contains the responses to problems 2 to 5 concerning other services usually available to teachers.

A summary of the research methodology and the major findings of the study are given in Chapter 7.

Chapter 8 contains the conclusions and implications of the study and recommendations for future research.

Letters to the principals and teachers involved in the study and a sample of the questionnaire are contained in the Appendix.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature related to the problems outlined in the previous chapter is presented under three headings: organizational size and the supervisory component, supervision and consultation, and research studies on consultation.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE AND THE SUPERVISORY COMPONENT

MacKenzie (1961:32-33) has attributed the hierarchy of supervisory personnel in central offices across Canada to a series of fundamental changes made in these establishments.

Contributing to these changes are (1) the increasing complexity of educational methods as the school attempts to provide a satisfactory program suited to every pupil's needs; (2) the development of larger administrative school units and larger schools; (3) the introduction of sophisticated technical equipment and methods, such as teaching machines, educational television, and data retrieval machines; (4) the increasing requirements for teaching certificates; and (5) the shift of responsibility from provincial departments of education to school boards for the inservice training and supervision of teachers.

Lucio and McNeil (1969:22-23) also considered that the increasing complexity of school organizations has been responsible in large part for the proliferation of new supervisory positions. They added that "respondents in the National Education Survey named so many areas of service for which supervisors are responsible that the title is hardly descriptive."

Gittell (1971:162) while agreeing that "the larger the school system, generally, the larger the headquarters structure," has pointed out that in a study (1968) of six American urban school districts, she found that several larger cities had not increased their central staffs as much as those with comparatively smaller school populations. Similarly, an 1969 NEA survey (Carter, 1969) of 741 American school districts in 50 states noted that districts with 6,001 to 75,000 students had lower numbers of central office personnel per 1000 students than districts with student populations of less than 6,000.

Alberta studies (Gill, 1967; Blowers, 1969; Duboyce, 1970; Vithayathil, 1969; and Gregory, 1972) found a similar pattern in Canadian school systems. However, from a study of 29 school systems in Western Canada, Holdaway (1971:31) concluded that numbers of total central office staff tended to increase more rapidly with increasing system size than did the numbers of instructional staff.

As systems get bigger, communication between all the members becomes more difficult so that, as Hertling and Getz (1970:202-4) have recommended, the duties of central office personnel must be clarified if a central office staff is to function efficiently.

These findings and recommendations have important implications for the numbers of central office personnel employed in a school jurisdiction. Teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel to provide certain services were considered in this study.

Lovell (1967:25) has insisted that, since the supervisory component is a sub-system of the organization and therefore controlled

by it to some extent, the study of supervisory behavior without considering the organization in which it occurs is unwise. Burnham and King (1961:33) hold the same point of view and have stated that the expected supervisory behavior may vary with the type of organization. They suggest that (1) the type of school jurisdiction, (2) the size of the jurisdiction, (3) "the clarity with which the purpose and function of the educational organization are perceived by members of staff," and (4) "the education, stability and experience of the school staff" may all influence and shape the supervisory function. These variables were taken into consideration in the study.

The numbers of personnel available to provide supervisory services also influences the nature of the supervisory function. McGowan (1971) concluded from a study of supervisory tasks and processes in the Wisconsin area, that teachers who had more supervision per year had significantly better attitudes towards supervision than those who had been visited less than three times per year.

Similarly Humphreys (1969) concluded that an important indicator of teaching quality was the availability of consultants. In reporting the findings of two Ontario studies, he (1971:37) found that "in both 1967 and 1969, consultants were available to the urban teacher far more frequently than to the rural teacher, whether in public or in separate schools."

Two Western Canadian studies reported by Holdaway (1971) found a similar disparity in the numbers of supervisory personnel available. He (1971:31) reported the mean numbers of central office

supervisory staff (all supervisors, assistant supervisors, subject consultants, and subject coordinators) as in Table 1.

The numbers of supervisory personnel (superintendents, assistant superintendents and instructional and program staff), grouped by type of jurisdiction in Alberta, are shown in Table 2 (Blowers, in progress).

When these data were examined by jurisdiction, a natural point of separation was discovered. Of the four largest jurisdictions, the lowest number of central office instructional and program staff recorded was eighteen, while the largest number of these staff recorded for any other jurisdiction was six. Those systems which had over eighteen such staff were termed "urban" and those with less than seven staff were termed "rural."

#### SUPERVISION AND CONSULTATION

Peach (1970:122-123), in reviewing the historical development of supervision in Canada, stressed the change in emphasis from inspection, a function favored at the beginning of the century, to the present emphasis on leadership, an emphasis first noted in Canadian literature in the 1950's.

Having reviewed recent American literature on supervision, Stewart (1970:521) defined supervision as "a creative and dynamic role of organizational leadership with the purpose of improving the teaching-learning process." This stress on formative evaluation is also evident in the definition of Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971:37) that supervisors are personnel "concerned with the appropriateness of

**Table 1**  
**Mean Numbers of Central Office**  
**Supervisory Personnel <sup>a</sup>**

Number of Pupils	Number of School Systems in the Group	Mean No. of Central Office Supervisory Personnel
72,950- 75,502	3	52
19,208- 48,106	11	15
8,024- 15,853	7	4
3,034- 7,016	8	5

<sup>a</sup> This table is taken from Holdaway (1971:30).



Table 2

Total Numbers of Staff in Central Office Supervisory Positions  
for 132 School Systems Grouped by Type of Jurisdiction<sup>a</sup>

Type of Jurisdiction	N	Superintendent	Assistant Superintendent	Instructional and Program Staff
Counties	29	28.5	19	8
Divisions	29	26.6	11	8
Public Districts	30	15.0	17	128.5
Separate Districts	44	9.2	6	46.4
Edmonton/Calgary	4	4.0	19	157.6
All other Systems	128	75.3	34	33.3

<sup>a</sup> Table taken from Blowers (in process).

school goals, the welfare and growth of school workers, and . . . the intellectual, social, and emotional self-actualization of school clients."

Munnelly (1970:673-4) put emphasis on the change process for the supervisor when he stated that "an orientation towards changing the status quo in teaching must be his goal."

Many writers (for example, Andrews,1960; Enns,1968; MacKay, 1969; Lucio and McNeil,1969) have classified consultation as one facet of supervision. MacKay (1969:9) considered consultation to be "the supervisor's activities as an expert in general or special education." Consultants, then, were seen by these writers as personnel whose major task was to provide this aspect of supervision.

Lucio and McNeil (1969:24) differentiated between supervisors and consultants on the basis of decision-making authority, the consultant being:

an instructional specialist assigned to promote the improvement of teaching and the curriculum by advising with teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, and others. He is especially concerned with the discovery and use of instructional aids, materials, teaching guides, methods of teaching, and resource units.

Miklos (1971:1) stressed the interaction between personnel rather than the advisory nature of the consultant's role in his definition of consultation as:

. . . the interaction of a teacher or teachers with resource persons on instruction-related matters. Accordingly, consultation takes place when a teacher discusses a problem with a colleague, seeks advice from the principal, plans a program with a supervisor. or interacts with other resource persons.

He analysed consultation in terms of the type of consultative help desired (Table 3) since a variety of personnel in a wide range of positions can provide aspects of the consultative function. This analysis takes into account many of the limitations of the central office consultant which McKean and Mills (1964:40) delineated:

The central office consultant is limited in his contributions because he necessarily must spread his energies and resources among many schools in the system. He probably lacks intimate insight into the nature of the individual school's student population, the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty, close and continuing acquaintance with the building and equipment, evolving local modes of operation, shifting patterns of interrelationships among the staff, and prevalent feelings and attitudes towards change.

This study considered only the consultative function. Teachers' perceptions of (1) the adequacy of numbers of central office and in-school personnel, regardless of position, to provide consultative services, (2) their frequency of use, and (3) the perceived value of these services, were sought.

#### RESEARCH STUDIES ON CONSULTATION

Research studies on consultation focus on three areas: central office personnel, in-school personnel, and teachers' perceptions of consultative services.

##### Central Office Personnel

Three studies (Snelgrove, 1965; Pitsula, 1966; McLoughlin, 1965) have investigated the role of central office personnel.

Snelgrove (1965) examined the role of the district supervising inspector in Newfoundland. The sixteen inspectors involved in the

**Table 3**  
**Analysis of the Consultative Function <sup>a</sup>**

<b>Type of Consultative Assistance</b>	<b>General Characteristics and Purpose</b>	<b>Personnel Initiating Assistance</b>	<b>Personnel Providing Assistance</b>
<b>Advice-Seeking</b>	Assistance with immediate problems	Teacher	Colleagues Team Leader Principal
<b>Performance Analysis</b>	Desire to have objective appraisal of teaching-learning situation	Teacher	Team Leader Dept. Head Principal Consultant
<b>Diagnosis</b>	Assistance with diagnosis of a vaguely-perceived problem	Teacher Supervisor	Colleagues Team Leader Dept. Head Principal Consultant Supervisor
<b>Functional Expertise</b>	Assistance with pupil problems, testing, audio-visual material, references, etc.	Teacher	Counsellors Librarians Technicians Psychologists Other Specialists
<b>Curricular Expertise</b>	Desire to improve the program; to introduce change	Teacher Supervisor	Team Members Consultants Resource Persons

<sup>a</sup> Table taken from Miklos (1971).

study felt that the large number of schools and the distance between schools hindered the effectiveness of their supervisory program.

Pitsula (1966) listed the tasks of supervisory assistants in large administrative units in Saskatchewan as being:

1. to keep informed on curricular developments in order to help teachers understand new trends and curricular objectives,
2. to provide a program of educational diagnosis and assistance in the development of remedial and enrichment procedures,
3. to consult with teachers on specific school programs,
4. to assist with orientation programs for teachers,
5. to encourage the use of a variety of instructional methods, and
6. to assist in the classification and grouping of pupils.

He concluded that supervisory assistants were involved in consultation rather than evaluation.

Duboyce (1969) examined the growth of a large school system in Alberta. Central office auxiliary staff to provide consultative services for teachers were first appointed in 1956 but, even in 1969, the numbers of administrative and support personnel far outnumbered the numbers of central office auxiliary personnel. He found that central office supervisory personnel were divided in their opinions as to whether program development or teacher improvement should receive most emphasis. Principals and teachers as groups seemed to hold different perceptions for the functions of central office personnel. While principals were generally confused by the lack of definition of the functions of central office personnel, teachers

felt that the first priority of central office personnel should be to provide assistance to teachers in the areas they desire.

McLoughlin (1965) sought opinions from nineteen supervisors, nineteen superintendents, sixty-five principals and two hundred and forty elementary teachers in an attempt to define the role of the supervisor of elementary education in British Columbia. While all groups mentioned providing assistance to teachers, principals and teachers were opposed to any form of inspection. Helping to obtain instructional materials, giving demonstration lessons, and arranging for intervisitations of teachers were functions often mentioned.

#### In-School Personnel

The principal. Most Alberta research studies of the principal's perception of his role mention curriculum development as an important function (Hrynyk, 1962; Morin, 1964; Wetter, 1965). While principals in Wetter's study also mentioned professional development activities, they tended to disregard direct evaluatory activities such as classroom visitation.

Three studies completed in Eastern Canada (Young, 1967; Uhlman, 1966; Harrison, 1965) reflect similar attitudes. In Quebec, Young (1967) found that teachers preferred principals who readily gave positive consultative assistance rather than negative evaluatory criticism. Uhlman's study (1966) of the Nova Scotia principals showed that school board members perceived the principal's most important function to be that of an instructional leader providing consultative assistance to teachers. The Nova Scotia principals in

Harrison's (1965) study also stressed assistance to teachers as their major supervisory function.

Ziolkowski (1965) in a study of Saskatchewan supervisory practices found that little emphasis was placed on direct classroom interaction between principals and teachers although consultative assistance was stressed. Egnatoff's (1968) longitudinal study of the status of school principals in Saskatchewan revealed an increase in the emphasis on instructional leadership.

Length of time available for supervisory activities. Reiderer (1965) in a study of the time Saskatchewan principals spent in supervisory activities found that, in urban school districts, elementary principals spent less than 2 hours/pupil/year in supervisory activities. Secondary principals spent slightly more than 4 hours/pupil/year.

Though principals in a Nova Scotia study (Harrison, 1965) reported spending an average of 17 percent of their working day in staff supervision, the actual percentages recorded varied between 0 percent and 40 percent, indicating a wide disparity in principals' emphasis on supervisory activities.

Principals indicated their perceptions of the adequacy of time allotted to staff supervision in Gregory's study (1972:67) of four large urban school districts in Alberta. The majority of principals, regardless of grade level, felt that their time allotment was insufficient.

Curricular associates -- senior high. The one hundred and eighty-one senior high department heads from thirty-six Alberta schools, in Clarke's study (1969), felt that one of their most serious problems was the lack of clearly defined responsibilities with regard to supervision, a task which they rated as less important than obtaining supplies and equipment and coordinating the work of the department.

Curricular associates -- junior high. Two studies on the role of the coordinator in junior high schools were completed by Hewko (1965) and Heron (1969). While Hewko found a congruence of expectations for the role of the coordinators by all personnel involved, Heron noted a number of areas of conflicting expectations between teachers and coordinators. Both studies mentioned insufficient time, apathy from principals and teachers, and a lack of clear role definition as factors which hampered coordinators' effectiveness.

Curricular associates -- elementary. Cowle (1971) studied the role of the elementary field consultant in an urban school system in Alberta. He found that although the position was new, principals and teachers already held definite perceptions of the functions of these personnel. While all groups (principals, teachers, central office coordinators, and field consultants) saw in-service education, assistance in program development, informing teachers of sources of consultative services, and giving demonstration lessons, as functions of the field consultant, there was a disparity of opinions between the



field consultants and alter groups on "preparing a 'model learning' environment in their own classroom for observation by teachers" (Cowle, 1971:66).

### Teachers' Perceptions of Consultative Services

Canadian research in this area has focused on teachers' perceptions of the availability of consultative services and their perceptions of the best source of consultative assistance.

Availability of services. The impact of physical distance was mentioned by Humphreys in his study of teachers in Ontario elementary schools (1969). He concluded that while consultative help was available more frequently to urban than to rural teachers, the service had become more readily available in all areas, and was now more often provided by principals and consultants than by superintendents.

Ratsoy (1970), in a study of Alberta teachers, found that over one-third of teachers considered that no consultative personnel were available, especially for secondary teachers. While more consultative assistance was available to urban teachers, they used the services less often.

Best source of consultative assistance. McGillivray (1966) in a study of one hundred and forty beginning teachers in Ontario high schools reported that the teachers had received most help from fellow teachers and department heads, and least help from principals and board supervisors (superintendents, master teachers, consultants, and

coordinators). The principals and supervisors felt that their assistance was perceived as adequate, while beginning teachers indicated that they perceived principals and supervisors as inspectors. These perceptions were valid for all the teachers regardless of number of years of post-secondary education.

Milne (1968) reported similar findings in his study of two hundred and twenty beginning teachers in an Alberta school system. Both studies indicated that beginning teachers saw the development of appropriate teaching techniques and the handling of pupil discipline and motivation as their major problems.

Six hundred and ninety-seven elementary teachers in West Central Ontario were asked to identify those supervisory positions which most affected their teaching content, methods, and/or outcomes and to rate them in effectiveness in a study by Parsons (1971). Principals were rated most influential and most effective by teachers. Other positions seen as influential and effective were other teachers, resource teachers and program consultants. Parsons (1971:8) suggested that:

in view of the effectiveness of 'other teachers' in helping staff members, it is recommended that greater opportunities be provided for teacher interaction in school systems by restructuring teacher roles. Teachers should be given greater freedom from their 'in-class' responsibilities to share new ideas and techniques with their colleagues.

Parsons also found that the greater the physical distance between the classroom and the supervisory position, the lower the teacher's perception of influence and effectiveness.

## SUMMARY

The present accelerated growth of system size and organizational complexity in school systems across Canada, has resulted in large increases in the numbers of central office personnel. Despite a general tendency for the numbers of supervisors to increase with increasing system size, a low percentage of total staff have consultation as their major function and these are more frequently employed by urban systems.

Writers on supervision and personnel in the field saw supervisors as instructional leaders introducing change to benefit the personnel and clientele. Consultation was generally regarded as part of supervision.

There are no clear guidelines between the roles of the principal and other personnel with regard to supervision. The conflicts in functions expected, the resistance against any type of evaluatory behavior, and the little time principals have available, tend to make the availability of consultative assistance a haphazard affair.

Research does indicate that in-school personnel are most influential and effective in terms of consultative assistance.

## Chapter 3

### RESEARCH DESIGN

The research methodology of the study is presented in this chapter. It is discussed in terms of the research instrument, data collection procedures, the treatment of the data, and the delimitations and assumptions of the design.

### RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A research instrument was devised which would obtain teachers' perceptions of consultative and other auxiliary services in their school systems.

#### Choice of Type of Instrumentation

Ratsoy (1970) in his study of the Alberta teaching population used a survey research technique, the questionnaire, to obtain teachers' opinions concerning teaching methods, use of the library, use of central office consultative staff, and other issues. A study of teachers in Ontario elementary schools (Humphreys, 1969) also used questionnaires to obtain teachers' perceptions of consultative services available to them.

In this study, due to the large numbers and the wide geographic location of the sample, the questionnaire was considered the best means of obtaining the necessary information while assuring anonymity.

### Instrumentation

The mail-back questionnaire used to obtain the data was constructed by the researcher. It had the following four sections.

Part A asked for personal data including grade level taught, subject area taught, age, sex, position held in the school, number of years of post-secondary education, length of employment in the school system, and length of employment in the school.

Part B provided a list of services usually available from central office staff and asked for opinions of the staffing adequacy in these areas in the central office of the school jurisdiction. Teachers were asked to indicate their extent of use of central office consultative services on a scale devised for this purpose. The scale response categories were "Not used," "1-2 times," "3-5 times," "6-10 times," "11-20 times," and "Over 20 times." They were also asked to evaluate these services using a scale with the following ratings, "Very valuable," "Valuable," "Not very valuable," "Not valuable," and "Undecided."

Part C was similar to Part B, but concerned staffing in the particular school. Teachers were asked for their opinions of staffing adequacy in the areas of consultation, administration, guidance, audio-visual, library aide, teacher aide, laboratory assistant, and clerical services. They were also asked to indicate their extent of use of in-school consultative services and the value of these services to them on the scales described in Part B.

Part D presented a list of services available from regional offices and asked teachers to indicate their expected use of these services. Areas of staff allocation were presented and teachers were asked for indications of those areas to which they thought additional staff should be assigned. They were also asked to indicate the effect of involvement in non-instructional tasks on their teaching.

#### Validity of the Instrument

In order to ensure that the questionnaire measured what it was supposed to measure and that the questions were expressed clearly and unambiguously, the questionnaire was pre-tested on three groups; (1) three members of staff in the Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, (2) ten graduate students from the same department, and (3) four teachers in the field. Their reactions to the questions were discussed with the group members. After the data collection procedures had been completed, each questionnaire in the sample was examined for internal consistency of response.

#### DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

On November 1, 1971, 1987 questionnaires were mailed to principals in 90 schools, chosen at random from a list of Alberta schools within the following limitations: (1) an equal number of schools in the four largest systems were chosen, and (2) at least one school from every jurisdiction was included in the sample.

A covering letter from Dr. E.A. Holdaway requested the cooperation of principals in the distribution of the questionnaires to each staff member and in the collection procedures outlined (Appendix A). A letter to each staff member from Dr. B.T. Keeler, Executive Secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association, was also included (Appendix A).

The principals of the seven schools with outstanding returns were contacted by telephone on November 15.

Of the 1987 questionnaires sent out to schools, 1558 questionnaires, 78.6 percent, were returned by November 30. Returns were received from 88 of the 90 schools approached. Table 4 presents an analysis of the returns according to type of jurisdiction.

#### TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Since the questionnaires had been precoded to facilitate key-punching, the raw data were transferred directly from the questionnaires to IBM computer data cards.

After computer printouts of the data had been checked for individual accuracy of response, frequency distributions and percentage frequency distributions were obtained for all variables.

Owing to the large size of the matrix, comparisons of responses on each variable against responses on every other variable were not feasible. Therefore, for each independent variable, certain dependent variables which were considered to be most likely to show differences between responses were chosen, and percentage frequency comparisons were computed.

**Table 4**  
**Distribution of Responses**

Questionnaires	Counties	Divisions	Public Districts	Separate Districts
No. distributed to teachers	340	291	679	677
No. returned by teachers	288	224	503	543
% returned by teachers	84.7	76.9	73.0	80.1
Overall % of returns by teachers	18.0	14.3	35.5	32.2
No. of schools contacted	22	19	23	26
No. of schools returning questionnaires	21	19	22	26



### DELIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The study was confined to a sample of Alberta schools and delimited to the staffing adequacy, use and value of various services usually provided for teachers as perceived by all in-school personnel holding a teaching certificate. The study, therefore, was descriptive and cross-sectional.

The validity of the findings was dependent upon the accuracy of data provided by the respondents. These assumptions were made:

1. the perceptions of instructional staff regarding the various services could be obtained through the use of a questionnaire,
2. the areas to which the respondents were asked to react represented the major areas of auxiliary staff services,
3. instructional personnel were able to judge the availability of personnel for each of the listed services, and
4. respondents used the terms as defined in the study.

### SUMMARY

This descriptive study used a survey research technique, the mail-back questionnaire, to obtain information from 1558 in-school staff concerning their perceptions of various services provided for teachers. Through computer analysis of the data, frequency distributions and percentage frequency distributions of all responses and comparisons between responses when distributed according to certain dependent variables were obtained.

## Chapter 4

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

A sample of 1987 teachers, approximately 10 percent of the Alberta teaching population, was chosen for the study. Tables showing the teaching population according to jurisdiction, grade level span of the school, and number of teachers per school were prepared. From the data in these tables, ratios for the number of teachers in the sample in each category were obtained.

Teacher returns according to jurisdiction and grade level most commonly taught are given in Table 5, and by subject area most commonly taught in Table 6. Thirty-three percent of teachers taught elementary grades, 23 percent taught G.7 - 9 and 39 percent G.10 - 12. Five percent of the sample indicated that they "Do not teach." Over half of the division teachers taught K - G.6 while 50 percent of public district teachers taught G.10 - 12 as did 47 percent of separate district teachers.

When responses were classified by subject area, 14 percent of teachers taught G.1-2-3 and twelve percent taught English. There were smaller percentages of social studies (10 percent), mathematics (9 percent), science (10 percent) and G.4-5-6 (9 percent) teachers in the sample.

Table 5  
 Classification of Teachers in Sample  
 by Grade Level Most Commonly Taught

Jurisdiction	N	Do not teach	K - G.3	G.4 - 6	G.7 - 9	G.10 - 12
		%	%	%	%	%
Counties	288	2.1	18.8	19.4	42.4	17.4
Divisions	224	1.8	25.0	29.9	18.3	25.0
Public Districts	503	6.2	12.5	13.5	17.7	50.1
Separate Districts	543	6.6	14.4	12.0	20.3	46.8
Overall	1558	4.9	16.1	16.4	23.2	39.3

Table 6

Classification of Teachers in Sample  
by Subject Area Most Commonly Taught

(N = 1558)

	% Reading	% English	% Social Studies	% Mathematics	% French	% Language other than French	% Science	% Fine Arts	% Phys. Ed.	% Home Ec.	% Ind. Arts	% Bus. Ed.	% Voc. Ed.	% G.1-2-3	% G.4-5-6	% Other areas	% Do not teach
Counties	3.8	16.3	9.7	11.8	1.7	0.7	10.1	2.8	5.2	3.8	1.7	1.7	0.4	16.7	9.7	2.4	1.4
Divisions	2.7	9.4	9.8	8.9	4.0	0.5	7.1	3.1	5.4	1.8	0.9	4.5	3.6	21.9	13.0	2.7	0.9
Public Districts	2.6	9.9	9.2	8.4	2.0	1.0	9.7	4.8	6.0	2.6	2.0	5.6	8.0	11.1	8.8	3.6	5.0
Separate Districts	2.6	12.9	9.6	9.4	3.9	1.3	10.1	2.6	4.8	1.8	2.0	5.7	5.5	11.4	6.3	3.5	6.6
Overall	2.8	12.0	9.5	9.4	2.9	1.0	9.6	3.4	5.3	2.4	1.8	4.8	5.1	13.8	8.7	3.2	4.3

Forty-nine percent of teachers had four years of post-secondary education and sixteen percent had five years of post-secondary education. Nine percent of teachers in the sample indicated one year of training. The largest group, 29 percent, had taught for five to nine years and 29 percent also indicated that they had spent five to nine years in the school. Ten percent were first-year teachers and 18 percent were in their first year in the school.

Teachers made up 81 percent of the sample and 5 percent were principals.

#### COMPARISON OF SAMPLE AND POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Classifications of the returns by grade level and subject area most commonly taught were compared with Ratsoy's percentages (1970:95) for the Alberta teaching population in 1968-69 (Tables 7 and 8). Since schools teaching only grades 10 to 12 are most often found in urban districts, and have large teaching populations, the percentage of respondents in this category is somewhat higher than the population figure. Similarly, the percentage of elementary teachers is slightly lower than Ratsoy's figure.

In the classification by subject area most commonly taught (Table 8), the higher percentage of teachers in English and the lower percentages of K - G.3 and G.4 - 6 teachers may suggest that more elementary schools are becoming departmentalized or that a number of elementary teachers marked English or reading as the subject area most commonly taught.

**Table 7**  
**Comparison of Sample and Population**  
**Characteristics by Grade Level Most**  
**Commonly Taught**

	K - G.3	G.4 - 6	G.7 - 9	G.10 - 12
	%	%	%	%
Sample <sup>a</sup>	16.1	16.4	23.2	39.3
Population <sup>b</sup>	21.8	26.4	19.1	21.7

<sup>a</sup> The sample figures refer to this study.

<sup>b</sup> Population figures are taken from Ratsoy (1970:95).

**Table 8**  
**Comparison of Sample and Population**  
**Characteristics by Subject Area Most**  
**Commonly Taught**

Subject Area	Sample <sup>a</sup>	Population <sup>b</sup>
Reading	2.8	2.5
English	12.0	8.7
Social Studies	9.5	7.6
Mathematics	9.4	7.6
French	2.9	2.8
Languages other than French	1.0	0.4
Science	9.6	7.7
Fine Arts	3.4	2.4
Physical Education	5.3	3.6
Home Economics	2.4	1.8
Industrial Arts	1.8	1.6
Business Education	4.8	2.6
Vocational Education	5.1	1.6
Gr. 1-2-3	13.8	21.5
Gr. 4-5-6	8.7	15.5

<sup>a</sup> The sample figures refer to this study.

<sup>b</sup> Population figures were taken from Ratsoy (1970:101).

The sample and population were compared according to number of years of (1) post-secondary education, (2) total teaching experience, (3) employment in the school system, and (4) employment in the school (Table 9). The higher percentages of four year qualified teachers in the sample, and the lower figures for teachers with one and two years of post-secondary education, may reflect the general trend towards higher teacher qualifications (Clarke, 1968). The lower sample of percentages of teachers with one year of total system or school employment may reflect a decrease in the number of graduates going into the teaching profession and also a lessening of teacher mobility perhaps reflecting the present teacher surplus.

Comparisons on the basis of position held in the school are shown in Table 10. The higher percentage of department heads and grade coordinators in the sample may reflect a move towards more consultative services within the school.

#### SUMMARY

The sample used in the study consisted of 1558 in-school personnel holding a teaching certificate. Teachers made up 81 percent of the total sample. One-third of the teachers taught elementary grades and 39 percent indicated that they taught grades 10 to 12. The largest group of teachers (44 percent) had four years of post-secondary education, and 29 percent had been employed by their present school system for five to nine years.



Table 9

Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics  
by Position Held in the School

		Years of Post-Secondary Education for Salary Purposes					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Sample <sup>a</sup>		8.5	11.6	12.2	42.8	15.8	9.1
Population <sup>b</sup>		17.2	19.5	11.2	29.1	10.8	10.9

  

		Years of Teaching Experience								Over
		1	2	3-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	34
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sample <sup>a</sup>		6.4	7.5	14.6	28.8	15.9	10.0	7.3	7.4	2.2
Population <sup>b</sup>		8.6	7.3	13.9	24.4	14.2	11.5	8.4	8.1	3.6

  

		Years of Employment in the School System								Over
		1	2	3-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	34
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sample <sup>a</sup>		10.9	14.6	24.9	29.0	11.1	5.3	2.3	1.7	0.2
Population <sup>b</sup>		22.7	14.9	17.5	20.7	12.0	6.1	3.0	2.5	0.7

  

		Years of Employment in the School							Over
		1	2	3-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	24
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sample <sup>a</sup>		18.1	18.7	26.2	25.2	6.9	3.0	1.2	0.6
Population <sup>b</sup>		33.0	17.9	18.0	15.9	7.8	3.2	1.0	0.8

<sup>a</sup> The sample figures refer to this study.

<sup>b</sup> Population figures are taken from Ratsoy (1970:103).

**Table 10**  
**Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics**  
**by Position Held in the School**

Position held	Sample <sup>a</sup>	Population <sup>b</sup>
	%	%
Teacher	80.7	78.7
Department Head/ Grade Coordinator	5.1	1.9
Consultant for two or more schools	0.2	0.2
Guidance Counsellor	2.2	1.9
Teacher-Librarian	2.3	2.6
Principal	4.7	5.9
Vice/Assistant Principal	4.9	5.7

<sup>a</sup> The sample figures refer to this study.

<sup>b</sup> Population figures are taken from Ratsoy (1970:94).

The sample reflects, with reasonable accuracy, the characteristics of the Alberta teaching population as described by Ratsoy (1970). The characteristics of the respondents were used to determine the boundaries of the sub-groups.

## Chapter 5

### TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONSULTATIVE SERVICES

The distribution of responses from the sample of 1558 teachers to Problem 1 concerning consultative services are presented in this chapter. Problem 1 asked:

"What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of consultative staff, and the extent of use and value of consultative services provided by central office, in-school and regional office personnel?"

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.1

Statement. "What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of (a) central office personnel and (b) in-school personnel available to provide consultative services?"

Table 11 presents the opinions of teachers classified by type of jurisdiction on this question. Thirty-six percent of teachers saw the numbers of central office and in-school personnel as "Sufficient," while 26 percent saw central office and 23 percent saw in-school personnel as "Too few." Twenty-seven percent saw in-school services as "Unavailable," and 13 percent responded "Don't know" about central office services.

Central office consultative services. An average of 36 percent of teachers indicated that they were satisfied with the numbers of

**Table 11**  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services**

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<b>CENTRAL OFFICE</b>					
Counties	2.8	26.0	31.6	18.8	8.3	12.5
Divisions	2.2	38.0	28.1	16.5	4.5	10.7
Public Districts	11.1	39.0	20.7	10.1	6.6	12.5
Separate Districts	3.9	36.3	26.3	12.5	6.3	14.7
Overall	5.8	35.5	25.7	13.5	6.5	13.0
	<b>IN-SCHOOL</b>					
Counties	0.0	25.0	22.9	35.4	8.0	8.7
Divisions	0.5	29.0	25.5	32.6	6.7	5.8
Public Districts	0.2	42.9	20.7	22.0	5.0	9.2
Separate Districts	0.7	37.2	24.9	25.2	5.5	6.5
Overall	0.4	35.6	23.2	27.2	6.0	7.6

personnel. In the counties, however, the highest percentage of teachers (32 percent) indicated that they considered the numbers of central office personnel providing consultative services to be "Too few." Only 26 percent of county teachers thought that the numbers of personnel were "Sufficient." While division and separate district teachers were more satisfied than county teachers with the numbers of personnel, over one-quarter felt that "Too few" consultative personnel were available. More public district teachers saw central office consultative services as available, but 11 percent felt that "Too many" personnel were employed.

In-school consultative services. County and division teachers felt that the numbers of in-school consultative personnel were very restricted. Sixty-five percent of county and 59 percent of division teachers considered the personnel to be either "Too few" or "Unavailable." District teachers were more satisfied with the numbers of personnel available, yet 43 percent of public and 50 percent of separate district teachers indicated either "Too few" or "Unavailable." For all jurisdictions higher percentages of "Unavailable" than "Too few" responses were recorded. The lowest percentage of "Unavailable" responses was recorded by the public district teachers (22 percent), while over 35 percent of county teachers indicated that in-school consultative personnel were "Unavailable."

## SUB-PROBLEM 1.2

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of personnel to provide consultative services associated with:

1. position held in the school,
2. grade level span of the school,
3. number of years of post-secondary education,
4. length of employment in the school system, and
5. length of employment in the present school?"

Responses Classified by School Position

While responses were fairly similar regardless of type of jurisdiction, they varied widely when compared according to the positions held by the respondents (Table 12).

Central office consultative services. As might be expected, principals and vice-principals expressed the least hesitancy in their opinions of numbers of central office personnel. No principals and only 1 percent of vice-principals indicated "Don't know." Principals were divided in their responses, 38 percent indicating "Sufficient" while an equal percentage indicated "Too few." More principals than any other group saw central office personnel as "Unavailable."

Forty-seven percent of vice-principals indicated that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Department heads and teachers were divided between "Sufficient" personnel and insufficient ("Too few" and "Unavailable") personnel. Librarians and guidance counsellors

Table 12

**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Position, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office  
and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services**

School position	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>CENTRAL OFFICE</b>							
Principals	73	4.1	38.4	38.4	17.8	1.4	0.0
Vice Principals	76	6.6	47.4	28.9	11.8	3.9	1.3
Department Heads	79	10.1	38.0	27.8	10.1	7.6	6.3
Consultants	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
Teachers	1258	5.8	33.9	25.1	13.8	6.9	14.5
Guidance counsellors	34	2.9	44.1	20.6	2.9	2.9	26.5
Librarians	35	0.0	51.4	14.3	17.1	5.7	11.4
<b>IN-SCHOOL</b>							
Principals	73	0.0	27.4	45.2	23.3	4.1	0.0
Vice Principals	76	0.0	42.1	31.6	21.1	3.9	1.3
Department Heads	79	0.0	48.1	31.6	10.1	6.3	3.8
Consultants	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Teachers	1258	0.5	35.4	21.1	28.9	6.0	8.3
Guidance counsellors	34	0.0	23.5	32.4	23.5	8.8	11.8
Librarians	35	0.0	31.4	11.4	28.6	8.6	20.0



were generally satisfied with the numbers of central office personnel available, 44 percent of guidance counsellors and 51 percent of librarians indicating that the numbers of personnel were "Sufficient." Of the three consultants for two or more schools in the sample, two were uncertain about the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel, one indicating "Don't know" and the other "Undecided."

In-school consultative services. While vice-principals (42 percent) and department heads (48 percent) were the groups with the highest percentages of "Sufficient" responses, over 40 percent of all groups felt that the numbers were insufficient. Forty-five percent of principals indicated that the numbers of in-school personnel available to provide consultative services were "Too few" and another 23 percent felt that the service was "Unavailable." Librarians had the highest percentage (20 percent) of "Don't know" responses.

#### Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span

Teachers in schools encompassing combinations of grade level spans expressed more dissatisfaction with the numbers of personnel available (Table 13).

Central office consultative services. Junior high and senior high school teachers were the groups most satisfied with the numbers of central office personnel, 41 percent of junior high and 39 percent of senior high school teachers indicating that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Eleven percent of senior high teachers thought that there were "Too many" personnel. Elementary-junior-senior high school

Table 13

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office and In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services

School grade level span	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
CENTRAL OFFICE							
Elementary	304	4.9	35.2	28.0	15.1	5.9	10.9
Junior High	155	1.9	41.3	24.5	11.6	7.7	12.9
Senior High	527	10.6	39.1	21.4	7.2	7.4	14.2
Elementary-Junior High	247	3.6	34.8	34.0	11.7	4.5	11.3
Junior High-Senior High	109	0.9	26.6	28.4	15.6	7.3	21.1
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	216	2.8	28.2	23.1	28.7	6.0	11.1
IN-SCHOOL							
Elementary	304	0.0	34.2	18.4	35.5	5.9	5.9
Junior High	155	0.0	40.6	26.5	20.0	7.1	5.8
Senior High	527	1.1	48.6	22.8	12.3	5.9	9.3
Elementary-Junior High	247	0.0	26.7	27.5	34.8	4.0	6.9
Junior High-Senior High	109	0.0	23.9	19.3	38.5	10.1	8.3
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	216	0.0	18.5	25.9	42.1	5.6	7.9

teachers were the group most dissatisfied with the numbers of central office personnel available. Twenty-three percent felt that there were "Too few" personnel and another 29 percent thought that the service was "Unavailable." While the percentage of "Undecided" responses varied little among the groups, 21 percent of junior-senior high school teachers indicated "Don't know" to this question.

In-school consultative services. While only 19 percent of elementary-junior-senior high school teachers indicated that the numbers of in-school consultative personnel were "Sufficient," 49 percent of senior high school teachers thought that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Over half of the teachers in schools with elementary grades, and 45 percent of teachers in schools with junior high grades indicated that the numbers of personnel were insufficient. Over 42 percent of elementary-junior-senior high school teachers saw in-school consultative services as "Unavailable" and 30 percent of teachers in this group felt that the numbers were "Too few." While 19 percent of elementary teachers saw the numbers of personnel as "Too few," 36 percent felt that they were "Unavailable." Only senior high school teachers thought that there were "Too many" in-school personnel available.

#### Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

Teachers' satisfaction with the numbers of personnel available tended to increase as the number of years of post-secondary education increased (Table 14).

Table 14

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide  
Consultative Services

Years of post-secondary education	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
6	141	5.0	39.7	25.5	10.6	6.4	12.8
5	246	8.1	36.6	24.4	10.2	7.3	13.4
4	667	7.3	37.6	24.6	12.9	6.1	11.4
3	190	2.6	32.1	29.5	13.2	3.7	18.9
2	181	2.2	32.6	23.2	19.3	9.4	13.3
1	133	3.8	27.1	32.3	18.0	6.8	12.0

Central office consultative services. While 40 percent of teachers with six years of post-secondary education saw the numbers of central office personnel as "Sufficient," only 27 percent of teachers with one year of post-secondary education indicated "Sufficient" personnel. Thirty-two percent of teachers with one year of training felt that the numbers of personnel were "Too few" and 19 percent of teachers with two years of post-secondary education saw the services as "Unavailable."

Teachers with five and six years of post-secondary education recorded higher percentages of "Sufficient" responses and 8 percent of teachers with five years of training felt that there were "Too many" personnel.

#### Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System

Teachers who had been with the system longer tended to view the numbers of central office personnel as insufficient more often than teachers who were in their first two years with the school system (Table 15).

Central office consultative services. Regardless of length of time with the school system, approximately 35 percent of teachers saw the numbers of central office consultative personnel as "Sufficient." Of teachers in their first year of employment with the school system, 29 percent indicated that they "Don't know" about central office services, the largest percentage for any of the groups. The percentages of teachers indicating that there were "Too few"

Table 15

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in the School System,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel to Provide  
Consultative Services

Years of employment in the school system	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%
over 35	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25 - 34	27	7.4	29.6	18.5	18.5	11.1	14.8
20 - 24	35	5.7	40.0	34.3	11.4	2.9	5.7
15 - 19	83	8.4	32.5	24.1	18.1	7.2	9.6
10 - 14	173	8.1	43.4	20.2	13.3	6.4	8.7
5 - 9	452	7.7	32.3	28.3	16.2	6.2	9.3
3 - 4	388	5.9	34.5	25.5	11.1	8.0	14.9
2	227	2.2	40.1	26.4	15.0	5.7	10.6
1	170	1.2	32.4	24.7	7.6	4.7	29.4

central office consultative personnel rose from 25 percent for teachers in their first year to 34 percent for teachers who had been employed by the system for twenty to twenty-four years. Teachers with over five years of employment with the school system indicated more often that the numbers of personnel were "Too many."

#### Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School

Teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel as "Too few" or "Unavailable" tended to increase as the numbers of years of employment in the school increased (Table 16).

In-School consultative services. Teachers new to a school were almost equally divided in their perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school consultative personnel between those who considered the numbers of personnel "Sufficient," (39 percent) and those who felt that the numbers were "Too few" (21 percent) and "Unavailable" (23 percent). As years of employment in the school increased, lower percentages of teachers saw the numbers of personnel as "Sufficient" while the percentages of respondents indicating "Too few" rose from 21 percent for those with one year of employment to 42 percent for those with twenty to twenty-four years of employment in the school. The percentage of "Unavailable" responses also rose. Forty percent of teachers with fifteen to nineteen years of employment in the school felt that in-school consultative personnel were "Unavailable."

Table 16

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Employment in the School, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Consultative Services

Years of employment in the school	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%
25 - 34	11	0.0	50.0	0.0	30.0	10.0	10.0
20 - 24	19	0.0	26.3	42.1	26.3	0.0	5.3
15 - 19	47	0.0	23.4	23.4	40.4	4.3	8.5
10 - 14	107	0.0	29.9	23.4	32.7	6.5	7.5
5 - 9	393	0.0	34.1	22.6	30.3	5.6	7.4
3 - 4	408	0.5	35.0	25.5	26.7	5.1	7.1
2	291	0.7	39.5	22.7	23.7	6.2	7.2
1	282	0.7	39.0	20.9	22.7	7.6	8.9



## SUB-PROBLEM 1.3

Statement. "How often did teachers use central office and in-school consultative services in the 1970-71 school year?"

Of those teachers who were teaching in 1970-71, and who saw central office and in-school consultative services as available, just over half made some use of central office and in-school services (Table 17). Thirty-nine percent of all teachers used central office services, and 34 percent used in-school services in 1970-71.

Central office consultative services. County and division teachers who more often indicated that they saw the services as "Unavailable," correspondingly made less use of central office services. Forty-three percent of district teachers used the services compared to 34 percent of county teachers and 27 percent of division teachers.

In-school consultative services. The pattern of responses for use of in-school services was similar to that for use of central office services. County and division teachers used the services less often. District teachers not only indicated a wider use of the services, but they also had the highest frequency of use. Twelve percent of public district teachers indicated that they used in-school services more than twenty times.

While most teachers used central office services less than five times, over two-thirds used in-school services more than five times and one-third used the services more than ten times in 1970-71.

Table 17

Estimates by Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Jurisdiction	CENTRAL OFFICE							IN-SCHOOL		
	Over 20 times %	11-20 times %	6-10 times %	3-5 times %	1-2 times %	Not used %	Not teaching %	Not applicable %		
Counties	2.1	2.8	4.5	8.3	15.3	35.8	13.2	18.1		
Divisions	2.2	2.2	4.5	7.1	11.2	40.2	15.2	17.4		
Public Districts	3.0	2.4	8.2	12.3	17.9	37.4	8.6	10.3		
Separate Districts	5.9	3.1	6.3	12.3	15.7	34.1	9.2	13.4		
Overall	3.7	2.7	6.3	10.9	15.7	36.3	10.6	13.9		
Counties	4.2	4.2	7.6	6.3	3.8	29.5	9.4	35.1		
Divisions	5.4	4.5	6.7	5.8	3.1	28.1	13.4	33.0		
Public Districts	12.3	5.0	10.7	7.2	6.0	29.4	7.6	21.9		
Separate Districts	10.7	5.9	6.6	8.1	4.1	30.9	8.5	25.2		
Overall	9.2	5.1	8.2	7.1	4.5	29.8	9.1	27.1		

## SUB-PROBLEM 1.4

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' use of central office and in-school services associated with:

1. grade level taught,
2. subject area taught,
3. sex,
4. age, and
5. number of years of post-secondary education?"

Responses Classified by Grade Level Taught

Those respondents in the category "Do not teach", for example, principals, guidance counsellors, librarians, made much greater use of central office and in-school services in 1970-71, than did instructional personnel as shown in Table 18.

Central office consultative services. Forty-seven percent of K - G.3 teachers made use of central office services. In general, not only did more elementary teachers than any other group use the services, their frequency of use was higher than that for secondary teachers. Senior high teachers made least use of the services available; 38 percent used central office services and 41 percent indicated "Not used." Four percent of elementary teachers used central office services "Over 20 times."

In-school consultative services. With increasing grade level, more teachers used in-school services. Twenty-eight percent of K - G.3 teachers and 39 percent of G.10 - 12 teachers indicated at

Table 18

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Grade level taught	CENTRAL OFFICE							IN-SCHOOL		
	Over 20 times %	11-20 times %	6-10 times %	3-5 times %	1-2 times %	Not used %	Not teaching %	Not applicable %		
K - G.3	4.4	2.4	8.8	13.5	17.5	29.5	8.8	15.1		
G.4 - 6	2.7	2.7	8.2	11.3	12.1	34.8	13.3	14.8		
G.7 - 9	3.3	2.8	4.4	8.6	15.2	37.8	11.9	16.0		
G.10 - 12	2.1	2.6	4.7	10.6	17.6	40.8	9.3	12.1		
Do not teach	19.5	3.9	13.0	13.0	7.8	20.8	11.7	10.4		
K - G.3	7.2	3.6	6.0	6.4	5.2	26.3	8.0	37.5		
G.4 - 6	7.8	3.5	7.4	5.9	2.3	25.8	9.0	38.3		
G.7 - 9	7.7	4.7	8.3	8.3	3.9	30.4	11.3	25.4		
G.10 - 12	9.8	6.4	10.0	7.2	5.7	32.5	8.0	20.4		
Do not teach	23.4	6.5	2.6	7.8	2.6	29.9	10.4	16.9		

least some use of the services. However, the percentages indicating "Not used" also increased with grade level taught, although to a smaller extent (26 percent to 33 percent). This may reflect the perceived lack of in-school services at lower grade levels, since, with increasing grade level, fewer teachers saw the service as "Unavailable."

#### Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught

Teachers' use of central office and in-school consultative services varied widely when compared according to subject area taught (Table 19).

Central office consultative services. Over 40 percent of English, mathematics, science, industrial-business-vocational education and G.4 - 6 teachers did not use central office services. Of those teachers who did use the services, those indicating the highest percentages of use were in the social studies area. Fourteen percent of social studies teachers indicated using the services over twenty times.

In-school consultative services. In-school services were used more often than central office services by all teachers, although approximately 35 percent of English, mathematics, languages, and physical education teachers indicated that they did not use in-school services. Social studies, science and industrial-business-vocational education teachers made most use of the services. Twenty-nine

Table 19

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Use of consultative services	CENTRAL OFFICE													IN-SCHOOL													
	English %	Social Studies %	Mathematics %	Languages %	Science %	Fine Arts %	Physical Education %	Home Economics %	Industrial-Business %	Voc. Ed. %	G.1 - 3 %	G.4 - 6 %	Other areas %	Do not teach %	English %	Social Studies %	Mathematics %	Languages %	Science %	Fine Arts %	Physical Education %	Home Economics %	Industrial-Business %	Voc. Ed. %	G.1 - 3 %	G.4 - 6 %	Other areas %
Over 20 times	1.6	14.2	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.8	9.6	0.0	1.1	4.6	1.5	6.0	22.4	10.1	10.1	7.5	0.0	12.8	7.5	3.6	5.3	8.3	7.7	11.1	10.0	23.9	
11 - 20	2.7	3.4	2.0	3.3	1.3	1.9	4.8	2.6	3.9	2.7	1.5	4.0	4.5	3.7	7.4	6.1	1.7	4.7	1.9	6.0	2.6	8.8	3.9	3.7	0.0	9.0	
6 - 10	3.7	2.0	4.1	3.3	4.0	7.5	6.0	2.6	5.5	8.9	11.1	10.0	11.9	6.4	10.1	8.2	8.3	11.4	3.8	8.4	5.3	12.2	5.8	7.4	10.0	4.5	
3 - 5	9.6	4.1	8.8	23.3	7.4	11.3	6.0	7.9	10.5	14.3	9.6	8.0	14.9	7.4	5.4	9.5	5.0	6.7	9.4	6.0	2.6	9.4	6.2	7.4	6.0	7.5	
1 - 2	13.8	10.8	17.7	13.3	18.1	18.9	10.8	15.8	13.8	16.2	14.1	12.0	10.4	4.8	6.1	3.4	8.3	2.7	7.5	2.4	5.3	5.5	5.4	0.7	6.0	3.0	
Not used	40.4	22.3	42.2	30.0	41.6	30.2	31.3	34.2	47.0	27.8	42.2	34.0	16.4	36.2	27.7	34.7	36.7	27.5	28.3	37.3	31.6	32.0	24.3	20.0	34.0	26.7	
Not teaching	12.8	34.5	6.1	13.3	11.4	15.1	15.7	23.7	5.0	10.4	9.6	18.0	9.0	10.1	8.1	6.8	13.3	9.4	11.3	10.8	23.7	4.4	9.3	6.7	14.0	9.0	
Unavailable	15.4	8.8	17.0	13.3	14.1	11.3	5.3	13.2	13.3	15.1	10.4	8.0	10.4	21.3	25.0	23.8	26.7	24.8	30.2	25.3	23.7	19.3	37.5	43.0	20.0	16.4	

percent of teachers in these groups indicated that they used the services more than ten times.

#### Responses Classified by Sex of Respondents

Teachers' use of central office and in-school consultative services on the basis of sex showed little difference between the responses (Table 20).

While approximately 40 percent of male and female teachers used central office services, male teachers seemed to use in-school services to a greater extent than did female teachers. Of those who used central office services over twenty times, 5 percent were men and 3 percent were women. Eleven percent of men used in-school services to this extent while 8 percent of women indicated using in-school services over 20 times. Since personnel who were not teaching indicated the greatest use of both services, this difference in percentages may be due to the higher percentage of principals who are male.

#### Responses Classified by Age of Respondents

The general tendency, as is shown in Table 21, was for older teachers to make less use of consultative services.

Central office consultative services. Forty-two percent of teachers over fifty years of age did not use central office consultative services. Teachers between twenty-six and thirty years of age used central office services more often. Thirty-eight percent

Table 20

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Sex, of Extent of Use of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Sex		Over 20	11-20	6-10	3-5	1-2	Not	Not	Unavailable
		times	times	times	times	times	used	teaching	
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Female	CENTRAL OFFICE	2.8	2.7	6.3	11.3	15.4	35.1	11.5	15.0
Male		4.6	2.7	6.3	10.4	16.0	37.6	9.7	12.7
Female	IN-SCHOOL	7.6	4.5	6.7	6.8	4.6	30.3	9.7	29.8
Male		10.9	5.7	9.7	7.5	4.4	29.2	8.4	24.3



Table 21

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Age, of Extent of Use of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Years of age	Over 20 times		11-20 times		6-10 times		3-5 times		1-2 times		Not used		Not teaching		Unavailable	
	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times
Over 60	1.9	9.6	13.5	9.6	7.7	46.2	0.0	11.5								
56 - 60	5.2	2.1	7.3	13.5	17.7	41.7	1.0	11.5								
51 - 55	3.5	2.6	6.1	10.4	17.4	42.6	1.7	15.7								
46 - 50	4.1	2.5	6.6	9.0	14.8	41.8	3.3	18.0								
41 - 45	5.5	4.1	4.8	12.3	19.2	34.9	4.1	15.1								
36 - 40	4.3	4.9	7.9	9.1	11.6	35.4	6.7	20.1								
31 - 35	5.7	1.7	8.7	11.3	15.2	36.1	11.3	10.0								
26 - 30	3.0	2.3	4.0	11.9	17.2	35.9	11.4	14.4								
Under 26	1.3	0.8	5.5	9.3	14.8	28.7	29.5	10.1								
CENTRAL OFFICE																
Over 60	9.6	3.8	9.6	5.8	3.8	38.5	0.0	28.8								
56 - 60	5.2	8.3	9.4	9.4	3.1	38.5	1.0	25.0								
51 - 55	5.2	5.2	9.6	10.4	9.6	26.1	1.7	32.2								
46 - 50	7.4	7.4	9.0	4.9	4.9	37.7	3.3	25.4								
41 - 45	11.6	2.1	11.0	8.9	2.7	35.6	4.1	24.0								
36 - 40	9.8	6.7	7.9	6.7	4.9	26.8	6.7	30.5								
31 - 35	10.4	6.1	8.3	5.2	4.3	29.6	9.1	27.0								
26 - 30	11.6	3.8	7.6	6.8	4.0	28.8	10.6	26.8								
Under 26	6.8	4.6	5.5	7.6	4.2	22.4	22.8	26.2								
IN-SCHOOL																

indicated that they had used central office services, the majority using them less than five times.

In-school consultative services. Teachers between 26 and 45, years of age made most extensive use of in-school services. Teachers under 26 years of age indicated that over half used in-school consultative assistance less than ten times in 1970-71.

#### Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

Teachers with more years of post-secondary education used central office and in-school consultative services more often (Table 22).

Central office consultative services. Over 50 percent of teachers with six years of post-secondary education used consultative services. Fourteen percent indicated that they had used the services over 20 times. Although the general tendency was for use to increase with number of years of post-secondary education, teachers with one year of training used central office services more often than teachers with three and four years of post-secondary education.

In-school consultative services. Teachers with five years of training used in-school services most often, with 24 percent indicating that they had used the services over ten times. Over one-third of teachers with one and two years of post-secondary education felt that in-school consultative services were "Unavailable," and a further 30 percent did not use in-school services.

Table 22

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services in 1970-71

Years of post-secondary education	CENTRAL OFFICE						IN-SCHOOL		
	Over 20 times	11-20 times	6-10 times	3-5 times	1-2 times	Not used	Not teaching	Not applicable	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
6	13.5	3.5	11.3	9.9	14.9	24.1	11.3	11.3	
5	4.9	4.5	4.9	11.8	15.4	37.8	9.3	11.4	
4	2.8	1.9	5.5	10.6	16.3	36.1	13.5	13.0	
3	2.6	1.6	6.3	8.4	14.2	40.5	12.6	13.7	
2	1.7	3.9	3.3	12.2	16.0	37.0	5.5	20.4	
1	0.0	2.3	11.3	12.8	15.0	40.6	1.5	16.5	
6	8.5	5.7	14.2	5.7	2.1	36.9	9.9	17.0	
5	13.8	10.6	7.3	3.7	5.7	35.4	7.7	15.9	
4	9.3	3.4	8.8	7.9	4.6	26.7	12.1	27.0	
3	8.4	4.7	4.7	9.5	4.2	25.3	8.9	34.2	
2	7.7	5.5	6.1	6.1	2.8	31.5	4.4	35.9	
1	4.5	2.3	7.5	9.0	6.8	31.6	1.5	36.8	

## SUB-PROBLEM 1.5

Statement. "How often did teachers use central office and in-school consultative services in the first two months of the 1971-72 school year?"

In the first two months of the 1971-72 school year, approximately 40 percent of teachers used central office and in-school consultative services (Table 23). While most teachers had used central office services less than five times, over 16 percent indicated that they had already used in-school services over ten times.

Central office consultative services. More teachers from public (38 percent) and separate (41 percent) districts than from counties (31 percent) and divisions (34 percent) used central office consultative services. While the percentage of teachers who had not used these services varied little between jurisdictions (approximately 47 percent), over 18 percent of county teachers felt that central office consultative services were "Unavailable" while only 10 percent of public district teachers thought so.

In-school consultative services. The pattern of responses displayed in teachers' use of in-school services is similar to the pattern of responses for central office services. Forty-four percent of public district teachers used in-school services. In general, more district teachers used in-school services and the frequency of their use was greater than that for county and division teachers. Eleven percent of public and 9 percent of separate district teachers as

Table 23

Estimates by Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971

Jurisdiction	Over 20 times		11-20 times		6-10 times		3-5 times		1-2 times		Not used		Not applicable	
	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times
	CENTRAL OFFICE													
Counties	0.7	1.0	2.4	8.3	18.4	51.0	18.1							
Divisions	0.9	0.5	2.7	10.3	19.6	48.7	17.4							
Public Districts	1.4	1.8	2.2	11.3	21.5	51.5	10.3							
Separate Districts	0.9	2.6	3.9	12.3	21.7	45.1	13.4							
Overall	1.0	1.7	2.9	10.9	11.0	48.8	13.9							
	IN-SCHOOL													
Counties	1.7	2.1	6.6	10.1	11.8	32.6	35.1							
Divisions	0.5	2.2	7.1	13.0	11.2	33.0	33.0							
Public Districts	8.2	2.6	9.0	13.1	11.5	33.8	21.9							
Separate Districts	5.9	2.6	10.1	14.9	9.4	31.9	25.2							
Overall	5.1	2.4	8.6	13.2	10.8	32.8	27.1							

compared to 4 percent of county and 3 percent of division teachers used in-school consultative services over ten times.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.6

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' use of consultative services associated with:

1. grade level taught, and
2. subject area taught?"

#### Responses Classified by Grade Level Taught

The extent of use of central office consultative services fell with increasing grade level from 46 percent for K - G.3 teachers to 31 percent for G.10 - 12 teachers as shown in Table 24.

While the percentage of teachers who did not use in-school services rose from 27 to 36 percent, there was an overall increase in the extent of use of in-school services with increasing grade level.

#### Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught

Use of central office and in-school consultative services was spread fairly evenly across subject areas, as shown in Table 25. Central office services were used most often by elementary teachers (40 percent) and least often by industrial-business-vocational education teachers (27 percent).

Over 40 percent of English, social studies, science, home economics, and industrial-business-vocational education teachers used

Table 24  
 Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office  
 and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971

Grade level taught	Over 20 times		11-20 times		6-10 times		3-5 times		1-2 times		Not used		Not Available	
	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times
	CENTRAL OFFICE													
K - G.3	1.2	0.8	4.0	13.9	25.9	39.0	15.1							
G.4 - 6	1.2	1.6	1.6	15.2	20.7	44.9	14.8							
G.7 - 9	0.8	1.9	3.0	8.6	20.4	48.9	16.3							
G.10 - 12	0.5	1.5	2.1	8.5	18.6	56.7	12.1							
Do not teach	5.2	6.5	9.1	18.2	22.1	28.6	10.4							
	IN-SCHOOL													
K - G.3	4.4	2.0	4.4	14.3	10.0	27.5	37.5							
G.4 - 6	3.9	1.6	8.6	11.3	8.2	28.1	38.3							
G.7 - 9	3.6	1.9	8.6	14.1	13.0	33.4	25.4							
G.10 - 12	5.1	3.1	10.5	13.6	11.4	35.9	20.4							
Do not teach	18.2	3.9	9.1	7.8	6.5	37.7	16.9							

Table 25

Estimates by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Extent of Use of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services, September-November, 1971

Extent of use	CENTRAL OFFICE											IN-SCHOOL															
	English	Social Studies	Mathematics	Languages	Science	Fine Arts	Physical Education	Home Economics	Industrial-Business-Voc. Ed.	G.1 - 3	G.4 - 6	Other areas	Do not teach	English	Social Studies	Mathematics	Languages	Science	Fine Arts	Physical Education	Home Economics	Industrial-Business-Voc. Ed.	G.1 - 3	G.4 - 6	Other areas	Do not teach	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Over 20 times	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	6.0	4.5	7.4	6.8	3.4	0.0	4.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.3	4.2	5.9	4.0	19.4	
11 - 20	0.5	2.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	3.8	6.0	2.6	0.6	1.2	1.5	0.0	10.4	1.1	2.7	2.0	0.0	2.7	7.5	1.2	5.3	2.8	2.3	2.2	2.0	4.5	
6 - 10	1.6	2.0	4.8	1.7	0.7	0.0	4.8	0.0	3.9	3.9	0.0	4.0	10.4	8.0	10.1	8.1	11.7	10.7	5.7	6.0	7.9	11.6	5.0	8.9	10.0	10.4	
3 - 5	12.2	10.1	5.4	11.7	8.1	9.4	8.4	7.9	7.7	14.3	14.1	22.0	14.9	13.8	17.6	12.9	10.0	16.1	5.7	12.0	23.7	7.7	13.5	13.3	16.0	10.4	
1 - 2	22.3	18.2	17.7	26.7	20.8	22.6	13.3	21.1	14.4	24.3	24.4	24.0	23.9	11.2	8.1	10.9	10.0	9.4	13.2	8.4	7.9	21.5	10.0	7.4	4.0	7.5	
Not used	47.3	52.7	54.4	46.7	53.7	50.9	50.6	55.3	60.2	39.8	49.6	36.0	25.4	37.2	29.7	38.1	41.7	31.5	37.7	43.4	31.6	33.7	27.4	17.3	44.0	31.3	
Not applicable	15.4	14.2	17.0	13.3	14.8	11.3	15.7	13.2	13.3	15.1	10.4	8.0	10.4	21.3	25.0	23.8	26.7	24.8	30.2	25.3	23.7	19.3	37.5	43.0	20.0	16.4	



in-school consultative services. Physical education teachers (31 percent) used in-school services least often.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.7

Statement. "What are teachers' perceptions of the value of central office and in-school consultative services?"

The majority of teachers who used central office and in-school services found them helpful. Over half the teachers who used central office services and over 80 percent of those who used in-school services rated them "Valuable" or "Very valuable" (Table 26).

Central office consultative services. Of the 56 percent of teachers who used central office services, 29 percent rated the services "Valuable" while 12 percent rated them "Not very valuable" and 4 percent rated them "Not valuable." Half of the county and division teachers who used the services considered them "Valuable" or "Very valuable," while of the 58 percent of public district teachers who used the services, 33 percent found them "Valuable" or "Very valuable." Seven percent of separate district teachers considered the services they used to be "Very valuable."

In-school consultative services. Eighty-one percent of teachers who had used in-school consultative services found them "Valuable" or "Very valuable," and only 11 percent did not find the services helpful. As with central office consultative services, a higher percentage of teachers who found the services "Valuable" or "Very valuable" were from the district jurisdictions. Over 60 percent

Table 26

Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Value of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services

Jurisdiction	Very valuable		Valuable		Not very valuable		Not valuable		Undecided		Not applicable	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<b>CENTRAL OFFICE</b>											
Counties	4.5	21.2	10.8	3.2	9.7	50.7						
Divisions	4.0	22.8	11.2	2.7	9.4	50.0						
Public Districts	5.4	27.4	14.2	4.8	6.2	42.2						
Separate Districts	7.0	31.3	11.1	3.7	5.5	41.4						
Overall	5.6	27.0	12.0	3.8	7.1	45.2						
	<b>IN-SCHOOL</b>											
Counties	4.2	24.3	5.2	1.0	3.5	61.8						
Divisions	6.7	24.6	4.5	0.9	4.9	58.5						
Public Districts	9.3	32.2	4.4	1.2	3.6	49.3						
Separate Districts	9.6	30.9	2.6	1.3	3.9	51.8						
Overall	8.1	29.2	3.9	1.2	3.9	53.8						

of county teachers indicated "Not applicable," and either did not use central office services or did not consider them to be available. Of the 38 percent of county teachers who used in-school consultative services, 24 percent found them "Valuable" and only 1 percent indicated that they considered them to be "Not valuable." The same percentage of separate district teachers considered their services "Not valuable" while over 30 percent indicated that they found the services "Valuable."

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.8

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the value of consultative services associated with:

1. number of years of post-secondary education,
2. grade level taught, and
3. subject area taught?"

#### Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

The group of teachers who considered central office and in-school consultative services to be most valuable were teachers with six years of post-secondary education (Table 27).

Central office consultative services. While the percentages of teachers indicating that the services were "Not very valuable" or "Not valuable" increased as the number of years of post-secondary education increased, the percentage of "Valuable" and "Very valuable" responses also increased overall. Teachers with three and four years of post-secondary education had lower percentages of "Valuable" and

Table 27

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education,  
of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services

Years of post-secondary education	Very valuable		Valuable		Not very valuable		Not valuable		Undecided		Not applicable	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	CENTRAL OFFICE											
6	7.1	36.9	12.8	6.4	3.5	33.3						
5	7.3	27.6	14.2	4.5	4.5	41.9						
4	4.8	25.9	12.7	4.3	6.7	45.4						
3	4.7	21.6	12.1	1.1	6.8	53.7						
2	5.0	29.8	7.7	3.9	7.2	46.4						
1	6.8	24.1	9.0	0.8	17.3	42.1						
	IN-SCHOOL											
6	7.8	35.5	2.8	0.7	2.1	51.1						
5	11.0	30.1	4.5	1.2	3.7	49.6						
4	8.4	30.9	3.9	1.0	4.8	51.0						
3	5.3	27.4	5.3	0.5	3.2	58.4						
2	7.7	22.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	61.3						
1	6.0	24.1	3.8	0.8	3.8	61.7						

"Very valuable" responses and higher percentages of "Not applicable" responses than did the other groups. Of teachers with one year of post-secondary education who used central office consultative services, over half found the services "Valuable" or "Very valuable" although 17 percent were "Undecided," a much higher percentage than the average (7 percent).

In-school consultative services. The pattern of teacher ratings of in-school services was similar to that for central office services. Higher percentages of "Valuable" and "Very valuable" responses were recorded by teachers with five and six years of post-secondary education. Over 60 percent of teachers with one and two years of post-secondary education did not use in-school consultative services or considered them to be unavailable. Eight percent of teachers with four years of training and 11 percent of those with five years of post-secondary education considered the services to be "Very valuable." Compared with teachers' perceptions of central office services, more teachers saw in-school services as "Valuable" and fewer found them unsatisfactory.

#### Response Classified by Grade Level Taught

Teachers' ratings of central office consultative services as "Valuable" and "Very valuable" fell with increasing grade level, while their ratings of in-school services as "Valuable" increased as grade level increased (Table 28).

Table 28

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Value of Central Office  
and In-School Consultative Services

Grade level taught	CENTRAL OFFICE					IN-SCHOOL						
	Very valuable %	Valuable %	Not very valuable %	Not valuable %	Undecided %	Not applicable %	Very valuable %	Valuable %	Not very valuable %	Not valuable %	Undecided %	Not applicable %
K - G.3	6.4	30.3	11.6	3.2	10.8	37.8	7.6	22.7	5.2	0.4	4.4	59.8
G.4 - 6	5.1	27.7	9.4	2.7	7.4	47.4	5.5	27.0	2.7	1.2	3.9	59.8
G.7 - 9	4.1	26.0	9.4	3.6	8.6	48.3	6.9	31.5	3.9	1.1	3.0	53.6
G.10 - 12	5.7	23.2	15.5	4.9	4.7	45.9	9.6	30.9	4.2	1.6	4.2	49.3

Central office consultative services. Teachers' ratings of central office consultative services as being "Valuable" or "Very valuable" fell with increasing grade level. Thirty-seven percent of K - G.3 teachers found the services "Valuable" or "Very valuable," while only 29 percent of G.10 - 12 teachers did so. The highest percentage of "Not very valuable" and "Not valuable" responses came from G.10 - 12 teachers.

In-school consultative services. Teachers in the higher grades most often considered the services as being "Valuable" or "Very valuable." Thirty percent of K - G.3 teachers saw the services as "Valuable" or "Very valuable" whereas 41 percent of G.10 - 12 teachers found them "Valuable" or "Very valuable." A greater percentage of elementary teachers (60 percent) than secondary teachers (51 percent) either did not use in-school services or did not consider them to be available.

#### Responses Classified by Subject Area Taught

Table 29 shows teachers' ratings of central office and in-school services by subject area taught. Teachers were generally satisfied with central office and in-school consultative services across all subject areas.

Central office consultative services. Just over half the teachers who used central office consultative services found them "Valuable" or "Very valuable," regardless of subject area. While 58 percent of "other" teachers (for example, religious education,

Table 29

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Subject Area Taught, of Value of Central Office and In-School Consultative Services

	English	Social Studies	Mathematics	Languages	Science	Fine Arts	Physical Education	Home Economics	Industrial-Business-Voc. Ed.	G.1-2-3	G.4-5-6	Other areas	Do not teach
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	4.8	3.4	7.5	11.7	2.0	11.3	8.4	0.0	5.0	5.4	1.5	20.0	6.0
	27.1	21.6	21.8	26.7	28.9	18.9	28.9	26.3	17.7	29.7	30.4	34.0	52.2
	13.8	16.9	12.9	10.0	8.7	11.3	7.2	10.5	15.5	11.6	9.6	8.0	10.4
	4.8	6.8	2.0	1.7	6.0	5.7	3.6	0.0	3.9	3.1	3.0	4.0	0.0
	4.8	4.7	4.8	3.3	8.7	5.7	7.2	13.2	6.6	12.4	7.4	2.0	4.5
	44.7	46.6	51.0	46.7	45.6	47.2	44.6	50.0	51.4	37.8	48.1	32.0	26.9
	CENTRAL OFFICE												
	7.4	10.8	6.8	10.0	9.4	5.7	4.8	2.6	9.9	6.9	6.7	10.0	11.9
	32.4	28.4	29.9	25.0	31.5	18.9	24.1	42.1	32.6	23.2	28.9	32.0	38.8
	3.2	5.4	4.8	3.3	2.7	7.5	2.4	2.6	5.0	5.0	2.2	0.0	3.0
	0.5	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.3	3.8	1.2	0.0	2.2	0.4	1.5	0.0	0.0
	2.1	4.1	3.4	3.3	2.0	5.7	8.4	0.0	5.5	4.2	5.2	2.0	1.5
	54.3	50.0	53.7	56.7	53.0	58.5	59.0	52.6	44.8	60.2	55.6	56.0	44.8
	IN-SCHOOL												



family life education, special education) found the central office services available to them to be "Valuable" or "Very valuable," the lowest percentage of these responses came from social studies (25 percent), home economics (26 percent) and industrial-business-vocational education teachers (23 percent). Eleven percent of teachers of languages and fine arts teachers and 20 percent of "other" teachers found the services they used to be "Very valuable."

Six percent of social studies and science teachers rated the services "Not valuable" and 17 percent of social studies teachers and 16 percent of industrial-business-vocational education teachers rated central office consultative services as "Not very valuable."

In-school consultative services. Teachers' ratings of in-school consultative services were generally higher than their ratings of central office consultative services. Ten percent of social studies teachers and teachers of languages rated the in-school services they had used as "Very valuable," while 32 percent of English, science, "other" and industrial-business-vocational education teachers and 42 percent of home economics teachers rated the services as "Valuable." Fine arts teachers expressed the most dissatisfaction with in-school consultative services, 11 percent indicating that the services they used were "Not very valuable" or "Not valuable." Over 56 percent of fine arts, physical education, elementary teachers, and teachers of languages either did not use in-school services or found the services not available.

## SUB-PROBLEM 1.9

Statement. "To what extent do teachers expect to use the following regional office consultative services:

1. subject area consultation,
2. program evaluation,
3. staff development,
4. educational research assistance,
5. media (library/audio-visual),
6. assistance in curriculum and instructional innovation,
7. pupil guidance and/or counselling, and
8. program planning assistance in intercultural education?"

Forty percent of teachers indicated that they expected to use subject area consultation, curriculum and instruction innovation, staff development, and library and media services provided by regional office personnel. Approximately 20 percent of teachers indicated "Don't know," and the percentage of "No use expected" responses varied between 25 percent for curriculum and instruction innovation services and 38 percent for program development in intercultural education (Tables 30 - 33).

Subject area consultation. Overall 42 percent of teachers expected to use regional office subject area consultation services. More county (48 percent) and separate district (45 percent) teachers expected to use the service than did division and public district teachers (both 38 percent). Five percent of county teachers expected

Table 30

Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services  
in (1) Subject Area Consultation and (2) Program Evaluation

(N = 1558)

Jurisdiction		Extensive use %	Moderate use %	Some use %	No use expected %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	SUBJECT AREA CONSULTATION						
Counties		4.9	12.2	31.3	21.5	14.2	16.0
Divisions		0.9	10.7	26.8	21.4	10.7	29.5
Public Districts		2.4	8.0	27.4	33.2	9.9	19.1
Separate Districts		4.1	10.3	30.6	24.1	11.1	19.9
Overall		3.2	10.0	29.1	26.2	11.2	20.3
	PROGRAM EVALUATION						
Counties		1.4	8.3	20.8	28.5	18.4	22.6
Divisions		1.3	4.5	22.8	25.9	14.3	31.3
Public Districts		1.4	6.2	18.9	35.6	13.3	24.7
Separate Districts		3.3	7.7	23.2	27.6	14.0	24.1
Overall		2.1	6.9	21.3	30.1	14.6	25.0

Table 31  
 Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services  
 in (1) Staff Development and (2) Educational Research  
 (N = 1558)

Jurisdiction	Extensive use		Moderate use		Some use		No use expected		Undecided		Don't know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	STAFF DEVELOPMENT											
Counties	2.1	9.4	27.4	24.3	17.7	19.1						
Divisions	1.3	13.4	27.2	19.6	10.3	28.1						
Public Districts	3.2	7.2	24.1	32.4	11.3	21.9						
Separate Districts	4.1	9.0	25.6	23.4	15.3	22.7						
Overall	3.0	9.1	25.7	25.9	13.7	22.5						
	EDUC. RESEARCH											
Counties	1.0	2.1	13.5	34.7	17.7	30.9						
Divisions	0.9	2.7	13.8	29.9	17.0	35.7						
Public Districts	1.6	4.6	14.1	37.8	15.1	26.8						
Separate Districts	2.0	5.9	15.8	32.2	16.0	28.0						
Overall	1.5	4.3	14.6	34.2	16.2	29.3						

Table 32

Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services  
in (1) Media and (2) Instructional and Curriculum Innovation

(N = 1558)

Jurisdiction	Extensive use %	Moderate use %	Some use %	No use expected %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	MEDIA					
Counties	4.2	6.3	22.6	27.4	15.3	24.3
Divisions	2.7	8.9	24.6	24.1	12.1	27.7
Public Districts	2.4	9.7	24.9	31.8	9.2	22.1
Separate Districts	5.3	12.9	28.6	22.5	11.6	19.2
Overall	3.8	10.1	25.7	26.6	11.6	22.3
	INNOVATION					
Counties	4.2	8.0	30.2	22.2	15.3	20.1
Divisions	2.2	9.4	29.5	17.0	10.7	31.3
Public Districts	2.6	7.8	23.5	30.8	12.5	22.9
Separate Districts	4.1	11.6	24.9	25.4	13.6	20.4
Overall	3.3	9.4	26.1	25.4	13.2	22.7

Table 33  
 Expectations of Teachers in Sample of Extent of Use of Regional Office Services in (1) Pupil Guidance  
 and/or Counselling and (2) Intercultural Education Programs

(N = 1558)

Jurisdiction	Extensive use %	Moderate use %	Some use %	No use expected %	Undecided %	Don't know %
Counties	3.1	5.9	11.5	35.1	17.0	27.4
Divisions	3.6	6.7	24.1	21.9	12.5	31.3
Public Districts	1.4	6.2	16.3	40.2	10.1	25.8
Separate Districts	2.0	9.0	17.3	32.8	11.6	27.3
Overall	2.3	7.2	16.9	34.0	12.3	27.4
Counties	0.4	2.1	6.9	40.6	18.8	31.3
Divisions	1.8	4.0	14.3	29.9	11.6	38.4
Public Districts	0.4	3.0	7.0	47.1	11.3	31.2
Separate Districts	2.0	5.5	13.1	31.9	14.0	33.5
Overall	1.2	3.9	10.1	38.1	13.7	33.1

to make "Extensive use" of the service while this was indicated by less than 1 percent of division teachers. Division teachers, however, had the largest percentage of "Don't know" responses (30 percent). Thirty-three percent of public district teachers indicated that they did not expect to use this service.

Program evaluation. In general, 30 percent of teachers expected to use this regional office service, 30 percent indicated "No use expected" and 39 percent were "Undecided" or responded "Don't know." Thirty-four percent of separate district teachers expected to use the program evaluation service and 3 percent expected to make "Extensive use" of this service. Division teachers again had the greatest percentage of "Don't know" responses (31 percent) and county teachers were the most "Undecided" (18 percent). Thirty-six percent of public district teachers indicated "No use expected."

Staff development. Twenty-six percent of teachers expected to make "Some use" and 9 percent indicated "Moderate use" of the regional office staff development service. More division teachers (42 percent) expected to use this service, and 4 percent of separate district teachers expected to make "Extensive use" of the service.

Educational research assistance. Overall, 20 percent of teachers expected to use this regional office service, 34 percent indicated "No use expected" and 29 percent responded "Don't know." More district than division and county teachers expected to use the

service. Over 5 percent of all teachers indicated that they expected to make at least "Moderate use" of the service.

Media (Library/Audio-visual). Twenty-six percent of teachers indicated "Some use" and 10 percent indicated "Moderate use" of regional office library and audio-visual services. Separate district teachers (47 percent) expected to make most use of the service, while only 33 percent of county teachers expected to use the service. Four percent of county teachers indicated "Extensive use" of media services.

Curriculum and Instruction Innovation. Forty percent of county, division, and separate district teachers and 34 percent of public district teachers indicated expected use of this regional office service. Over 15 percent of separate district teachers expected to make "Moderate use" or "Extensive use" of the curriculum and instruction innovation service.

Pupil guidance and/or counselling. In general, 26 percent of teachers expected to use this service while 34 percent indicated "No use expected" and 27 percent recorded "Don't know" responses. Over 34 percent of division teachers expected to use this service, with 4 percent indicating "Extensive use." Only 21 percent of county teachers indicated expected use of this service, while 35 percent indicated "No use expected."

Program development in intercultural education. Only 15 percent of teachers expected to use this regional office service.



Fourteen percent of division teachers indicated that they expected to make "Some use" of this service. While over 40 percent of county and public district teachers responded "No use expected," a large percentage of teachers, 47 percent overall, either were "Undecided" or indicated "Don't know."

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.10

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' expected use of regional office services associated with the grade level span of the school?"

#### Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span

When teachers' responses were compared according to the grade level span of the school (Table 34), the four regional office consultative services, namely, subject area consultation, staff development, media, and curriculum and instruction assistance were chosen by teachers in all types of schools as the services which they expected to use most often. Thirty-five percent of elementary-junior-senior high school teachers expected to use program evaluation services. Over 30 percent of junior high school teachers and senior high school teachers indicated that they expected to use pupil guidance and/or counselling services.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 1.11

Statement. "How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in

Table 34

Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span,  
 Indicating Expected Use of Regional Office Services

Grade level span	N teachers	subject area consultation %	Program evaluation %	Staff development %	Educational research assistance %	Media %	Curriculum and instruction %	Pupil guidance/counseling %	Program development in inter-cultural education %
Elementary	304	38.4	26.4	40.6	16.6	35.4	33.1	25.6	15.1
Junior High	155	39.2	28.2	38.1	17.2	37.6	39.7	32.5	18.8
Senior High	527	47.9	28.4	38.4	17.9	43.7	39.5	31.6	14.2
Elementary-Junior High	247	45.7	30.2	40.1	19.8	41.3	40.1	25.4	14.0
Junior High-Senior High	109	37.0	32.0	33.3	26.8	38.1	37.3	23.6	14.6
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	216	35.4	35.4	30.4	23.4	34.1	37.6	20.5	17.8

all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of central office and in-school consultative personnel?"

The perceptions of urban teachers differed from those of rural teachers with regard to central office consultative services as shown in Table 35. Urban teachers were more satisfied with the numbers of personnel available, 49 percent indicating that the numbers of central office personnel were "Sufficient." More urban teachers considered the numbers of central office personnel to be "Too many" (11 percent) while only 3 percent of rural teachers thought that they were "Too many" personnel. More rural teachers (19 percent) than urban teachers (3 percent) saw central office consultative services as "Unavailable."

In-school consultative services. Thirty-six percent of teachers considered the numbers of in-school personnel to be "Sufficient," and of these 49 percent were urban teachers and 28 percent were rural teachers. The percentages of teachers indicating that the numbers of personnel were "Too few" differed little between the jurisdictions but a much higher percentage of rural teachers (36 percent) than urban teachers (11 percent) rated the service "Unavailable."

#### SUMMARY

This chapter presented teachers' responses to Problem 1, namely, what are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of consultative staff, and the extent of use and value of consultative services provided by central office, in-school and regional office personnel?

Table 35  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office  
 and In-School Consultative Services**

		N (teachers)	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
			Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
Urban <sup>a</sup>	URBAN	589	11.4	44.8	20.6	3.5	7.7	12.0
Rural <sup>b</sup>	URBAN	989	2.5	30.1	28.7	19.2	5.8	13.7
Overall		1558	5.8	35.5	25.7	13.5	6.5	13.0
Urban <sup>a</sup>	RURAL	589	0.9	49.0	24.3	11.1	6.7	8.1
Rural <sup>b</sup>	RURAL	989	0.1	27.9	22.6	36.4	5.6	7.4
Overall		1558	0.4	35.6	23.2	27.2	6.0	7.6

<sup>a</sup> Teachers in school systems with over 18 program and instructional staff.

<sup>b</sup> Teachers in school systems with less than 7 program and instructional staff.

While teachers' opinions of the adequacy of numbers of consultative personnel in central office were divided between those who considered the numbers "Sufficient" and those who found them insufficient, ("Too few" and "Unavailable"), the majority felt that there were insufficient personnel in schools to perform this service.

Over half of the teachers used central office and in-school consultative services. Elementary teachers used central office services most often, while senior high school teachers made most use of in-school consultative services.

Over half of the teachers who used central office consultative services and over 80 percent of teachers who used in-school services found them to be "Valuable" or "Very valuable." Teachers' ratings of central office services fell with increasing grade level while those for in-school services increased.

Urban teachers were more satisfied than rural teachers with the numbers of central office personnel available. Forty-nine percent of urban teachers indicated that the numbers of central office consultative personnel were "Sufficient."

Forty percent of teachers indicated that they expected to use the following regional office services: subject area consultation, curriculum and instruction innovation, staff development, and library and media services. Twenty percent of teachers were unable to indicate how much they expected to use regional office services.

## Chapter 6

### PRESENTATION OF DATA RELATED TO AUXILIARY SERVICES

This chapter describes teachers' responses to the other problems concerning auxiliary services, both in central office and in-school, the location of services, and the preferred allocation of future staff.

Problem 2 asked: What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, audio-visual, library aide, administrative, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?

#### SUB-PROBLEM 2.1

Statement. "What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, and audio-visual services?"

Teachers were divided over the adequacy of staff development and audio-visual personnel but regarded the numbers of central office personnel available to provide guidance services as insufficient (Tables 36-37).

Table 36

Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide  
(1) Guidance Services and (2) Staff Development Services

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
GUIDANCE	Counties	2.1	16.7	30.9	29.5	8.0	12.9
	Divisions	0.0	15.2	29.5	32.6	9.8	13.0
	Public Districts	6.0	27.2	34.8	10.3	4.6	17.1
	Separate Districts	4.1	30.9	24.7	19.0	5.5	15.8
	Overall	3.7	24.8	29.8	20.1	6.3	15.3
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	Counties	1.0	29.5	36.1	17.4	7.6	8.3
	Divisions	0.5	44.6	29.0	8.9	7.6	9.4
	Public Districts	8.8	34.4	28.4	10.5	6.8	11.1
	Separate Districts	3.0	32.6	35.1	11.2	6.3	11.8
	Overall	4.1	34.3	32.3	11.8	6.9	10.6

Table 37

Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel to Provide Audio-Visual Services

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Counties	0.4	42.7	31.6	10.1	5.9	9.4
Divisions	0.5	36.6	33.5	15.2	4.5	9.8
Public Districts	3.0	48.1	30.4	8.4	3.4	6.8
Separate Districts	2.0	49.4	28.2	7.7	3.7	9.0
Overall	1.8	45.9	30.3	9.4	4.1	8.5

AUDIO-VISUAL



Central office guidance services. The majority of teachers considered the numbers of central office guidance personnel to be insufficient with 30 percent indicating that the numbers were "Too few" and 20 percent indicating that the service was "Unavailable." District teachers were more satisfied with the numbers of personnel. Twenty-seven percent of public district teachers indicated that there were "Sufficient" personnel. The majority of county and division teachers were dissatisfied with the numbers of central office guidance personnel. Thirty-one percent of county teachers responded "Too few" and another 30 percent indicated "Unavailable." Despite the higher percentage of "Sufficient" responses from public district teachers, 35 percent considered that there were "Too few" central office guidance personnel.

Central office staff development services. Of all teachers, 34 percent felt that there were "Sufficient" staff development personnel in central office, but 32 percent indicated that the numbers were "Too few" and 12 percent considered the service to be "Unavailable." Over half of the county teachers and 46 percent of separate district teachers indicated that there were insufficient personnel, while 9 percent of public district teachers felt that there were "Too many" personnel in this area. The proportion of "Don't know" responses was lower than the average (11 percent) for county teachers (8 percent).

Central office audio-visual services. A higher proportion of teachers (46 percent) saw this service as having "Sufficient" personnel and fewer were "Undecided" or indicated "Don't know." County and division teachers again expressed the most dissatisfaction. Thirty-two percent of county and 34 percent of division teachers thought that there were "Too few" audio-visual personnel in central office. A further 15 percent of division teachers considered the service to be "Unavailable."

#### SUB-PROBLEM 2.2

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel associated with:

1. grade level span of the school,
2. length of employment in the school system,
3. number of years of post-secondary education?"

#### Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span

Only senior high teachers were satisfied with guidance services (Tables 38-39), but most groups were satisfied with the numbers of personnel providing audio-visual services. Elementary and elementary-junior high school teachers were the only groups to be generally satisfied with the numbers of staff development personnel.

Table 38

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide (1) Guidance Services and (2) Staff Development Services

Grade level span	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	GUIDANCE					
Elementary	1.3	18.4	36.2	27.6	4.6	11.8
Junior High	2.6	29.7	28.4	16.8	6.5	16.1
Senior High	8.3	37.0	24.7	5.1	5.7	19.2
Elementary-Junior High	1.2	15.8	40.5	23.5	6.5	12.6
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	31.2	16.5	22.9	10.1	19.3
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	1.4	7.9	28.7	43.1	7.9	11.1
	STAFF DEVELOPMENT					
Elementary	2.0	41.4	27.6	14.5	5.6	8.9
Junior High	1.9	23.9	40.6	11.0	9.7	12.9
Senior High	9.1	30.2	31.7	7.6	8.2	13.3
Elementary-Junior High	1.6	43.7	35.2	8.1	2.8	8.5
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	31.2	36.7	11.9	11.9	8.3
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	1.4	32.9	28.7	23.1	5.6	8.3

**Table 39**  
**Assessment by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of**  
**Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services**

	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Elementary	1.0	46.1	26.6	12.8	5.3	8.2
Junior High	1.3	49.0	26.5	11.6	5.8	5.8
Senior High	3.8	52.0	28.8	3.8	2.8	8.7
Elementary- Junior High	1.2	42.1	35.2	11.7	1.2	8.5
Junior High- Senior High	0.0	54.1	26.6	4.6	7.3	7.3
Elementary- Junior High- Senior High	0.0	28.7	38.0	16.7	6.0	10.6

Central office guidance services. Thirty-seven percent of senior high school teachers rated the numbers of central office guidance personnel as "Sufficient" and 8 percent felt that there were "Too many" such personnel. Elementary teachers were dissatisfied with the numbers of guidance personnel; 36 percent of elementary teachers and 40 percent of elementary-junior high teachers indicated that they considered the numbers to be "Too few." Forty-three percent of elementary-junior-senior high school teachers felt that central office guidance services were "Unavailable."

Central office staff development services. Elementary and elementary-junior high school teachers were the groups most satisfied with the numbers of staff development personnel in central office. Forty-one percent of elementary teachers and 44 percent of elementary-junior high school teachers considered the numbers of personnel "Sufficient." However, 40 percent of junior high school teachers felt that there were "Too few" staff development personnel.

Central office audio-visual services. Senior high teachers (52 percent) and junior-senior high school teachers (54 percent) had the highest percentages of "Sufficient" responses and elementary-junior-senior high school teachers recorded the lowest percentage (29 percent) of "Sufficient" responses. Seventeen percent of teachers in this latter group felt that central office audio-visual services were "Unavailable."

### Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System

Teachers with more years of employment in the school system tended to have higher percentages of "Sufficient" responses with regard to the numbers of guidance and audio-visual personnel in central office, but lower percentages of "Sufficient" responses concerning the numbers of central office staff development personnel as shown in Tables 40-42.

Central office guidance services. While 45 percent of teachers with one, three to four, and ten to fourteen years of employment in the school system indicated that there were insufficient guidance personnel in central office, over 50 percent of teachers in the other groups also indicated that the numbers were "Too few" or the service "Unavailable." Twenty-five percent of teachers in their first year of employment with the school system indicated "Don't know" responses. The largest percentage of "Sufficient" responses came from teachers with ten to fourteen years of experience in the school system.

Central office staff development services. Teachers with ten to fourteen years of employment in the school system were the most satisfied with the numbers of central office staff development personnel. Forty-one percent of this group indicated that they thought the number of personnel was "Sufficient." Thirty-five percent of teachers with three to nine years of employment in the in the school system found the numbers of staff development personnel

Table 40  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School System, of Adequacy  
of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Guidance Services**

Years of employment in school system	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
Over 35	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
25 - 34	0.0	22.2	18.5	22.2	7.4	29.6
20 - 24	5.7	25.7	34.3	25.7	0.0	8.6
15 - 19	6.0	18.1	28.9	22.9	7.2	16.9
10 - 14	4.6	34.1	26.0	18.5	6.9	9.8
5 - 9	4.4	24.6	34.1	19.7	5.5	11.7
3 - 4	3.9	28.1	26.0	18.8	5.7	17.5
2	3.1	21.1	32.6	24.2	4.8	14.1
1	0.6	17.6	28.2	17.1	11.2	25.3

Table 41  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School System, of Adequacy  
of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Staff Development Services**

Years of employment in school system	Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Over 35	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
25 - 34	3.7	37.0	29.6	11.1	7.4	11.1	11.1
20 - 24	2.9	31.4	34.3	11.4	5.7	14.3	14.3
15 - 19	6.0	34.9	27.7	12.0	9.6	9.6	9.6
10 - 14	4.6	40.5	28.9	10.4	7.5	8.1	8.1
5 - 9	5.3	32.1	34.7	15.0	6.0	6.9	6.9
3 - 4	3.6	33.0	34.5	9.5	5.7	13.7	13.7
2	4.0	34.4	33.0	12.8	7.0	8.8	8.8
1	1.2	37.1	25.3	8.8	9.4	18.2	18.2



Table 42  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School System, of Adequacy  
of Numbers of Central Office Personnel To Provide Audio-Visual Services**

Years of employment in school system	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Over 35	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25 - 34	0.0	51.9	22.2	3.7	11.1	11.1
20 - 24	2.9	51.4	40.0	2.9	0.0	2.9
15 - 19	1.2	47.0	24.1	13.3	4.8	9.6
10 - 14	2.3	50.3	26.0	9.2	4.6	7.5
5 - 9	2.4	48.5	29.6	9.1	4.0	6.4
3 - 4	2.3	46.4	30.7	8.2	3.1	9.3
2	0.9	43.6	34.4	13.7	1.8	5.7
1	0.0	32.9	32.9	8.2	8.8	17.1

in central office to be "Too few," and 15 percent of teachers with five to nine years of employment saw the service as "Unavailable." The highest percentage of "Don't know" responses came from teachers in their first year of employment with the school system.

Central office audio-visual services. Over 45 percent of teachers who had been employed by the school system for more than two years were satisfied with the numbers of personnel and indicated that the numbers were "Sufficient." Approximately 33 percent of teachers in their first two years of employment with the school system found the numbers of central office audio-visual personnel to be "Too few" and 14 percent of teachers who were in their second year of employment found the service "Unavailable."

#### Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

The percentage of teacher responses indicating satisfaction with the numbers of guidance and audio-visual personnel (Tables 43-45), increased as the number of years of post-secondary education increased. Teachers, regardless of the length of their post-secondary education, were dissatisfied with the numbers of staff development personnel.

Central office guidance services. The percentage of "Sufficient" responses increased from 15 percent for teachers with one year of training to 36 percent for teachers with six or more years of post-secondary education. Thirty-nine percent of those with two years of post-secondary education felt that there were "Too few" central office guidance personnel, and 32 percent of teachers with

Table 43  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel  
To Provide Guidance Services**

Years of post- secondary education	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
6	7.1	35.5	26.2	12.8	2.1	16.3
5	6.1	30.1	26.8	15.0	8.9	13.0
4	4.0	24.1	30.7	19.0	6.1	15.9
3	1.6	22.6	28.4	24.7	4.7	17.9
2	0.6	21.5	34.8	22.7	7.2	13.3
1	1.5	15.0	29.3	32.3	7.5	14.3

Table 44  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel  
To Provide Staff Development Services**

Years of post- secondary education	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
6	6.4	32.6	36.9	7.8	6.4	9.9
5	7.3	37.4	24.8	11.0	9.3	10.2
4	4.8	31.8	34.3	12.1	6.4	10.5
3	2.1	35.8	32.1	11.1	4.7	14.2
2	0.0	41.4	30.4	13.3	7.2	7.7
1	0.8	31.6	33.8	15.0	7.5	11.3

Table 45

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of Central Office Personnel  
To Provide Audio-Visual Services

Years of post- secondary education	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
6	3.5	49.6	29.1	5.0	4.3	8.5
5	2.4	57.3	22.0	9.3	3.3	5.7
4	2.1	43.0	34.6	7.8	3.9	8.5
3	1.1	41.6	31.1	12.1	4.2	10.0
2	0.6	47.0	23.8	14.4	6.1	8.3
1	0.0	39.8	33.1	12.0	3.8	11.3

one year of post-secondary education considered the service to be "Unavailable."

Central office staff development services. The highest percentage of "Sufficient" responses came from teachers with two years of training, 41 percent of whom considered the numbers to be adequate. Only 25 percent of teachers with five years of post-secondary education felt that there were "Too few" central office staff development personnel, while 34 percent of teachers with one year of training thought that the numbers were insufficient. Fifteen percent of teachers with one year of post-secondary education felt that the service was "Unavailable."

Central office audio-visual services. Over 40 percent of all teachers regardless of length of post-secondary education indicated that there were "Sufficient" audio-visual personnel in central office. Teachers with three and four years of training recorded higher percentages of "Too few" responses. One-third of teachers with one year of post-secondary education felt that there were "Too few" personnel and a further 12 percent considered the service "Unavailable."

### SUB-PROBLEM 2.3

Statement. "What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel to provide administrative, audio-visual, pupil guidance and/or counselling, library aide, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?"

In general, teachers were satisfied with the numbers of administrative and library aide personnel in the school, as shown in Tables 46-49, dissatisfied with the numbers of laboratory assistants and teacher aides, and divided over the adequacy of numbers of guidance, audio-visual and clerical services.

In-school administrative services. Nineteen percent of division teachers and 15 percent of county teachers felt that there were insufficient personnel to provide administrative services. Fewer division teachers (less than 1 percent) than the average (3 percent) felt that there were "Too many" administrators in the school.

In-school audio-visual services. While 44 percent of teachers considered the numbers of audio-visual personnel in school to be "Sufficient," 35 percent indicated that there were "Too few" personnel and 13 percent considered the service to be "Unavailable." Higher percentages of county and division teachers considered the service "Unavailable" and more district than county and division teachers indicated that there were "Too few" personnel.

In-school guidance services. Over 44 percent of division teachers saw this service as "Unavailable" and another 26 percent felt that the numbers of guidance personnel available were "Too few." The overall response pattern for district teachers indicated slightly more satisfaction with the availability of the service, although 43 percent of public and separate district teachers felt that there were insufficient personnel.

**Table 46**  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Administrative Services**

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Counties	3.5	74.3	10.4	4.9	2.1	4.9
Divisions	0.9	68.8	15.2	3.6	6.3	5.4
Public Districts	3.4	78.7	8.2	0.6	3.4	5.8
Separate Districts	3.7	76.2	11.1	1.8	2.0	5.2
Overall	3.2	75.6	10.6	2.3	3.1	5.3



**Table 47**  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide**  
**(1) Audio-Visual Services and (2) Guidance Services**

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>AUDIO-VISUAL</b>						
Counties	0.0	40.6	31.9	18.4	4.2	4.9
Divisions	0.0	37.1	33.9	19.6	4.5	4.9
Public Districts	0.4	44.5	35.8	11.5	4.2	3.6
Separate Districts	0.2	47.3	36.1	9.4	2.6	4.4
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.3</b>
<b>GUIDANCE</b>						
Counties	0.4	33.0	30.9	25.4	5.6	4.9
Divisions	0.0	21.0	25.9	44.2	2.7	6.3
Public Districts	5.0	43.1	34.0	8.8	3.4	5.8
Separate Districts	5.5	45.7	26.5	16.6	2.0	3.7
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.9</b>

Table 48  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide  
 (1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services**

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<b>LIBRARY AIDE</b>						
Counties	0.0	41.3	24.3	24.0	3.1	7.3	
Divisions	0.0	40.6	24.1	22.3	2.2	10.7	
Public Districts	0.8	53.5	22.7	10.5	3.8	8.8	
Separate Districts	0.7	48.1	27.3	15.1	1.8	7.0	
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>8.2</b>	
	<b>LAB. ASSISTANT</b>						
Counties	0.0	4.5	11.1	54.5	6.9	22.9	
Divisions	0.0	8.0	9.8	58.0	3.1	20.5	
Public Districts	0.0	12.9	17.3	38.2	3.2	28.4	
Separate Districts	0.0	19.0	16.8	34.8	4.2	25.2	
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>25.2</b>	

**Table 49**  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide**  
**(1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services**

Jurisdiction	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<b>TEACHER AIDE</b>					
Counties	0.4	8.0	16.0	67.4	2.8	5.6
Divisions	0.0	17.9	17.0	55.8	3.1	6.3
Public Districts	0.0	9.9	27.8	48.9	4.0	9.3
Separate Districts	0.4	15.3	30.0	44.2	2.0	8.1
Overall	0.2	12.6	24.8	51.7	3.0	7.7
	<b>CLERICAL</b>					
Counties	0.0	43.4	42.4	8.0	3.5	2.8
Divisions	0.0	37.5	37.5	18.3	3.1	3.6
Public Districts	0.2	49.9	39.8	4.0	3.2	3.0
Separate Districts	0.2	48.1	41.4	5.5	1.3	3.5
Overall	0.1	46.3	40.5	7.3	2.6	3.2

In-school library aide services. Although over 40 percent of all teachers indicated that the number of in-school library aides was "Sufficient," almost equal percentages of county and division teachers saw the numbers of personnel as "Too few" and "Unavailable." Eleven percent of division teachers indicated "Don't know" responses.

In-school laboratory assistant services. The availability of these personnel was much more marked in the districts than in the divisions and counties, where over half of the teachers saw them as being "Unavailable." Nineteen percent of separate district teachers and thirteen percent of public districts indicated that the numbers of laboratory assistants were "Sufficient," while only 5 percent of county teachers thought that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Overall, 25 percent of teachers indicated that they "Don't know" and another 4 percent were "Undecided" about laboratory assistants in the school.

In-school teacher aide services. Only 13 percent of teachers considered the numbers of teacher aides in the school to be "Sufficient." Sixty-seven percent of county teachers and 56 percent of division teachers felt that this service was "Unavailable." The majority of teachers indicated that the numbers of teacher aides in the school were "Too few" or that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school clerical services. While almost half of district teachers felt that the numbers of in-school clerical staff were "Sufficient," 40 percent thought that there were "Too few" personnel available. Eighteen percent of division teachers indicated that this service was "Unavailable" in the school.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 2.4

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel associated with:

1. length of employment in the present school, and
2. grade level span of the school?"

#### Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the Present School

Regardless of the number of years that they had been employed on their present school staffs, teachers were generally satisfied with the numbers of personnel providing administrative and clerical services (Tables 50-53). Teachers in their second year on staff viewed all in-school services more favorably than did teachers who had been on staff for a longer time. Teachers with more years of employment in a school, more often indicated that there were "Too few" or "Unavailable" personnel. This was noticeable in the responses regarding in-school guidance activities, where teachers with three to four years on staff expressed the highest percentage of satisfied responses.

**Table 50**  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School,**  
**of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide**  
**Administrative Services**

Years on school staff	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%
25 - 34	11	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0
20 - 24	19	5.3	57.9	21.1	10.5	0.0	5.3
15 - 19	47	2.1	70.2	8.5	6.4	6.4	6.4
10 - 14	107	3.7	69.2	14.0	2.8	4.7	5.6
5 - 9	393	4.1	74.0	10.2	2.5	3.3	5.9
3 - 4	408	3.7	77.0	10.5	2.5	2.0	4.4
2	291	2.4	80.4	8.6	1.4	3.1	4.1
1	282	1.8	75.2	12.1	1.1	3.2	6.7



Table 52

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide  
(1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services

Years of employment in school system	Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 35	0.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0
25 - 34	0.0	42.1	36.8	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
20 - 24	0.0	40.4	25.5	25.5	0.0	8.5	8.5
15 - 19	0.9	45.8	17.8	26.2	1.9	7.5	7.5
10 - 14	1.0	43.0	24.2	20.9	3.1	7.9	7.9
5 - 9	0.7	49.3	28.4	13.7	2.7	5.1	5.1
3 - 4	0.0	55.3	22.3	12.4	2.1	7.9	7.9
2	0.0	46.1	24.5	12.1	3.9	13.5	13.5
1							
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Over 35	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
25 - 34	0.0	5.3	36.8	36.8	0.0	21.1	21.1
20 - 24	2.1	8.5	12.8	51.1	4.3	21.3	21.3
15 - 19	0.0	8.4	9.3	55.1	5.6	21.5	21.5
10 - 14	0.0	12.7	15.5	44.8	4.6	22.4	22.4
5 - 9	0.0	13.5	17.6	45.1	3.2	20.6	20.6
3 - 4	0.0	14.1	13.1	38.8	5.8	28.2	28.2
2	0.0	13.8	13.1	35.8	2.8	34.4	34.4
1							

LIBRARY AIDE

LAB. ASSISTANT



Table 53

**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Length of Employment in School,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide  
(1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services**

Years of employment in school system	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	<b>TEACHER AIDE</b>					
Over 35	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
25 - 34	0.0	0.0	20.0	50.0	10.0	20.0
20 - 24	0.0	15.8	26.3	57.9	0.0	0.0
15 - 19	0.0	8.5	14.9	68.1	2.1	6.4
10 - 14	0.0	11.2	18.7	57.0	4.7	8.4
5 - 9	0.5	12.0	24.9	51.9	3.6	7.1
3 - 4	0.0	10.0	27.2	54.7	3.4	4.7
2	0.3	16.8	22.3	50.9	2.1	7.6
1	0.0	14.2	28.0	42.6	1.8	13.5
	<b>CLERICAL</b>					
Over 35	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25 - 34	0.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	10.0
20 - 24	0.0	42.1	36.8	15.8	0.0	5.3
15 - 19	0.0	48.9	29.8	12.8	4.3	4.3
10 - 14	0.9	52.3	33.6	5.6	3.7	3.7
5 - 9	0.3	45.5	40.5	7.6	2.3	3.8
3 - 4	0.0	43.1	45.8	6.9	2.7	1.5
2	0.0	49.5	39.5	7.6	1.0	2.4
1	0.0	45.7	39.0	6.7	3.5	5.0

In-school administrative services. Teachers were generally satisfied with the numbers of personnel providing administrative services. Of all groups, teachers with twenty to twenty-four years of employment in the school were the least satisfied. While 60 percent of teachers in this group indicated that the numbers of in-school administrative personnel were "Sufficient," 21 percent considered that there were "Too few" personnel and 11 percent considered the service "Unavailable." In comparison, 77 percent of teachers with three to four years of employment in the school felt that there were "Sufficient" in-school administrators, 11 percent considered the numbers "Too few" and only 3 percent thought that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school audio-visual services. Forty-five percent of teachers, regardless of length of employment on staff, felt that there were "Sufficient" in-school audio-visual personnel. Teachers who were in the school for a longer time were more dissatisfied with the numbers of in-school personnel. Of teachers with twenty to twenty-four years of employment in the school, 47 percent felt that the numbers were "Too few" and 21 percent thought that the service was "Unavailable." Only 12 percent of teachers in their second year on staff felt that the service was "Unavailable," but a further 40 percent considered the numbers of audio-visual personnel in school to be "Too few."

In-school guidance services. In general, the percentage of "Sufficient" responses decreased as the number of years of employment in the school increased. Twenty-six percent of teachers with twenty to twenty-four years of employment in the school compared to 39 percent of teachers in their first year, indicated that they considered the numbers of in-school guidance personnel to be "Sufficient." There was also a tendency for the percentages of "Too few" and "Unavailable" responses to increase with length of employment in the school. Thirty-two percent of teachers with fifteen to nineteen years of employment in the school considered the service to be "Unavailable" while this was indicated by only 20 percent of teachers with two years of employment.

In-school library aide services. Fewer teachers who had been employed in the school for over ten years considered the numbers of in-school library aides to be "Sufficient." Twenty-six percent of teachers with ten to fourteen years of employment in the school felt that the service was "Unavailable" and of teachers with three to four years of employment in the school, 28 percent indicated that there were "Too few" library aides in the school. Fourteen percent of teachers in their first year with the school indicated "Don't know" responses.

In-school laboratory assistant services. The majority of teachers, regardless of length of time employed in the school, considered this service to be "Unavailable" or indicated "Don't know."

Fifty-five percent of teachers with ten to fourteen years of employment in the school considered the service "Unavailable" and another 22 percent indicated that they "Don't know" about the numbers of in-school laboratory assistants.

In-school teacher aide services. Over half of all groups except teachers in their first year with the school considered the service to be "Unavailable." While 17 percent of teachers in their second year with the school considered the numbers of teacher aides as "Sufficient," only 9 percent of teachers with fifteen to nineteen years of employment in the school thought that the numbers were "Sufficient."

In-school clerical services. Teachers were divided in their opinions of the adequacy of numbers of in-school clerical staff. Forty-three percent of teachers with three to four years of employment in the school considered the numbers to be "Sufficient," but 46 percent indicated that there were "Too few" personnel.

#### Responses Classified by School Grade Level Span

Teachers in all types of schools, as shown in Tables 54-57, were, in general, satisfied with the numbers of administrative personnel and dissatisfied with the numbers of laboratory assistant and teacher aide personnel. All groups were divided about the numbers of audio-visual personnel, with the majority of teachers in elementary-junior high and elementary-junior-senior high schools indicating that they considered the numbers to be insufficient.

Table 54

**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span,  
of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide  
Administrative Services**

School grade level span	N	Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
Elementary	304	2.3	81.3	4.6	3.3	3.9	4.6	
Junior High	155	1.3	83.9	8.4	0.6	1.3	4.5	
Senior High	527	4.2	80.1	8.3	0.2	2.5	4.7	
Elementary-Junior High	247	1.6	68.0	14.6	5.3	3.6	6.9	
Junior High-Senior High	109	4.8	79.8	8.3	1.8	3.7	1.8	
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	216	4.2	57.4	22.7	3.7	3.7	8.3	

Table 55

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Audio-Visual Services and (2) Guidance Services

School grade level span	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	AUDIO-VISUAL					
Elementary	0.3	47.0	20.1	24.7	3.9	3.9
Junior High	0.0	50.3	32.9	10.3	2.6	3.9
Senior High	0.2	45.2	43.5	4.2	2.8	4.2
Elementary-Junior High	0.4	34.4	34.8	20.2	5.3	4.9
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	47.7	42.2	5.5	3.7	0.9
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.0	39.4	32.9	17.1	4.2	6.5
	GUIDANCE					
Elementary	0.0	21.4	30.9	38.2	4.6	4.9
Junior High	1.3	51.6	29.7	9.7	2.6	5.2
Senior High	10.1	61.3	22.2	0.0	2.8	3.6
Elementary-Junior High	0.4	20.6	36.0	33.2	2.4	7.3
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	54.1	33.0	5.5	5.5	1.8
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.0	13.4	37.0	40.3	2.3	11.1

Table 56

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Library Aide and (2) Laboratory Assistant Services

School grade level span	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	LIBRARY AIDE					
Elementary	0.0	44.4	18.8	29.6	3.0	4.3
Junior High	0.0	53.5	32.3	9.0	0.6	4.5
Senior High	1.1	55.4	24.7	4.2	3.8	10.8
Elementary-Junior High	0.8	37.2	30.0	21.9	1.2	8.9
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	53.2	21.1	17.4	4.6	3.7
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.0	37.0	24.1	25.5	2.3	11.1
	LAB. ASSISTANT					
Elementary	0.0	6.6	6.6	69.7	4.3	12.8
Junior High	0.0	20.6	7.7	45.8	3.9	21.9
Senior High	0.0	19.7	23.1	19.5	4.2	33.4
Elementary-Junior High	0.0	5.7	13.4	55.9	4.0	21.1
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	10.1	25.7	27.5	1.8	34.9
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.5	8.3	7.9	52.8	6.0	24.5

Table 57

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide (1) Teacher Aide and (2) Clerical Services

School grade level span	Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
	Too many %	Sufficient %	Too few %	Unavailable %	Undecided %	Don't know %
	TEACHER AIDE					
Elementary	0.0	16.1	24.7	52.6	3.3	3.3
Junior High	0.0	8.4	18.7	65.2	1.9	5.8
Senior High	0.4	10.4	29.6	43.5	4.2	12.0
Elementary-Junior High	0.0	10.9	18.6	61.5	2.0	6.9
Junior High-Senior High	0.9	15.6	39.4	34.9	2.8	6.4
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.0	16.2	17.6	57.9	1.4	6.9
	CLERICAL					
Elementary	0.0	48.6	35.2	9.3	3.2	3.6
Junior High	0.0	42.2	45.0	6.4	2.8	3.7
Senior High	0.0	38.4	41.7	14.4	1.4	4.2
Elementary-Junior High	0.0	54.6	31.6	7.9	2.6	3.3
Junior High-Senior High	0.0	44.5	44.5	7.1	0.6	3.2
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	0.4	45.0	45.5	3.4	3.2	2.5



Twenty-six percent of teachers in elementary-junior-senior high schools felt that there were insufficient administrative personnel. Senior high and junior-senior high teachers were the only groups satisfied with the numbers of guidance and library aide personnel. All groups except elementary-junior high teachers were divided or definitely dissatisfied with the number of clerical personnel in the school.

In-school administrative services. Over 80 percent of teachers in elementary, junior high, senior high and junior-senior high schools felt that there were "Sufficient" in-school administrative personnel. Twenty-three percent of teachers in elementary-junior-senior high schools and 15 percent of teachers in elementary-junior high schools indicated, however, that the numbers of administrative personnel were "Too few" and 5 percent of elementary-junior high school teachers considered the service "Unavailable."

In-school audio-visual services. Over 45 percent of all teachers, except those in elementary-junior high schools and those in elementary-junior-senior high schools, indicated that there were "Sufficient" audio-visual personnel in school. Forty-three percent of teachers in senior high and junior-senior high schools felt that there were "Too few" personnel and 20 percent of teachers in elementary-junior high schools considered the service to be "Unavailable," as did 25 percent of elementary school teachers.

In-school guidance services. While over 50 percent of teachers in junior high, senior high and junior-senior high schools were satisfied with the numbers of guidance personnel in the school, less than 20 percent of teachers in other types of schools indicated that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Over 36 percent of teachers in elementary-junior high schools and in elementary-junior-senior high schools considered there to be "Too few" in-school guidance personnel. While no senior high school teachers considered the service "Unavailable," 38 percent of elementary and 40 percent of elementary-junior-senior high school teachers thought that the service was "Unavailable" in their schools.

In-school library aide services. Elementary-junior high school teachers and elementary-junior-senior high school teachers were the groups least satisfied with the numbers of library aides in the school, with only 37 percent of teachers in these groups indicating that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Although over 50 percent of junior high school teachers considered the number of library aides to be "Sufficient," another 32 percent indicated that there were "Too few" personnel. Over 29 percent of elementary teachers felt that the service was "Unavailable" in their schools.

In-school laboratory assistant services. Over half of elementary, elementary-junior high, and elementary-junior-senior high schools considered this service to be "Unavailable." While 20 percent of senior high school teachers indicated that they were satisfied with

the numbers of personnel, 23 percent saw the numbers as "Too few" and 20 percent did not have this service. Over one-third of senior high school and junior-senior high school teachers replied "Don't know."

In-school teacher aide services. The majority of teachers considered the numbers of teacher aides to be "Too few" or "Unavailable." Elementary, elementary-junior-senior high schools and junior-senior high school teachers were the groups most satisfied with the numbers of teacher aides although only 16 percent considered the numbers available "Sufficient." Over 65 percent of junior high school teachers indicated that teacher aides were "Unavailable" in their school.

In-school clerical services. Fewer senior high school teachers considered the numbers of clerical staff in the school to be "Sufficient," and 14 percent felt that the service was "Unavailable." Elementary (49 percent) and elementary-junior high school teachers (55 percent) were the groups most satisfied with the numbers of in-school clerical personnel.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 2.5

Statement. "How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of central

office personnel to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, and audio-visual services?"

The perceptions of urban teachers differed from those of rural teachers on all of the listed services (Table 58).

Central office guidance services. Thirty-seven percent of urban teachers felt that there were "Sufficient" guidance personnel in central office while this was indicated by only 18 percent of rural teachers. Thirty percent of rural teachers felt that there were "Too few" personnel and a further 31 percent indicated that the service was "Unavailable." While only 2 percent of urban teachers considered the service "Unavailable," 18 percent had "Don't know" responses.

Central office staff development services. Approximately the same percentage of urban and rural teachers (34 percent) felt that there were "Sufficient" staff development personnel. Another 32 percent of teachers in both groups felt that the numbers were "Too few." A higher percentage of rural teachers (16 percent) than urban teachers (4 percent) felt that the service was "Unavailable." Ten percent of urban teachers thought that there were "Too many" central office staff development personnel.

Central office audio-visual services. Fifty-two percent of urban teachers considered the numbers of audio-visual personnel to be "Sufficient," and 31 percent felt that there were "Too few" personnel. Thirty percent of rural teachers also felt that there were "Too few"

Table 58  
**Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural, of Adequacy of Numbers of  
 Central Office Personnel To Provide Guidance, Staff Development,  
 and Audio-Visual Services**

		Percentages of teachers making each assessment					
Central office services		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Urban N = 569	Pupil Guidance/ Counselling	8.4	36.6	29.3	1.8	5.8	18.1
	Staff Development	10.0	33.7	33.6	4.4	7.6	10.7
	Audio-Visual	4.0	51.8	30.9	1.9	3.5	7.7
Rural N = 989	Pupil Guidance/ Counselling	1.0	18.1	30.0	30.6	6.6	13.7
	Staff Development	0.7	34.7	31.5	16.1	6.5	10.5
	Audio-Visual	0.5	42.5	29.9	13.8	4.4	8.9

a -Teachers in school systems with over 18 program and instructional staff.

b -Teachers in school systems with less than 7 program and instructional staff.

personnel and a further 14 percent found the service "Unavailable." Forty-three percent of rural teachers thought that there were "Sufficient" central office audio-visual personnel.

#### SUB-PROBLEM 2.6

Statement. "How do the perceptions of teachers in the four largest school districts compare with the perceptions of teachers in all other school systems concerning the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel to provide administrative, audio-visual, pupil guidance and/or counselling, library aide, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?"

Urban teachers were satisfied with the numbers of in-school guidance, administrative, and library aide personnel (Table 59). Rural teachers were dissatisfied with the numbers of personnel available to provide all but administrative services. Both urban and rural teachers were divided as to the adequacy of personnel to provide clerical and audio-visual services but both agreed that the numbers of laboratory assistants and teacher aides were insufficient.

In-school guidance services. Fifty-eight percent of urban teachers felt that there were "Sufficient" personnel and 26 percent considered the number to be "Too few." Only 1 percent considered in-school services to be "Unavailable." The majority of rural teachers felt that there were insufficient personnel. Twenty-eight percent indicated that there were "Sufficient" personnel while 32 percent

Table 59

Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Urban/Rural, of Adequacy of Numbers of In-School Personnel To Provide Certain Services

		Percentages of teachers making each assessment						
In-school services		Too many	Sufficient	Too few	Unavailable	Undecided	Don't know	
		%	%	%	%	%	%	
Urban a N = 569	Guidance	9.1	57.8	25.5	1.4	2.6	3.5	
	Administrative	3.3	79.3	9.1	0.7	2.6	4.9	
	Library Aide	0.9	56.4	24.1	5.8	3.2	9.7	
	Audio-Visual Media	0.4	45.2	40.4	7.0	3.0	4.0	
	Lab. Assistant	0.0	24.1	21.8	19.2	4.4	30.6	
	Teacher Aide	0.4	14.2	33.9	37.8	3.2	10.5	
	Clerical	0.2	45.0	46.2	3.2	2.8	2.6	
Rural b N = 989	Guidance	0.4	28.1	32.1	30.1	3.5	5.8	
	Administrative	3.0	73.5	11.4	3.1	3.3	5.6	
	Library Aide	0.3	42.4	25.2	22.3	2.5	7.3	
	Audio-Visual Media	0.1	42.9	31.7	16.8	4.0	4.4	
	Lab. Assistant	0.1	6.3	10.9	56.5	4.1	22.0	
	Teacher Aide	0.1	11.6	19.6	59.7	2.8	6.2	
	Clerical	0.1	47.0	37.2	9.7	2.4	3.5	

a - Teachers in school systems with over 18 program and instructional staff.  
 b - Teachers in school systems with less than 7 program and instructional staff.

thought that the numbers were "Too few" and another 30 percent felt that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school administrative services. Eighty percent of urban teachers and 74 percent of rural teachers were satisfied with the numbers of administrative personnel. A slightly higher percentage of rural teachers (11 percent) than urban teachers (9 percent) thought that the numbers were "Too few."

In-school library aide services. Fifty-six percent of urban teachers and 42 percent of rural teachers thought that there were "Sufficient" library aides in the school. One-quarter of teachers in both groups felt that there were "Too few" personnel and 22 percent of rural teachers indicated that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school audio-visual services. Approximately the same percentage of teachers in both groups (43 percent) felt that the numbers of audio-visual personnel were "Sufficient." Forty-seven percent of both urban and rural teachers felt that the numbers were insufficient, a higher proportion of urban teachers rating the numbers as "Too few" while over half of the rural group felt that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school laboratory assistant services. Sixty-seven percent of rural teachers and 41 percent of urban teachers thought that there were insufficient laboratory assistants in school. Fifty-seven percent of rural teachers thought that the service was "Unavailable." Of



those who thought that the numbers were "Sufficient," 24 percent were urban teachers and 6 percent were rural teachers.

In-school teacher aide services. Teachers in both groups were dissatisfied with the numbers of teacher aides in the school. Only 14 percent of urban teachers and 12 percent of rural teachers thought that there were "Sufficient" personnel. Sixty percent of rural teachers considered the service to be "Unavailable." Forty percent of urban teachers thought that there were "Too few" personnel and a further 38 percent felt that the service was "Unavailable."

In-school clerical services. Teachers in both groups were divided as to the adequacy of numbers of in-school clerical personnel. Forty-five percent of urban teachers considered the numbers "Sufficient" and 46 percent thought the numbers to be "Too few." Ten percent of rural teachers considered the service "Unavailable."

### PROBLEM 3

Statement. "Which services, presently located in central office, would teachers consider could be more effectively performed if based in schools?"

While over half the teachers, regardless of type of jurisdiction, felt that guidance services should be located in schools, (Table 60), only 27 percent considered that consultative services could be more effectively performed in the school setting. Over 40 percent wanted audio-visual services removed to the schools, but 75 percent wanted staff development services to remain in central office.

**Table 60**  
**Percentages of Teachers Stating That Selected Services Should Be Relocated from Central Offices to Schools**  
**(N = 1558)**

Jurisdiction	Consultative Services	Guidance Services	Staff Development Services	Audio-Visual Services
	%	%	%	%
Counties	33.0	54.2	24.3	41.0
Divisions	25.0	54.9	16.5	35.7
Public Districts	24.9	54.3	25.8	43.3
Separate Districts	27.3	48.4	27.6	47.3
Overall	27.2	52.3	24.8	43.2

There was little difference in responses among jurisdictions. One-third of county teachers wanted to see consultative services moved to the schools, a higher percentage than that of the other jurisdictions. Forty-seven percent of separate district teachers wanted audio-visual services based in schools. Fewer division teachers (17 percent) than the average (25 percent) wanted staff development services moved to schools.

### Sub-problem 3.1

Statement. "To what extent is a difference in teachers' perceptions of the location of services associated with position held in the school?"

When the responses are considered according to the respondents' official position in the school (Table 61), all groups wanted guidance and audio-visual services relocated and 66 percent felt that consultative and staff development services could work effectively from a central office location.

Over 60 percent of principals, vice-principals, and guidance counsellors wanted guidance services relocated, and Principals and Department Heads were the groups most concerned about the relocation of consultative and audio-visual services. In general, school personnel were most interested in the relocation of services which directly affected their interaction with pupils.

**Table 61**  
**Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Position, Stating that Selected Services Should Be Relocated from Central Offices to Schools**

	Consultative Services	Guidance Services	Staff Development Services	Audio-Visual Services
	%	%	%	%
Principals	32.9	61.6	24.7	43.8
Vice Principals	19.7	67.1	17.1	43.4
Department Heads	32.9	53.2	30.4	48.1
Consultants	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
Teachers	27.4	51.2	24.9	43.2
Guidance Counsellors	23.5	61.8	38.2	41.2
Teacher- Librarians	14.3	34.3	14.3	28.6

## PROBLEM 4

Statement. "To what extent do teachers consider that their effectiveness and/or efficiency is reduced by their involvement in duties which might be performed by non-certificated personnel?"

Twenty-four percent of teachers indicated that they had been hindered "Very much," and 49 percent indicated that they had been hindered "To some extent" by their non-instructional duties as is shown in Table 62.

Fifteen percent of teachers felt that their non-instructional duties had affected their teaching "To a little extent," and the overall percentage of teachers who indicated that these duties had not affected their teaching at all was nine percent.

Sub-problem 4.1

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of their involvement in non-instructional duties associated with grade level taught?"

When the responses are classified by grade level taught, (Table 63), K - G.3 teachers were the group most affected by non-instructional duties. Twenty-seven percent indicated that their teaching effectiveness and/or efficiency was affected "Very much" by their involvement in non-instructional tasks. Fifteen percent of G.10 - 12 teachers indicated that they were affected "Little" by their involvement in non-instructional duties, and 10 percent felt

Table 62  
**Assessments by Teachers in Sample of Extent to which their Effectiveness and/or  
 Efficiency Is Reduced by Involvement in Non-Instructional Duties**  
 (N = 1558)

Jurisdiction	Very much	Some	Little	Not at all	Undecided
	%	%	%	%	%
Counties	25.0	51.7	13.2	7.6	2.4
Divisions	22.3	46.4	19.6	8.0	3.6
Public Districts	22.1	52.5	14.5	8.0	3.0
Separate Districts	25.4	45.3	15.1	11.4	2.8
Overall	23.8	49.0	15.2	9.1	2.9

Table 63  
 Assessments by Teachers, Classified by Grade Level Taught, of Extent to which their  
 Effectiveness and/or Efficiency Is Reduced by Involvement  
 in Non-Instructional Duties

Grade level taught	Very much %	Some %	Little %	Not at all %	Undecided %
K - G.3	27.1	51.0	10.8	7.2	4.0
G.4 - 6	20.3	51.2	18.4	7.0	3.1
G.7 - 9	24.0	48.9	14.6	9.1	3.3
G.10 - 12	23.4	48.9	15.5	10.3	1.9

that their teaching effectiveness had not been affected at all. In general, elementary teachers K - G.6, seemed to have been affected more by their involvement in non-instructional tasks than were secondary teachers.

#### PROBLEM 5

Statement. "To which instructional or non-instructional areas would teachers prefer additional staff to be assigned?"

Seventy percent of all teachers in the sample chose "Teaching" as an area for assignment of extra staff (Table 64), 45 percent chose "Special education consultants," and 41 percent chose "Pupil guidance and/or counselling personnel." Smaller percentages, in order, chose "Teacher/laboratory aides," "Clerical services," "Media specialists," "Consultants," and "Administration."

County teachers considered their most important priorities to be "Teaching," "Special education consultants," and "Pupil guidance and/or counselling services." Division teachers put "Pupil guidance and/or counselling services" first, then "Special education consultants" and "Teaching."

Higher percentages of district teachers indicated "Teaching" as a first priority. Public district teachers indicated "Teacher/laboratory aides" as their second priority, and then "Special education consultants," while separate district teachers chose, in order, "Special education consultants" and "Pupil guidance and/or counselling services."



Table 64  
 Percentages of Teachers Choosing Areas of Staff Allocation for  
 Assignment of Extra Staff

Jurisdiction	Teaching %	Administration %	Consultative Services %	Pupil Guidance and/or Counseling Services %	Media Specialists (Library/Audio-Visual) %	Laboratory/Teacher Aides %	Clerical Services %	Special Education Consultants (including Remedial Specialists) %
Counties	66.3 <sup>a</sup>	1.4	27.4	45.1	23.3	39.9	27.8	52.4
Divisions	51.3	4.5	20.5	54.5	31.3	37.1	29.0	51.8
Public Districts	78.9	4.2	14.7	35.2	25.8	46.5	32.6	42.4
Separate Districts	72.0	4.2	18.8	39.6	27.3	36.5	38.5	44.9
Overall	70.2	3.7	19.3	41.3	26.6	40.4	33.3	46.5

<sup>a</sup>This means that 66.3% of all county teachers in the sample stated that "teaching" was one of the three areas to which they would assign additional staff.

Sub-problem 5.1

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' choice of allocation of staff associated with:

1. position held in the school, and
2. grade level span of the school?"

Responses Classified by School Position

While all groups chose "Teaching" as their first area of staff allocation, their second and third choices reflected to some extent their position and concerns in the school (Table 65).

The three areas with highest percentages for each position were:

Position held	Choices		
	1	2	3
Principals	Teaching	Guidance	Special Educ.
Vice-Principals	"	"	"
Department Heads	"	Laboratory and Teacher Aides	Clerical
Consultants	"	Guidance	-
Teachers	"	Special Education	Guidance/ Laboratory and Teacher Aides
Counsellors	"	Guidance	Special Educ.
Librarians	"	Media	Special Educ./ Clerical

Table 65

Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Position, Choosing Areas of Staff Allocation for Assignment of Extra Staff

Position held	N	Teaching	Administration	Consultative Services	Pupil Guidance and/or Counselling Services	Media Specialists (Library/Audio-Visual)	Laboratory/Teacher Aides	Clerical Services	Special Education Consultants (Including Remedial Specialists)
Principals	73	60.3	4.1	30.1	52.1	31.5	32.9	26.0	52.1
Vice-Principals	76	64.5	6.6	18.4	47.4	30.3	42.1	38.2	44.7
Department Heads	79	78.5	7.6	16.5	25.3	22.8	48.1	41.8	38.0
Consultants	3	100.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
Teachers	1258	70.4	3.4	19.0	41.0	26.1	40.8	32.8	46.7
Guidance Counsellors	34	70.6	0.0	23.5	64.7	11.8	32.4	29.4	55.9
Teacher-Librarians	35	74.3	2.9	11.4	28.6	51.4	34.3	40.0	40.0
Overall	1558	70.2	3.7	19.3	41.3	26.6	40.4	33.3	46.5

Responses classified by school grade level span. Regardless of school type, all teachers chose "Teaching" as their first priority (Table 66). Elementary teachers were most concerned with "Special education consultants" while junior high teachers had broader areas of concern. "Laboratory/teacher aides," "Special education consultants," and "Clerical staff" were all indicated by over 40 percent of junior high teachers as important areas for allocation of new staff.

Forty-nine percent of teachers in senior high schools chose "Laboratory/teacher aides" as a second priority. "Clerical services" was chosen by 43 percent of senior high teachers. "Pupil guidance and/or counselling" and "Special education consultants" were considered priority areas by over 50 percent of elementary-junior high and elementary-junior-senior high school teachers.

#### SUMMARY

This chapter presented teachers' opinions regarding other services provided by central office and in-school personnel, their perceptions of the location of services and their preferred allocation of future staff.

Teachers were divided in their opinions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel to provide staff development and audio-visual services. The majority considered that there were insufficient pupil guidance and/or counselling personnel.

In general, teachers were satisfied with the numbers of in-school personnel providing administrative and library aide services,

Table 66  
 Percentages of Teachers, Classified by School Grade Level Span, Choosing Areas of  
 Staff Allocation for Assignment of Extra Staff

School grade level span	N	Teaching	Administration	Consultative Services	Pupil Guidance and/or Counseling Services	Media Specialists (Library/Audio-Visual)	Laboratory/Teacher Aides	Clerical Services	Special Education Consultants (Including Remedial Specialists)
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Elementary	304	70.1	1.6	23.0	46.7	24.0	37.2	22.4	57.2
Junior High	155	72.9	1.9	25.8	33.5	21.3	45.8	40.0	44.5
Senior High	527	75.0	3.8	14.6	27.7	31.5	48.6	42.7	34.2
Elementary-Junior High	247	61.1	6.5	19.8	52.6	27.1	32.8	30.8	54.3
Junior-Senior High	109	67.9	1.8	24.8	36.7	33.0	42.2	34.9	40.4
Elementary-Junior High-Senior High	216	68.1	5.6	17.6	62.0	18.5	29.2	22.7	56.5
Overall	1558	70.2	3.7	19.3	41.3	26.6	40.4	33.3	46.5

dissatisfied with the numbers providing laboratory assistant and teacher aide services and divided in their perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of pupil guidance and/or counselling, audio-visual and clerical personnel.

The perceptions of urban and rural teachers differed on most of the central office and in-school services. More urban than rural teachers were satisfied with the numbers of central office personnel providing guidance and audio-visual services. While urban teachers were satisfied with the numbers of in-school pupil guidance, administrative and library aide personnel, rural teachers were dissatisfied with the numbers of personnel in all areas except administration.

Teachers felt that central office pupil guidance and/or counselling services and audio-visual services could be performed more effectively if based in schools.

Three-quarters of the sample indicated that their teaching effectiveness and/or efficiency was reduced by their involvement in non-instructional duties.

"Teaching," "Special education consultants" and "Pupil guidance and/or counselling services" were the three areas to which teachers would assign future staff.

## Chapter 7

### SUMMARY

A summary of the study, including a restatement of the problems, the research methodology used and a review of the major findings are presented in this chapter.

#### Restatement of the Problems

This study attempted to obtain the following:

(1) Teachers' perceptions of the provision, extent of use, and value of consultative services usually provided by in-school, central office and regional office personnel,

(2) Teachers' opinions of the provision of central office and in-school personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, audio-visual, administrative, library aide, laboratory assistant, teacher aide and clerical services, and

(3) Teachers' preferences for the location of services and for areas of future staff allocation.

These major problems were each divided into a number of sub-problems.

#### Research Methodology

A survey research technique, the mail-back questionnaire, was used to obtain the data for the study. The purposes of the study restricted the choice of the sample to schools in Alberta.

Questionnaires were distributed to 1987 teachers in 90 schools, chosen on a stratified random basis to provide coverage of schools of different size, grade span, location, and jurisdiction. Returns were received from 1558 teachers, 78.6 percent of the sample. Of the 90 schools surveyed, 88 returned questionnaires. Percentage frequency distributions of responses for all questions were obtained. The distribution of responses according to selected dependent variables were also calculated.

### Review of the Findings

The findings are presented according to the major problems.

Problem 1. "What are teachers' opinions regarding the provision, extent of use, and value of consultative services usually provided by in-school, central office and regional office personnel?"

Teachers were divided in their opinions of the adequacy of numbers of central office consultative personnel. A slightly higher percentage of teachers felt that there were insufficient personnel and this was indicated by 59 percent of rural teachers as compared to 24 percent of urban teachers. Nineteen percent of rural teachers saw this service as "Unavailable."

The majority of teachers felt that there were insufficient in-school consultative personnel. Twenty-seven percent of teachers indicated that this service was "Unavailable," and of these, 36 percent were rural teachers and 11 percent were urban teachers. Fewer district teachers saw the numbers of central office and in-school personnel as insufficient.



Principals, as a group, were the most concerned about the inadequacy of numbers of central office and in-school consultative personnel. Staffs of K - G.6, G.7 - 9 and G.10 - 12 schools were generally more satisfied with the numbers of personnel than those staffs whose schools encompassed more grades.

As the number of years of system and in-school experience increased, teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of central office and in-school personnel decreased. More teachers expressed satisfaction with the numbers of central office and in-school personnel with increasing years of post-secondary education.

Over half of the teachers who considered the services to be available used them in the 1970-71 school year, central office services being used most often by elementary teachers and in-school services by senior high teachers. Teachers between twenty-six and forty-five years of age made most use of in-school services. Teachers who had more years of post-secondary education tended to use central office and in-school services more often.

For the two months, September to November, 1971, little differences were noted in teachers' use of central office and in-school services on any of the dependent variables, although district teachers had used the services more often than county and division teachers.

Those teachers who used central office and in-school consultative services generally considered them to be helpful, and this applied especially to in-school services. Overall, teachers'

ratings of the services as "Valuable" increased with increases in the number of years of post-secondary education. Ratings of central office services as "Valuable" fell with increasing grade level taught while the rating for in-school services rose.

Over 40 percent of teachers expected to use subject area consultation, curriculum and instructional innovation, media, and staff development services from regional office staff. Thirty percent of teachers, overall, and 35 percent of teachers in elementary-junior-senior high schools expected to use program evaluation services. A smaller percentage (20 percent) expected to use educational research assistance services. Division teachers (32 percent), junior high school teachers (33 percent) and senior high school teachers (32 percent) were the groups with the highest percentages indicating expected use of pupil guidance and/or counselling services. District teachers recorded the lowest percentages of expected use.

Problem 2. "What are teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of numbers of personnel available to provide pupil guidance and/or counselling, staff development, audio-visual, library aide, administrative, laboratory assistance, teacher aide and clerical services?"

Teachers were divided in their opinions of the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel. While 38 percent of teachers felt that there were "Sufficient" staff development personnel, 44 percent considered the numbers insufficient. Only 4 percent of urban teachers compared to 16 percent of rural teachers saw this service

as "Unavailable," but 34 percent of urban and 32 percent of rural teachers felt that the numbers of staff development personnel were "Too few."

Forty-six percent of teachers were satisfied with the numbers of audio-visual personnel in central office. Thirty-one percent of urban teachers and 30 percent of rural teachers felt that there were "Too few" personnel and 15 percent of division teachers indicated that this service was "Unavailable." For all services, county and division teachers more often indicated their dissatisfaction with the numbers of personnel available.

Half of the teachers felt that there were insufficient pupil guidance and/or counselling personnel in central office and only 25 percent of teachers rated the numbers as "Sufficient." In general, teachers from all types of jurisdictions felt that the numbers of pupil guidance and/or counselling personnel were insufficient, and only senior high school teachers indicated that they were satisfied with the numbers of guidance personnel.

As the number of years for which respondents had been employed by their school systems increased, the percentages of teachers expressing satisfaction with the number of guidance and audio-visual personnel also increased, as did teachers' dissatisfaction with the numbers of staff development personnel. A similar pattern occurred when responses were divided according to the number of years of post-secondary education of the respondents.

The majority of teachers (76 percent) were satisfied with the numbers of administrators in the school. Five percent of county and 4 percent of division teachers rated the service as "Unavailable."

Twenty percent of teachers, overall, and 44 percent of division teachers indicated that in-school pupil guidance and/or counselling services were "Unavailable" and 30 percent felt that there were "Too few" personnel.

Over 40 percent of teachers, especially in the counties and divisions, felt that there were insufficient library aides in the school. Forty-eight percent of teachers were satisfied with the numbers available.

Over 50 percent of division and county teachers rated laboratory assistants as "Unavailable" and only 13 percent of teachers felt that there were "Sufficient" laboratory assistants in the school.

The majority of teachers rated teacher aide services as "Unavailable." Fifteen percent of separate district teachers and 18 percent of division teachers rated the numbers of teacher aides as "Sufficient."

Forty-six percent of teachers were satisfied with the numbers of clerical staff in school, but 18 percent of division teachers rated the service "Unavailable" and another 38 percent found the numbers to be "Too few."

In general, teachers were satisfied with the numbers of in-school personnel available to provide administrative and library aide services, dissatisfied with the numbers of laboratory assistants and teacher aides, and divided over the adequacy of numbers of guidance,

audio-visual, and clerical services. Satisfaction with all services except administrative and clerical services tended to decrease with increasing number of years spent in the school.

Urban teachers' responses differed from those of rural teachers in all areas except in-school administration, audio-visual, clerical, laboratory assistant and teacher aide services. Urban and rural teachers were both generally satisfied with the numbers of in-school administrative personnel, dissatisfied with the numbers of laboratory and teacher aides, and divided over the adequacy of numbers of audio-visual and clerical personnel in the schools.

Problem 3. "Which services, presently located in central office, would teachers consider could be more effectively performed if based in schools?"

Teachers thought that guidance and audio-visual services could be more effectively performed if relocated in schools. Principals, vice-principals, and guidance counsellors recorded the highest percentages regarding guidance services and principals and department heads expressed the most concern about the location of audio-visual services.

Problem 4. "To what extent do teachers consider that their effectiveness and/or efficiency is reduced by their involvement in duties which might be performed by non-certificated personnel?"

Almost three-quarters of teachers indicated that their teaching effectiveness and/or efficiency was affected by the non-instructional duties which they had to perform. This applied

especially to elementary teachers, 27 percent of whom felt that their teaching was affected "Very much." Forty-nine percent of G.10 - 12 teachers felt that their teaching was affected "To some extent" by their involvement in non-instructional duties. Percentages varied little between jurisdictions.

Problem 5. "To which instructional or non-instructional areas would teachers prefer additional staff to be assigned?"

"Teaching", "Special education consultants" and "Pupil guidance and/or counselling" were the three areas chosen by teachers as those to which additional staff should be assigned. Department heads and teachers also mentioned "Laboratory and teacher aide" services while Librarians wanted more "Media" and "Clerical" personnel. Forty-seven percent of elementary teachers chose the area "Special education consultants" while 49 percent of senior high teachers wanted more "Laboratory and teacher aide" personnel.

## Chapter 8

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter consists of personal observations and opinions which are related to the data presented earlier in the thesis but are not necessarily supported by these data.

While teachers were generally divided as to the adequacy of numbers of central office and in-school personnel to provide certain services, a definite polarization of responses was noted when the responses were categorized according to the numbers of instructional and program staff available.

This breakdown of responses coincided with an urban-rural split and also segregated the answers of teachers in the four largest systems in Alberta. Holdaway's (1971) finding that larger systems tended to have higher proportions of staff in central office positions, higher proportions of staff in non-instructional positions, and lower proportions of staff in instructional positions, may help to explain why the percentages of teachers indicating that they considered the numbers of central office personnel to be "Too many" were much higher for the urban group. Approximately 10 percent of urban teachers felt that there were "Too many" central office consultative and staff development personnel. Yet, in their responses to the adequacy of numbers of in-school personnel, less than one percent indicated "Too many" for any of the services listed except

administration and pupil guidance and/or counselling. Rural teachers indicated the same percentage of "Too many" responses for the numbers of in-school administrative personnel.

The findings of this study would agree with Humphrey's (1969) observation that, for Ontario school systems, consultants were available to urban teachers more frequently than to rural teachers.

Communications seem to be a problem in all jurisdictions. As many as 20 percent of urban and rural teachers were unable to express an opinion concerning the adequacy of numbers of central office consultative personnel. The percentages which indicated uncertainty about the numbers of audio-visual personnel were noticeably lower.

This lack of knowledge about the consultative assistance available was especially evident in the responses of teachers in their first two years of employment who frequently recorded "Don't know" responses. Friesen (1968), Hertling and Getz (1970) and others, suggest that for an organization to function efficiently, the functions of its central office personnel should be known to all personnel employed by the system. The orientation of new employees concerning central office personnel and services available should be given greater prominence.

Ratsoy (1970) found that a much higher percentage of teachers (36 percent) indicated that no consultative personnel were available than was found in this study (4 percent). He asked teachers about consultative personnel who specialized in the subject(s) taught by the respondent rather than about personnel who could provide



assistance on request. Ratsoy did note that the percentages of teachers using these consultative services fell as the grade level taught by the respondent rose. A similar finding for teachers' perceptions of central office services was discovered in this study.

Since senior high school teachers made most use of in-school consultative services and rated them more highly than central office services, this may suggest that consultative services for secondary instructors should be mainly located in schools. Owing to the variety of programs offered in senior high schools and the specialized nature of these courses, senior high school teachers may perceive central office consultative services as providing assistance with general instructional problems rather than specific course difficulties. Since there is often a larger number of teachers on staff in senior high schools more direct assistance from "other teachers" may be available than would be the case in smaller schools. The position of department head is more common in senior high schools and these personnel may be able to provide the consultative services required by senior high instructors.

Heron's study (1969) noted that where a consultant was resident in one school and available to teachers in a number of other schools, teachers in the resident school made most use of his services. This would suggest that in-school consultative personnel should be resident in the school. Parsons's conclusion (1971:8) that people from outside the immediate school environment are viewed as less influential and less effective has importance in this regard. Parsons also noted that "other teachers" were a major consultative

resource for teachers. His suggestion that teachers be given more time away from instructional and non-instructional duties so that they may share ideas and methods is recommended.

A study might be undertaken to determine if school position is related to teachers' perceptions and use of consultative personnel. This could be done by comparing the characteristics of "consultants" with and without a designated in-school position other than classroom teacher. The availability, specialized knowledge, and/or length of teaching experience of consultants may prove to be factors which affect teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness and extent of use of the services of consultants.

Of teachers in all school types, elementary teachers made the most use of central office services and viewed them as the most valuable. McGowan (1971) pointed out that those teachers who use consultative services infrequently are likely to have a poorer attitude to them than will those teachers who use the services more often. This has implications for the services which teachers would like to see remaining in central office. If these services are to prove effective, better communication needs to be developed between central office personnel and teachers in individual schools. Alternatively, teachers may perceive the consultative services available from central office to be more related to elementary than to secondary grade levels.

The majority of teachers preferred staff development and consultative services to remain in central office, but thought that guidance and audio-visual services could be more effectively performed

if located mainly in schools. This may suggest that teachers find that the time lag between their request for guidance and audio-visual services and the fulfilment of their request has a more immediate and often inconvenient effect on their teaching and interaction with pupils. They, perhaps, hope to minimize this by having more direct access to these services.

Teachers' greater use of in-school services and their overall perceived lack of sufficient central office personnel may compound the problems of central office personnel as delineated by McKean and Mills (1964:40), and referred to in Chapter 2.

#### FURTHER RESEARCH STUDIES

The data in this study are descriptive and as such provide general information on the issue of consultative services. A future study might compare formal and informal in-school consultation. Another study could examine the source and use of consultative services in schools without formal consultative personnel, and schools with formal consultative personnel.

Research questions on which studies might be based include those pertaining to the frequency, length and subject of the visitation:

How often do supervisors/consultants visit schools?

Do their visits take place regularly during the year or do they tend to cluster in certain months?

Do they mainly visit as Burnham suggested (1961:33), the young, the inexperienced and the inept?

What proportion of the requests to visit schools are teacher-originated?

What proportion of visits are for the individual teacher, rather than for a general in-service session for groups of teachers?

Other areas for investigation include the following:

Does supervisory behavior differ substantially among types of school jurisdictions?

Do teachers view the use of consultative assistance as an indication of their own inadequacy?

Does increasing the availability of consultants, as Humphreys (1969) suggested, improve the quality of teaching?

Some of these questions, and the many others which could be developed, might be examined through a study of the role of central office consultants in a study throughout Alberta, or in a detailed case study of one system or even of one consultant. Alternatively, the findings of this study might provide a basis for comparison with the findings of other Canadian studies.

**REFERENCES**

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, J.H.M.  
1960 "Who Shall Supervise?" Paper presented at the C.E.A. Short Course, Banff, Alberta.
- Blowers, Thomas A.  
1969 "A Longitudinal Study of Administrative Ratios in Urban School Systems in Western Canada." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Buffett, F.  
1967 "A Study of Existing and Desired Supervisory Practices in Newfoundland." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University.
- Burnham, R.M.  
1961 "A New Supervisor on the Job," in Supervision in Action. R.M. Burnham and M.L. King (eds.). Washington D.C.:NEA (ASCD).
- Burnham, R.M., and M.L. King (eds.)  
1961 Supervision in Action. Washington D.C.:NEA (ASCD).
- Carter, S.  
1969 "How Many School Administrators Are Enough?" Nations Schools 83:51-57.
- Clarke, Audrey M.  
1969 "The Department Head in the Schools in Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Clarke, S.T.C.  
1968 "The Role of Teachers in Decision Making." A.T.A. Magazine 48:11-15.
- Cowle, Walter  
1961 "The Role of the Elementary School Consultant." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Duboyce, Raymond A.  
1970 "A Longitudinal Study of Administrative Ratios in the Edmonton Public School District." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

- Egnatoff, John G.  
1968 "The Changing Status of Saskatchewan's School Principals,"  
Canadian Education and Research Digest, December:  
354-365.
- Enns, Frederick  
1968 "Supervision of Instruction: A Conceptual Framework,"  
Canadian Education and Research Digest, September:  
283-297.
- Friesen, David  
1968 "Toward Strategies of Effective Communication," in The  
Leadership Course For School Principals. D.A. MacKay  
(ed.). Edmonton: The University of Alberta.
- Gregory, David MacLeod  
1972 "Staffing Ratios in Schools." Unpublished Master's  
thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Gill, Norman  
1967 "Relationship Between the Size of School Systems and  
Certain Characteristics of their Administrative Staff."  
Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta,  
Edmonton.
- Gill, Norman and David Friesen  
1968 "Administrative Staff and School System Size,"  
The Canadian Administrator, 8:1-4.
- Gittell, Marilyn  
1971 "Supervisors and Coordinators: Power in the System,"  
in Freedom Bureaucracy and Schooling. V.F. Haubrich  
(ed.). Washington, D.C.:NEA (ASCD).
- Holdaway, Edward A.  
1971 "Staffing Metropolitan School Districts," The Canadian  
Administrator, 10:30-33.
- Humphreys, E.H.  
1971 "Equality? The Rural-Urban Disparity in Ontario  
Elementary Schools." Ontario Education, 11:34-9.  
1969 "A Comparative Study of School Districts in Ontario,"  
Toronto:OISE.
- Heller, R.W., and H.J. Hartley  
1971 "Formal and Informal Dimensions of the Teaching  
Environment," Education, 91:364-70.

- Hertling, J.E., and H.G. Getz  
1970 "How Efficient is your Central Office Staff?"  
Journal of Secondary Education, 45:202-4.
- Hrynyk, N.L.  
1962 "Supervisory Needs: West Jasper Place Public Schools."  
Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta,  
Edmonton.
- Harrison, R.E.  
1965 "An Analysis of the Weekly Work Load of Nova Scotia  
High School Principals." Unpublished Master's thesis,  
The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Hewko, Walter M.  
1965 "An Analysis of the Role of the Junior High School  
Coordinator." Unpublished Master's thesis, The  
University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Heron, R. Peter  
1969 "Innovativeness, School Climate and Coordinators."  
Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta,  
Edmonton.
- Lepatski, William  
1970 "Staffing Ratios and Costs in Metropolitan School  
Systems in Western Canada." Unpublished Master's thesis,  
The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Lovell, J.T.  
1967 "A Perspective for Viewing Instructional Supervisory  
Behavior," in Supervision: Perspectives and  
Propositions. W.H. Lucio (ed.). Washington, D.C.  
:NEA (ASCD).
- Lucio, W.H. and J.D. McNeil  
1969 Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action.  
New York: McGraw-Hill. (revised ed.).
- MacKay, D.A.  
1969 "Canadian Supervisory Practices," The Canadian Administrator,  
9:10-14.
- MacKenzie, George  
1969 "The Principalship: New Look." Education Canada.  
9:28-33.



- McGowan, G.R.  
1971 "A Study of Supervisory Tasks and Processes,"  
Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of  
Wisconsin.
- Munnally, R.J.  
1970 "Teacher-Supervisor Conflicts and the Issue of Academic  
Freedom." Educational Leadership, 27:673-7.
- Miklos, Erwin  
1971 "Consultation." Paper presented at the C.E.A. Short  
Course, Banff, Alberta.
- McKean, R.C. and H.H. Mills  
1964 The Supervisor. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied  
Research in Education.
- McLoughlin, Roy I.  
1965 "A Study of the Role of Supervisor of Elementary  
Instruction." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University  
of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Milnes, John L.  
1968 "Problems of First Year Teachers in the Urban School  
System." Unpublished Master's thesis,  
The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Morin, L.H.  
1964 "The Principal's Perception of His Role." Unpublished  
Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- McGillivray, William R.  
1966 "A Survey of Supervisory Assistance as Perceived by  
Beginning Teachers in Selected Urban High Schools  
in Ontario." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University  
of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Parsons, G. Llewellyn  
1971 "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness,"  
The Canadian Administrator, 11:5-8.
- Peach, J.W.  
1970 "The Historical Development of Supervision in Canada,"  
in Design for the 70's. Calgary, Alberta: The Department  
of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary.
- Pitsula, Michael  
1966 "An Analysis of the Role of Supervisory Assistants in  
Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan." Unpublished  
Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

- Ratsoy, Eugene W.  
 1970 "Characteristics and Instructional Practices of Alberta Teachers in 1968-1969." Edmonton: The Alberta Advisory Committee on Education Studies.
- Reiderer, L.A.  
 1965 "A Time Study of Educational Supervision and Administration of Urban School Districts of Saskatchewan." Canadian Education and Research Digest, 5:40-7.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and R.J. Starratt  
 1971 Emergent Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Snelgrove, Vernon J.  
 1965 "A Study of the Administrative Role of the District Supervising Inspector in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Stewart, Bob R.  
 1970 "Supervisory Behavior," Educational Leadership, February: 521-525.
- Sparby, H.T.  
 1960 "The Administrative Staff in a Growing School System." Paper presented at Regional Conference of School Administration, Banff, Alberta.
- Uhlman, Charles C.  
 1966 "An Analysis of the Expectations of School Board Members for the Role of Supervising Principal in Nova Scotia." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Vithayathil, K.A.  
 1969 "Administrative Ratio and Threshold Sizes of Administrative Offices in Alberta School Systems." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Wetter, W.J.  
 1965 "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Defined by Parents in Selected Attendance Areas." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Young, J.E.M.  
 1967 "A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Towards Certain Aspects of Their Profession." Canadian Education and Research Digest, June: 112-129.

Ziolkowski, E.

1965

"A Study of Practices Employed by High School Principals in the Supervision of Instruction." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

**APPENDIX**  
**INSTRUMENT USED FOR DATA COLLECTION**

# QUESTIONNAIRE — STAFFING PRACTICES

ALL IN-SCHOOL STAFF HOLDING A TEACHING CERTIFICATE ARE REQUESTED TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

## Section A

### PERSONAL DATA

1. Name of school .....
2. In which one of these grade levels do you spend most instructional time? Check (✓) one.  
 ..... Do not teach (0) ..... K-3 (1) ..... 4-6 (2) ..... 7-9 (3) ..... 10-12 (4)
3. In which one of these subject areas do you spend most instructional time? Check (✓) one.  
 (0) ..... Do not teach (6) ..... Language other than French (11) ..... Ind. Arts  
 (1) ..... Reading (7) ..... Science (12) ..... Bus. Ed.  
 (2) ..... English (8) ..... Fine Arts (13) ..... Voc. Ed.  
 (3) ..... Social Studies (9) ..... Phys. Ed. (14) ..... Teaching Gr. 1-2-3  
 (4) ..... Math. (10) ..... Home Ec. (15) ..... Teaching Gr. 4-5-6  
 (5) ..... French  
 (16) ..... Other (Specify) .....
4. Sex: (1) ..... F (2) ..... M
5. Age (nearest birthday): Check (✓) one.  
 (1) ..... Under 25 (4) ..... 36-40 (7) ..... 51-55  
 (2) ..... 26-30 (5) ..... 41-45 (8) ..... 56-60  
 (3) ..... 31-35 (6) ..... 46-50 (9) ..... Over 60
6. What is your position in the school? Check (✓) one.  
 (1) ..... Principal  
 (2) ..... Vice-Principal or Assistant-Principal  
 (3) ..... Department Head, Grade Coordinator, Curricular Associate, Consultant for one school, or assistant to any of these.  
 (4) ..... Consultant or Curricular Associate for two or more schools  
 (5) ..... Teacher  
 (6) ..... Guidance Counsellor (either full-time counselling, or teaching part-time)  
 (7) ..... Teacher-Librarian  
 (8) ..... Other (Specify) .....
7. What is the average percentage of the SCHOOL DAY (e.g. 8:30-4:00) you spend in the functions listed? Your total percentage should be 100%, unless you are employed part-time.

FUNCTION	AVERAGE % OF SCHOOL DAY (e.g., 8:30-4:00) SPENT BY YOU ON EACH FUNCTION	
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b> (Also include supervision of staff, planning instruction for a department, and library organization.)	%	15-17
<b>TEACHING</b> (Include time spent in interaction with pupils and in individual guidance.)	%	18-20
<b>TEACHER PREPARATION TIME</b>	%	21-22
<b>TOTAL</b>	%	23-25

8. For how many years of post-secondary education are you paid? Check (✓) one.  
 ..... 1 yr. ..... 2 yrs. ..... 3 yrs. ..... 4 yrs. ..... 5 yrs. ..... 6 yrs.

C C
1-4
5-8
9
10-11
12
13
14
15-17
18-20
21-22
23-25
26

9. What is your total number of years of teaching, counselling, library and/or administrative experience? Count this year as a full year. Check (V) one.
- (1).....1 year                      (4).....5-9 years                      (7).....20-24 years  
 (2).....2 years                      (5).....10-14 years                      (8).....25-34 years  
 (3).....3-4 years                      (6).....15-19 years                      (9).....35 or more years
10. Counting the present year as a full year, for how many years have you been employed by your present school county, district or division? (Include time spent as an administrator, teacher, counsellor, librarian, etc.) Check (V) one.
- (1).....1 year                      (4).....5-9 years                      (7).....20-24 years  
 (2).....2 years                      (5).....10-14 years                      (8).....25-34 years  
 (3).....3-4 years                      (6).....15-19 years                      (9).....35 or more years
11. Counting the present year as a full year, for how many years have you been employed in your present school? (Include time spent as an administrator, teacher, counsellor, librarian, etc.) Check (V) one.
- (1).....1 year                      (4).....5-9 years                      (7).....20-24 years  
 (2).....2 years                      (5).....10-14 years                      (8).....25-34 years  
 (3).....3-4 years                      (6).....15-19 years                      (9).....35 or more years

CC
27
28
29

**Section B**

This section concerns your opinions on staffing in the CENTRAL OFFICE of your school county, division or district.

12. Some services which are often available from CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF are listed below. In Column A, indicate your opinion regarding the number of personnel available to perform these services by using the code:

5 Too many                      3 Too few                      1 Undecided  
 4 Sufficient                      2 Unavailable                      0 Don't know

In Column B, check (V) the services which you think could be performed more effectively if based in schools rather than in central office.

SERVICES	COLUMN A	COLUMN B
(a) Consultative Services for teachers (providing assistance on request for teachers)		
(b) Guidance and/or Counselling Services for pupils		
(c) Staff Development Services (providing activities, e.g., workshops, designed to improve teacher performance)		
(d) Audio-Visual Media Services (provision of teaching materials; assistance with equipment)		

30	34
31	35
32	36
33	37

IF YOU HAVE CENTRAL OFFICE CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (Part (a) in Question 12) AVAILABLE TO YOU, ANSWER QUESTIONS 13, 14 and 15.

13. How often have you used central office consultative services since September 1, 1971? Check (V) one.
- (1).....Not used                      (3).....3-5 times                      (5).....11-20 times  
 (2).....1-2 times                      (4).....6-10 times                      (6).....Over 20 times
14. How often did you use central office consultative services last year (1970-71)? Check (V) one.
- (1).....Not teaching last year                      (4).....3-5 times                      (6).....11-20 times  
 (2).....Not used                      (5).....6-10 times                      (7).....Over 20 times  
 (3).....1-2 times
15. If you have used central office consultative services, how valuable have these services been to you? Check (V) one.

38
39
40

Very Valuable                      Valuable                      Not Very Valuable                      Not Valuable                      Undecided

(5)                      (4)                      (3)                      (2)                      (1)

**Section C**

*This section concerns your opinions on staffing in YOUR SCHOOL.*

16. Some services which are often available from IN-SCHOOL STAFF are listed below.

In Column A, indicate your opinion regarding the numbers of personnel available to perform these services by using the code:

- |              |               |              |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 5 Too many   | 3 Too few     | 1 Undecided  |
| 4 Sufficient | 2 Unavailable | 0 Don't know |

SERVICES	COLUMN A
(a) Consultative Services for teachers (instructional assistance from any person in your school)	
(b) Guidance and/or Counselling Services for pupils	
(c) Administrative Services (office management, timetabling)	
(d) Library Aide Services (not teachers)	
(e) Audio-Visual Media Services	
(f) Laboratory Assistant Services	
(g) Teacher Aide Services (non-certificated teacher assistance other than clerical)	
(h) Clerical Services (typing, duplicating)	

IF YOU HAVE IN-SCHOOL CONSULTATIVE STAFF (Part (a) in Question 16), AVAILABLE TO YOU, ANSWER QUESTIONS 17, 18 and 19.

17. How often have you used in-school consultative services since September 1, 1971? Check (V) one.

- |               |                |                   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| (1) Not used  | (3) 3-5 times  | (5) 11-20 times   |
| (2) 1-2 times | (4) 6-10 times | (6) Over 20 times |

18. How often did you use in-school consultative services last year (1970-71)? Check (V) one.

- |                            |                   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| (1) Not teaching last year | (5) 6-10 times    |
| (2) Not used               | (6) 11-20 times   |
| (3) 1-2 times              | (7) Over 20 times |
| (4) 3-5 times              |                   |

19. If you have used in-school consultative services, how valuable have these services been to you? Check (V) one.

- |               |          |                   |              |           |
|---------------|----------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Very Valuable | Valuable | Not Very Valuable | Not Valuable | Undecided |
| (5)           | (4)      | (3)               | (2)          | (1)       |

**Section D**

20. To what extent, if any, do you consider that your effectiveness and/or efficiency is reduced by your involvement in duties which might be performed by non-certificated personnel (e.g., typing, duplicating, recordkeeping)? Check (V) one.

- |           |      |        |            |           |
|-----------|------|--------|------------|-----------|
| Very Much | Some | Little | Not At All | Undecided |
| (5)       | (4)  | (3)    | (2)        | (1)       |

C C
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

21. If the numbers of staff in your school county, division or district were to be increased, to which three areas do you think the additional staff should be assigned? Indicate by checks (✓).

AREAS OF STAFF ALLOCATION	Check (✓) three	C C
Teaching .....		53
Administration .....		54
Consultative Services .....		55
Guidance and/or Counselling Services for pupils .....		56
Media Specialists (Library/Audio-Visual) .....		57
Laboratory/Teacher Aides .....		58
Clerical Services .....		59
Special Education Consultants (Include Remedial Specialists) .....		60
Other .....		61
		62
		63

22. The Department of Education now has Regional Offices in Athabasca, Calgary, Edmonton, Grande Prairie, Lethbridge, and Red Deer.

Indicate how much you expect to use Regional Office staff in the following service areas by using this scale:

- 5 Extensive Use                      3 Some Use                      1 Undecided  
 4 Moderate Use                      2 No Use Expected              0 Don't Know

	Response
<b>A. Consultative Services in Curriculum and Instruction</b>	
Subject Area Consultation in existing programs .....	64
Program Evaluation .....	65
Staff Development Services (providing activities designed to improve teacher performance) .....	66
Educational (Action) Research Assistance .....	67
Media Services (Library/Audio-Visual) .....	68
Assistance in instructional and curriculum innovation .....	69
	70
<b>B. Special Services</b>	
Guidance and/or Counselling for pupils .....	71
Assistance in developing intercultural education programs .....	

23. Please add any comments that you wish to make about aspects covered in this questionnaire.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION**

Dr. E. A. Holdaway, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.



**FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL  
ADMINISTRATION**



**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
EDMONTON 7, CANADA**

I wish to thank you for returning the questionnaires sent to you on November 1, 1971. The time you and your staff put into providing the information is very much appreciated. Would you please convey my thanks to your staff.

Yours sincerely,

**E. A. Holdaway  
Associate Professor**